GRANTMAKING ASSESSMENT
A LEARNING ENGAGEMENT IN COLLABORATION WITH PROJECT EVIDENT
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Executive Summary

Healthy Democracy Fund Overview

In fall of 2019, Tides Foundation (Tides) launched the Healthy Democracy Fund (HDF) with two primary goals: 1) to close the voter turnout gap and 2) to defend the voting rights of historically underrepresented communities.¹ Through HDF, Tides focused its grantmaking and resources toward organizations that dedicated themselves to:

- Mobilizing underrepresented communities to vote through non-partisan voter registration and turnout.
- Bringing diverse perspectives to public discourse through local leadership in underrepresented communities.
- Engaging hard-to-reach groups and employing innovative tools and tactics to elevate their issues to the forefront of community discussions.
- Holding officials accountable beyond elections, cultivating local leadership and supporting policy solutions that strengthen community voices.
- Proactively engaging young people to drive civic engagement through year-round organizing.

Additionally, HDF seeks to advance Tides’ organizational Impact Model² in service of:

- Strengthened capacity, collaboration and infrastructure of partners and the social change sector.
- Increased transfer of all forms of capital to, and wealth creation by, those who are without access and resources.
- Increased inclusion and representation across sectors by those who are without visibility and whose voices are often unheard.

Healthy Democracy Fund Grantmaking Assessment

In the spring of 2021, Tides partnered with Project Evident to conduct an efficacy analysis of the HDF’s 2020 grantmaking strategy. Project Evident committed to collect and synthesize data, and to share actionable insights about the execution of the grant strategy. The ultimate goals of these efforts were to assess the reach, impact, and evidence base of the fund. Anchoring the strategic learning engagement is a Learning Agenda—a set of questions developed by Tides and refined throughout the process. These questions guided the collection of actionable data from both primary (grantee reports, grantee survey responses, and grantee interviews) and secondary (publicly available data) sources (see Figure 1).

¹ This includes communities that historically have a lower propensity to register and cast a vote and, as a consequence, are often ignored by political campaigns. Tides HDF defines these communities specifically as people of color, indigenous people, LGBTQIA+ individuals, and youth (ages 18 to 29).
² Tides’s organizational Impact Model describes the assumptions, challenges, inputs, solutions, and outcomes necessary for the organization to achieve its vision of a world of shared prosperity and social justice.
Figure 1: Tides HDF Learning Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can we learn about the grantmaking process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was easy for grantees about the process and what was hard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have we honored our commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do grantees perceive Tides through their involvement with HDF?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can we learn about the grantmaking impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were the activities grantees focused on to promote civic engagement and turnout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does the publicly available data suggest about the voter turnout gap for underserved communities in select geographies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did partnering with HDF help grantees pivot planned activities and/or leverage the expansion of pandemic-related pro-voter reforms?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What actions can be taken based on the insights from the strategic learning engagement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What can we learn from data collection to inform future grant rounds and HDF programmatic structure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should we communicate what we learned with grantees going forward?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Tides defined trust-based philanthropy as “... committed to redistributing power in service of a healthier and more equitable nonprofit sector. On a practical level, this includes unrestricted funding; streamlined applications and reporting; and a commitment to building relationships based on transparency, dialogue, and mutual learning.”
Key Findings

Working within the framework of the Learning Agenda, Project Evident distilled the following insights:

What can we learn about the grantmaking process?

- Overall, Tides was considered an effective grantmaker by grantees. Grantees found the grantmaking process relatively easy compared to similar funding opportunities, and 96% of respondents agreed that Tides honored their commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy.

- Grantees expressed an overwhelmingly positive perception of Tides, with one noting that, “Our HDF grant increased our capacity enormously [...] I can confidently say that we have always had a great deal of appreciation for Tides and its impact on our organization.”

What can we learn about the grantmaking impact?

- Based on feedback from grantees and publicly available voter data, HDF increased the flow of money to organizations focused on promoting civic engagement and voter turnout, helped close the voter turnout gap for underrepresented communities, and created momentum for pro-voter policies in the 2020 election cycle.

- In addition to directly engaging in democracy reform activities, organizations that received HDF grant dollars in the 2020 election cycle provided invaluable services to protect the integrity of the electoral process, challenge voter suppression and voter purges, build leadership and grassroots power, increase voter registration (particularly for underrepresented communities), and encourage individuals to get out and vote.
What actions can be taken based on the insights from the strategic learning engagement?

- Grantees requested that Tides continue to offer a trust-based philanthropy approach to grantmaking, including keeping funds as unrestricted grants and minimizing the amount of work required to apply to the fund.

- Grantees offered suggestions for improving the grantmaking process, such as prioritizing the funding of grassroots organizations that lack fundraising capacity and providing time estimates for application and reporting requirements.

- Beyond tactical improvement to the grantmaking process, grantees expressed interest in receiving additional support from Tides, including piloting a “digital application platform,” allowing for multiple donor applications, and considering a Tides-sponsored mentorship program to support emerging organizations and BIPOC leaders.

- Finally, the Project Evident team identified opportunities for Tides to elevate its voice (and, by extension, the voices of grantees) within the broader funding community, including educating the field about the expanded definition of civic engagement that many grantees have employed in their activities.

---

4 Black, Indigenous, people of color.
About the Healthy Democracy Fund

Tides launched HDF in the fall of 2019 as a vehicle for awarding grants to organizations that are dedicated to increasing civic engagement in underrepresented communities. Tides advisors work alongside aligned donor networks and leaders from important social justice movements to identify the gaps in funding where momentum for change is building. HDF prioritizes the following in making grant decisions:

1. Mobilizing underrepresented communities to vote through non-partisan voter registration and increasing voter turnout through close relational organizing, texting, phone banks, social media, and other digital platforms.

2. Bringing diverse perspectives to public discourse through local leadership in underrepresented communities.

3. Engaging hard-to-reach groups and employing innovative tools and tactics to elevate their issues to the forefront of community discussions.

4. Holding officials accountable beyond elections, cultivating local leadership and supporting policy solutions that strengthen community voices.

5. Proactively engaging young people to drive civic engagement through year-round organizing to make sure underrepresented communities are always represented, regardless of election cycles.

As shown in Figure 2, through HDF grantmaking, Tides seeks to:

1. Increase the flow of money to organizations focused on promoting civic engagement and voter turnout.

2. Help close the voter turnout gap for communities of color, young voters and the economically disadvantaged.

3. Create momentum for pro-voter policies.
HDF is novel in Tides’ approach to grantmaking. The Fund partners with and raises resources from donors and other philanthropic institutions into a pooled initiative that Tides staff manages and directs funding for, in consultation with movement leaders and donor networks. A Tides Independent Advisory Committee is ultimately responsible for providing direction on administering the Fund, guiding the fundraising efforts, establishing the grantmaking approach, and making all final approvals.

**Healthy Democracy Fund Learning Agenda**

A learning agenda is a set of questions that facilitate learning and decision making within an organization. Those learning questions serve three main functions:

1. Prioritize Tides’ learning needs with specific learning objectives (i.e., what do you want to know?), which can provide input into how to approach measurement and learning

2. Provide a roadmap for evidence building that can ultimately both “prove and improve” Tides’ grantmaking

3. Support the value Tides places on being a learning organization
Below is a list of prioritized learning questions that served as a learning agenda for Tides’ HDF.

**Figure 3: Tides HDF Prioritized Learning Agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can we learn about the grantmaking process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was easy for grantees about the process and what was hard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have we honored our commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do grantees perceive Tides through their involvement with HDF?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can we learn about the grantmaking impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were the activities grantees focused on to promote civic engagement and voter turnout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does the publicly available data suggest about the voter turnout gap for underserved communities in select geographies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did partnering with HDF help grantees pivot planned activities and/or leverage the expansion of pandemic-related pro-voter reforms?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What actions can be taken based on the insights from the learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What can we learn from data collection to inform future grant rounds and HDF programmatic structure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should we communicate what we learned with grantees going forward?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement Approach**

The Project Evident team developed a measurement approach (see Figure 4) to answer each prioritized learning question. The mixed-methods approach collected data from multiple sources to understand the impact that HDF grantees are having on priority outcomes so that Tides can make data-informed program decisions for 2022 and beyond.
To measure grantee experience, Project Evident sent a short survey to all grantees, along with an invitation to participate in an optional 30-minute follow-up interview. In addition, Tides Foundation staff selected a representative group of grantees to target for interviews to ensure diverse geographic and demographic inclusion. This approach provided breadth and depth to the data that were collected, with an over 80% survey response rate as well as 5 hours of interviews with 10 grantees.

In addition to measuring the experience of grantees, the Project Evident team analyzed publicly available voter data to visualize the voter turnout gap for communities of color, young voters, and female voters. While these analyses were not intended to establish direct links between HDF grantmaking and voter turnout, by focusing on turnout in specific geographies, the Tides team can make informed decisions about where to continue existing investments and where to prioritize new investments.

Figure 4: Description of measurement approach and data collection strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sample Question</th>
<th>Sample Size/ Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Reports</td>
<td>PDF and other data products with descriptive impact reporting for select grantees</td>
<td>What were the activities grantees focused on to promote civic engagement and turnout?</td>
<td>65 reports to HDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interview</td>
<td>Weekly calls with Tides and Project Evident staff</td>
<td>What can we learn from data collection to inform future grant rounds and HDF program structure?</td>
<td>25 recurring calls with 3 core team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Survey</td>
<td>A brief (21-question) survey focused on the impact of HDF on grantees</td>
<td>What was easy for grantees about the process and what was hard?</td>
<td>59 responses of 74 total grantees (response rate of 80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Interviews</td>
<td>A 30-minute follow-up conversation with grantees to deepen understanding of survey responses</td>
<td>Have we honored our commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy?</td>
<td>10 follow-up interviews with grantees and 3 meeting debriefs from coalition members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Visualization</td>
<td>Visualizations of trends in voter turnout among key demographic groups in the 2016 and 2020 federal elections</td>
<td>How did we do with different segments of the voting population?</td>
<td>Primary source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2016 and 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2016 and 2020
Key Findings and Takeaways
Following 11 weeks of data collection and analysis, the Project Evident team presented key findings to Tides staff. The findings included insights on the guiding Learning Agency questions as well as observations around the future priorities of HDF grantees and HDF’s future grantmaking.

Below is a summary of findings, with key insights highlighted in gray boxes.

Grantmaking Process

Learning Agenda: What can we learn about the grantmaking process?
1. What was easy for grantees about the process and what was hard?
2. Have we honored our commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy?
3. How do grantees perceive Tides through their involvement with HDF?

What was easy for grantees about the process and what was hard?
Tides was interested in learning how Tides did as a grantmaker and the level of effort required by grantees to complete grant requirements. To answer these questions, the Project Evident team asked grantees to rate the level of effort required by HDF compared to the effort required by similar types of grants (see Figure 5). We also asked grantees, in the survey and follow-up interviews, to share what Tides did well and suggest areas for improvement.
Figure 5: Compared to grants of similar award amounts, how would you rate the level of effort that was required of you as a grantee of HDF? (n = 49)

Overall, grantees expressed their appreciation of Tides’ grantmaking processes and approach compared to those of other grants. When asked what was easy for grantees about the process (e.g., what did Tides do really well?), grantees specifically identified the following grantmaking elements:

- Flexibility
- Clear communication
- Easier application
- Relatively quick application, contracting, and payment processes
- Broader definition of civic engagement
- Locally decided funding enabled

Grantees also wrote in a few areas for improvement to consider for future HDF opportunities:

- More communication with/from Tides staff.
- Establishment of a multi-year funding mechanism.
- Further reduction in reporting requirements.
- Clarification on Tides staff roles and expectations.
- Replacement of progress reports with telephonic communications.
- Earlier announcement of funding opportunity.
Overall, Tides was considered a successful grantmaker by grantees because the grantmaking process was easier relative to grants of similar size. Sample grantee quotes include:

- "I thought the application process was clear and specific. The questions asked indicate to me that you all understand the field in a way that is not always evident from funders."
- "I really appreciated the abbreviated grant application and reporting process. It takes in consideration the foundation's need for accountability as well as the organization's need to focus on doing the work."
- "One thing that we also prioritize is long-term funding, which is crucial to ensuring that our work is supported and our staff know they can engage in the kind of long-term organizing we need."

**Have we honored our commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy?**

When grantees were asked if Tides honored their commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy, 96% of respondents strongly or somewhat agreed (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6: [Was Tides] open, honest, and transparent with grantees? (n = 49)**

![Bar chart showing responses to the question of openness, honesty, and transparency.](chart)
Tides staff also wanted to know whether grantees felt Tides honored specific trust-based philanthropy practices. These practices include:

- Ensuring all communication was open, honest, and transparent
- Reducing the amount of information grantees needed to provide in applications
- Prioritizing adaptability as grantees’ needs evolved (e.g., scaling up digital and remote organizing)
- Supporting grantee discretion over funding
- Facilitating rapid-response grantmaking (e.g., helping grantees weather the storm)

Grantees most commonly agreed that Tides ensured all communication was open, honest, and transparent, and that they supported grantee discretion over funding. Grantees were least likely to agree that Tides facilitated rapid-response grantmaking (see Figure 7).

Figure 7: [Has Tides] honored [specific] trust-based philanthropy [practices]? (n = 49)
Grantees also wrote in suggestions for how to honor trust-based philanthropy in future HDF opportunities:

- Provide opportunities for multi-year funding to reduce the burden of proposals, reports, and other administrative grantmaking activities
- Further reduce reporting requirements
- Share more about Tides’ long-term vision and staffing roles
- Provide funding during local election cycles that occur outside of the larger federal election cycles

Tides staff stressed the importance of knowing if the HDF grantmaking strategy supported trust-based philanthropy principles. Grantees expressed strong agreement and gratitude for Tides’ fulfillment of trust-based philanthropy practices. Sample grantee quotes include:

- “HDF believed in the project. That matters.”
- “Allowed me to define what success means to the organization, not what the funder defines as impact.”

**How do grantees perceive Tides through their involvement with HDF?**

Through HDF, there is an opportunity to test the assumption, embedded in the Impact Model, that Tides empowers social change leaders and funders by providing critical resources to fuel their work. Project Evident interrogated this assumption in part by asking grantees how they perceive Tides.

Grantee responses were overwhelmingly positive; of 39 respondents, 32 (74%) expressed a positive perception of Tides (see Figure 8). Some grantees mentioned that they already had positive perceptions of Tides, and that their involvement with HDF reinforced those perceptions.
While only a few grantees expressed negative perceptions of Tides, their comments are useful to consider moving forward. Those with negative perceptions frequently requested more time with Tides staff—a finding that will be further explained in the Actionable Insights section of this report.

Tides sought to gauge how their HDF grantees perceived them and their performance in partnership. Responses from grantees showed a strong majority of positive perceptions regarding Tides. Sample grantee quotes include:

- “[We] have had a very compatible working relationship with Tides over the last several years. Our HDF grant increased our capacity enormously [...] I can confidently say that we have always had a great deal of appreciation for Tides and its impact on our organization.”

- “The perception that we’ve always held of Tides as a partner, not just a funder in our efforts to reach vulnerable communities, became more evident as we worked together to ensure that all of our community was able to receive voter education, as well as be able to register and vote during the November 2020 election. [Our organization] has been granted funding from Tides for our civic engagement work on several occasions. The 2020 funding was especially reassuring that our original perception of Tides was not only based on our past experience, but it was especially meaningful as we tackled new issues during the COVID-19 crises.”
Case Study: Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Atlanta

Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Atlanta (AAAJ-A) is the first legal advocacy organization dedicated to protecting the civil rights of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders in Georgia and the Southeast U.S. It works at the intersection of immigrant rights and voting rights through four programs: Policy Advocacy, Civic Engagement and Organizing, Impact Litigation, and Legal Services.

During the 2020 general election and 2021 Senate runoff election cycles in Georgia and with support from HDF, AAAJ-A focused on voter registration and outreach, election protection, and language access. Its civic engagement and organizing team reached 94% of eligible Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI) voters in Georgia in seven different languages, contributing to a 91% increase in AAPI voter turnout from 2016. Critical to this success was the work of the legal services team in direct representation and community education events to help complete 1,540 N-400 applications for naturalization between 2016 to 2021. AAAJ-A also provided 140 staff and volunteers to serve as interpreters and poll monitors at 45 polling sites during the general elections, and additionally covered 250 election protection shifts at 38 polling sites during the Senate runoff elections. Lastly, AAAJ-A advocated for in-language voting resources and materials and successfully secured Korean and Spanish language sample ballots and materials in DeKalb County. This was the first time in Georgia history that a county offered an officially translated sample ballot in an Asian language.

In response to the Atlanta spa shootings in March 2021, AAAJ-A pivoted to lead a community-centered response to the shootings, which included fundraising and the facilitation of legal and other community resources to survivors. Just 9 days after the spa shootings, the Georgia legislature passed Senate Bill 202 (SB 202), which introduced new and discriminatory restrictions on absentee-by-mail voting—a method used heavily by AAPI voters in 2020 and 2021. In response, AAAJ-A filed a lawsuit to repeal key provisions of SB 202.
Grantmaking Impact

Learning Agenda: What can we learn about the grantmaking impact?

1. What were the activities grantees focused on to promote civic engagement and voter turnout?
2. What does the publicly available data suggest about the voter turnout gap for underserved communities in select geographies?
3. How did partnering with HDF help you pivot planned activities and/or leverage the expansion of pandemic-related pro-voter reforms?

What were the activities grantees focused on to promote civic engagement and voter turnout?

In 2020, HDF prioritized funding the following civic engagement activities:

1. **Pivot Planned Activities**: Reducing and/or eliminating in-person activities and increasing digital and remote engagement.

2. **Election Security**: Protecting against personal safety threats as well as cyber attacks and systemic fraud.

3. **Voter Protection**: Challenging voter suppression, voter purges, and actions that lead to disenfranchisement, and maintaining pro-voter reforms put in place due to the pandemic, such as vote by mail, early voting, and automatic voter registration.

4. **Democracy Reform**: Redistricting and supporting campaign finance reform.

5. **Year-Round Organizing**: Building leadership and grassroots power outside of election cycles, with a focus on multi-issue, multiracial organizing.

6. **Voter Registration**: Increasing voter registrations, especially in underrepresented communities.

7. **Voter Turnout**: Expanding get-out-the-vote activities in the weeks preceding the election.

Grantees reported that voter turnout, year-round organizing, and voter protection were the three highest-ranked priorities in alignment between their organizations and the HDF (see Figure 9).
Through reviewing grantee reports submitted to the HDF team, as well as analyzing survey and interview data, the Project Evident team learned more about grantee experiences in executing these activities on the ground. Below is a sample summary for each priority activity of the work grantees reported engaging in (for a comprehensive list, refer to Appendix 2):

**Pivot Planned Activities**
- The **A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund** created Facebook Live events, including a town hall and DJ watch parties; updated their website with an interactive voter engagement tool; and conducted regional virtual training sessions in the Northeast, Southern, Midwest, Southwestern, and Western regions of the U.S.

**Election Security**
- **Pennsylvania Voice** put in place voter-protection and election-security measures, drafted an FAQ with legal guidance about guns in polling locations, monitored and assessed the movements of extremist groups, and responded to elevated tickets concerning voter intimidation on Election Day.
Voter Protection

- **Media Democracy Fund** created a Disinformation Rapid Response Protocol, formed and facilitated Disinformation Simulations, developed Communications Tools with weekly meetings to discuss updates, and launched Disinfo Defense Toolkits to assist coalition partners with communications strategies.

Democracy Reform

- The **Fair Representation in Redistricting** initiative is an intermediary that provided support for civic organizations and coalitions in targeted states to advance community-centered redistricting, conducted research and mitigation strategies to promote the continued use of total population for drawing districts, and provided national support services to enable fair maps across states.⁶

Year-Round Organizing

- **ProGeorgia** reinforced their funding commitments to their partners with additional grants to ensure their voter engagement was undisturbed by any COVID- or off-year-election-related cash flow shortages.

---

⁶ Source: Funders’ Committee for Civic Participation. Available at: [https://funderscommittee.org/redistricting/](https://funderscommittee.org/redistricting/)
Case Study: Black Leaders Organizing for Communities (BLOC)

BLOC is a fiscally sponsored project of Tides Advocacy, and a 501(c)(4) and 501(c)(3) Tides affiliate partner organization. BLOC works to ensure a high quality of life and access to opportunities for members of the Black community in Milwaukee and throughout Wisconsin. In a state bearing the highest incarceration rate for Black men in the entire country, BLOC is building grassroots power on the ground to try and create the conditions in which Black families can fully thrive. BLOC is dedicated to:

- Investing in their community and engaging residents to build long-term political power
- Empowering Black leaders with the tools, trainings, and resources needed to organize their community
- Ensuring that Black issues, concerns, and values are represented at all levels of government

As Angela Lang, Executive Director of BLOC, says, “We really started to shift what civic engagement looks like […] It’s not just voting a couple times a year, it needs to be a year-round organizing effort.”

BLOC realizes these goals through one-on-one dialogues, block-by-block engagement, training for a new generation of leaders in Ambassador and Fellowship programs, and civic engagement organizing. With support from the HDF and other funders in 2020, BLOC supported Ambassadors, conducted calls, and sent texts.

Voter Turnout

- **Blueprint North Carolina** organized phone banking through network mapping, provided limited in-person voter registration, expanded their mail-in-voter-registration strategy, engaged in advertising (both digital and targeted radio spots), and invested in new tools to promote voter turnout (such as mass text messaging platforms).

Voter Registration

- **Forward Justice** texted over 70,000 people in North Carolina to provide resources and information on their right to vote, called over 90,000 people to provide information about voting rights and registration, and spoke with over 17,000 community members via phone or text about their voting plans and community involvement.
Case Study: The New Georgia Project

To address historical and increasing political exclusion policies and practices in Georgia, The New Georgia Project (NGP) is protecting the right to vote for Black, Latinx, AAPI, and young Georgians, as well as new residents unaccustomed to Georgia’s new strict voting-restriction law SB 202. NGP’s work focuses on:

- Legislative advocacy e.g., voting access bill SB202
- Public and civic education
- Voter registration campaigns
- Protections for voters and voter advocates

With support of donors like HDF, NGP helped more than 24,000 residents register to vote, trained volunteers to act as poll monitors to assist voters at polling sites, and regularly provided grassroots network updates through their Georgia Peanut Gallery citizen volunteer program.

In response to Georgia’s rapidly changing demographics and voting rights bills, NGP has also expanded operations and made foundational investments in their infrastructure. Three new field offices were founded during 2021 in north Atlanta (Gwinnett County), south Atlanta (Clayton County), and Savannah with plans to open two more in Columbus and Valdosta in 2022. Staff hires bolstered grassroots organizing, operational capacity, data analysis, business development, and other expertise areas to address the expanding workload and support Georgia’s emerging leadership in the South.

What does the publicly available data suggest about the voter turnout gap for underserved communities in select geographies?

By investing in organizations dedicated to increasing civic engagement in underrepresented communities, HDF seeks to close the voter turnout gap for communities of color, young voters, and the economically disadvantaged. Project Evident analyzed data from the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey voting supplement to determine where and to what extent BIPOC, young, and female voters turned out and cast ballots in the 2020 election.

Closing the voter turnout gap for communities of color

Overall, the story of turnout during the 2020 election is a positive one: Voter turnout was exceptionally high, with 66.8% of eligible voters casting ballots. The results from the Census Bureau survey provide a more nuanced picture of turnout for key demographic groups by state.

---

Figure 10: Change in BIPOC voter turnout by state from 2016 to 2020 (percentage points)

The chart above highlights that the majority of states in 2020 experienced an increase in BIPOC voter turnout compared to the 2016 election. One approach for determining the extent to which HDF contributed to these figures is to focus on HDF investments by state. Figure 11 shows the dollars invested through HDF grantmaking during the 2020 election by state, with the change in BIPOC voter turnout as compared to the 2016 election in percentage points.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>$ Invested through HDF Grantmaking</th>
<th>Change in BIPOC Voter Turnout, 2016 to 2020 Election (p.p.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$774,160.00</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$490,000.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$366,666.00</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$345,500.00</td>
<td>16.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$290,000.00</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$250,666.00</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$215,000.00</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$151,844.00</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$66,667.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>-7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the majority of states that received grant dollars also experienced an increase in BIPOC voter turnout compared to the 2016 election, notable exceptions such as North Carolina and Nevada received $366,666 and $150,000 from Tides HDF respectively yet saw a decrease in BIPOC voter turnout. Additionally, of the 13 states that experienced a decrease in BIPOC voter turnout, only 5 were served directly by organizations supported by HDF. The 2 states with the largest percentage point decrease in BIPOC voter turnout (South Carolina and Arkansas) received no direct funding from HDF.

Case Study: Poder Latinx

Poder Latinx Collective, a fiscally sponsored project of Tides Foundation, is dedicated to building the political power of Latinxs in the United States through issue-education initiatives, leadership development, and year-round community organizing. Poder Latinx employs 100% Latinx staff hired from their local communities to ensure representation and build the future of leaders of color in the civic engagement space.

Poder Latinx’s work breaks down Latinx cultural and generational identities to provide year-round organization and education initiatives to support families, youth, and low-propensity Latinx voters. Poder Latinx’s work more broadly focuses on a get-out-the-vote program with year-round civic engagement around voter participation, climate and economic justice, and immigrant justice issues.

With the HDF and other donors’ support in 2020, Poder Latinx deployed field and digital programs in Arizona, Georgia, and Florida to help drive an increase in BIPOC voter turnout in all three states.

In Arizona alone, Poder Latinx engaged 100 volunteer leaders throughout the year and conducted 5,000 one-on-one conversations through volunteers to support voter registration and engagement through their Food Bank, digital events, and social distanced activities (as appropriate).

Closing the voter turnout gap for young voters

Figure 12 also references data from the Census Bureau to compare youth (ages 18-29) voter turnout rates by state from the 2016 to 2020 election. With only a handful of exceptions, youth voter turnout in each state increased dramatically from the 2016 to 2020 election. Similar to the analysis above, the exceptional states that saw decreases in youth voter turnout should be considered in future funding selections. Of particular note is North Carolina, which received over $350,000 in funding yet saw a decrease of 1.4 percentage points in youth voter turnout.

---

9 It is important to note that a few grantees of HDF have a national scope, receiving collectively $400,000 from HDF.
10 Propensity describes any given voter's likelihood of voting in any particular election based on the type of election being held. Low-propensity implies a lower likelihood of voting.
Additionally, the four states that saw the greatest decreases in youth voter turnout (Wyoming, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and Indiana) received no direct funding from HDF in the 2020 election. This should be considered if HDF contemplates funding youth voter turnout in the future.

**Figure 12: Change in youth (ages 18-29) voter turnout from 2016 to 2020 (percentage points)**


**Placing the voter turnout gap in historical context**

While an analysis of both BIPOC and youth voter turnout in 2020 as compared to 2016 paints an optimistic (though complicated) picture, the gap between Non-Hispanic Black, Non-Hispanic Asian, Hispanic, and Non-Hispanic White voters remains stubbornly large (See **Figure 13**). Moreover, an analysis of the previous four election cycles shows that Non-Hispanic Black voter turnout in 2020 was 2-4 percentage points lower than in the 2008 and 2012 elections that President Obama won.
Figure 13: Voter turnout by race and Hispanic origin, presidential elections 2008-2020 (percentage of citizens 18 and over)

Voter Turnout by Race and Hispanic Origin, Presidential Elections 2008-2020 (percentage of citizens 18 and over)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, November supplement, 2008 to 2020
Opportunities for additional analysis

The Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey voting supplement is an excellent, publicly available resource for state and national level analysis of voting trends. The reality is, though, that many 2020 grantees of HDF work on a more local scale. To truly test the causal assumption that investing in grassroots organizations committed to increasing civic engagement results can increase the number of votes cast by individuals living in underserved communities, more localized data of voter turnout is needed. Unfortunately, each state collects and reports voting data slightly differently, which complicates the task of 1) comparing voting patterns across states and 2) comparing voting patterns within states across demographic groups. That being true, below is one example of county-level voter turnout figures in locations that received significant investment from HDF:

**Broward County, FL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Turnout</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 General Election</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 General Election</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Point Change, 2016 to 2020</td>
<td>+ 5.3</td>
<td>+ 2.5</td>
<td>+ 4.1</td>
<td>+ 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in # of Voters, 2016 to 2020</td>
<td>+ 13,925</td>
<td>+ 32,271</td>
<td>+ 46,853</td>
<td>+ 25,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Turnout</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 General Election</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 General Election</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Point Change, 2016 to 2020</td>
<td>+ 5.2</td>
<td>+ 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in # of Voters, 2016 to 2020</td>
<td>+ 57,854</td>
<td>+ 53,742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


**How did partnering with HDF help you pivot planned activities and/or leverage the expansion of pandemic-related pro-voter reforms?**

In surveys and interviews, grantees offered a sobering picture of the evolving challenges they face in supporting a healthy and inclusive democracy while balancing the disparate impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on communities of color. Their responses underscore the need for grantees to balance traditional civic engagement activities (e.g., get-out-the-vote campaigns) with pandemic response activities and broader civic engagement activities (e.g., providing PPE supplies to staff and voters).

COVID-19 presented unique challenges for the 2020 presidential voting cycle, impacting the way grantees pivoted planned activities. During 2020, voters used nontraditional voting modalities (e.g., mail-in voting) more than in previous election years (see **Figure 14** below). Overall, nontraditional voting use was similar for key demographics (see **Figure 15** below).

**Figure 14: Nontraditional voting in presidential elections: 1996-2020 (percent points).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school graduate</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>Bachelor’s degree or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Black</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Asian</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Nontraditional voting includes those who voted early and/or by absentee ballot. The estimates presented are only for individuals with valid responses to both the method and timing questions.

Pivot planned activities

Pivoting planned activities among grantees included two categorical findings:

- Pivoting activities included changes from traditional in-person outreach strategies to digital outreach
- Defining civic engagement more broadly

Pivoting to digital outreach

Of the 30 grantee reports submitted, 22 grantees specifically cited or described pivoting planned activities, but it is more likely that all grantees pivoted planned activities to some degree. From grantee reports and interviews, pivoting to digital outreach specifically meant identifying and securing appropriate digital technologies, training staff and volunteers how to use digital platforms and technologies, and learning what type(s) of communications and methods work best for grantees’ communities during 2020. For some grantees, these initiatives took a significant amount of effort to pivot quickly. Examples include:

- **Voces De La Frontera** cited issues with the Empower App tied to relational voter programs and needs for year-round funding for basic infrastructure and continuity. Extremely high Latinx voter turnout was reported in WI – 74% of eligible Latinx voters voted in 2020 compared to 46.7% of Latinx voters in 2016.
• The Center for Cultural Power used funds from the Healthy Democracy Fund to support the development of culturally appropriate digital engagement content for Black, Latinx, Indigenous, AAPI, and young people, but identified sharing/leveraging content for other organizations as a missed opportunity because assets were developed late in the election cycle.

While some grantees identified digital engagement challenges, many others were able to successfully leverage HDF funds to pivot to digital outreach. Examples include:

• Accelerate Change field tested call-to-action messaging for specific audiences to support refined digital engagement.

• The Asian American Advocacy Fund used WhatsApp and Kakao social platforms for targeted engagement.

• Engage Miami reported youth digital engagement transitioned well from in-person activities; however a lack of in-person engagement did still affect the program's overall success.
Case Study: One PA

One PA administers an Ambassador program to develop deep knowledge, and to support local advocates and civic engagement activities in Pittsburgh. Ambassadors are BIPOC civic engagement leaders from across the city who are recruited for this volunteer program through a thoughtful selection process. They attend workshops and educational sessions to learn about outreach methods, build skills as advocates, and prepare for deployment on local civic engagement issues around census, voter registration, and issue organizing.

With support from HDF, One PA recruited, trained, and deployed for in-person outreach activities in early 2020. However, Ambassadors began pivoting to digital activities in March when the COVID-19 pandemic forced them to reconsider in-person outreach. Ambassadors felt the need more than ever to support stronger civic engagement leadership as they felt the disparate effects of the pandemic on their local communities.

Pivoting to digital activities included shifting to phone calls, text messages, social media outreach, and Zoom meetings. Conversations quickly moved from “How are you?” to more urgent questions around “So, what are we going to do about it?!” With Ambassadors hosting, Zoom meetings quickly expanded to include larger town hall settings with hundreds of participants regularly attending.

During 2020, Ambassadors and One PA staff:

- Nearly doubled One PA's grassroots base and consistently engaged over 2,500 members
- Engaged 369 volunteers in 1,265 volunteer shifts
- Reached 1,322 people via Empower App-based relational organizing
- Sent 1,412,059 text messages
- Made 1,300,795 phone calls

Due to the program’s success, **One PA shared the Ambassador model, and it is now being replicated nationally by other civic engagement organizations.**
**Defining civic engagement broadly**

While grantees engaged in a discrete set of activities (i.e., phone banking to get out the vote), many spoke to a broader definition of civic engagement and infrastructure initiatives as co-dependent and systemic. Defining civic engagement beyond traditional get-out-the-vote efforts was a consistent theme in grantee interviews, reports, and survey responses. Grantees frequently mentioned the importance of addressing underrepresented communities’ “hierarchy of needs.”

For example, 35% (26/75) of grantee reports specifically talked about civic engagement activities that went beyond voting efforts to support an inclusive and representative democracy. Grantees also consistently reported balancing the need to be cautious in the midst of a public health crisis and the need to address the voting access crisis (e.g., voter intimidation, voter registration difficulties, etc.). This resulted in pivoting to activities such as supporting PPE purchases so staff and voters felt safe going to the polls if non-traditional voting was unavailable.
During 2020, grantees faced many challenges from the impacts of COVID-19 and civil unrest on communities traditionally underrepresented in our democracy. Grantees pivoted planned activities as a result of the need to juggle the immediate public health and socioeconomic needs of their communities.

The pivoting of planned activities included tactical strategy changes like pivoting in-person outreach to digital campaigns. However, “pivot” also meant defining civic engagement more broadly as grantees balanced the need to be cautious during a public health crisis while addressing the pressing hierarchy of needs that has prevented equitable access to participation in our democracy. Sample grantee quotes include:

- "Our increased use of the online voter registration tool helped us to identify a gap in the system for registrants without a [state] ID. Because we had [HDF] funding to run a full scale program, we identified this gap and ... subsequently worked in coalition to help pass a solution in the 2021 [state] legislative session."

- "Didn’t have to explain how affordable housing and other initiatives are related to civic engagement. We need to talk about the less obvious democracy issues - hierarchy of needs."

- "What I appreciate about the Healthy Democracy Fund [...] is it was an opportunity for us to, to really not have to explain how things like livable wages or affordable housing are also civic engagement issues."

- “[Tides] understand[s] that the challenges to civic engagement are not just limiting early vote hours and not having a ride. There are also real structural issues [...] All of those things are kind of compounded on itself about why democracy isn’t always accessible to communities of color.”

Expansion of pandemic-related, pro-voter reforms

Protections and creating momentum for pro-voter reforms was a core exploration to understand how and to what extent HDF funds assisted grantees with creating momentum for pro-voter policies. Project Evident used a mixed-methods approach to collect information from grantee reports, a survey, interviews, and publicly available data. Pro-voter reforms included a diverse array of issues and efforts identified by HDF grantees. Examples include:

- Litigation efforts to protect voting-access rights.
- Challenging and/or preventing discrimination at polling sites.
- Redistricting challenges and advocacy.
- Voter-registration access and expansion reforms.
Case Study: Four Directions

Four Directions was founded in 2002 to organize Tribal members in South Dakota to register to vote. From these beginnings, Four Directions has built strong relationships with Tribal communities in Nevada, Arizona, Montana, North Carolina, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota in order to make a critical difference in close federal elections.

With support from Tides and other donors in 2020, Four Directions began organizing for get-out-the-vote efforts, voter-registration drives, and voting-transportation initiatives. However, Four Directions and community leaders pivoted during the COVID-19 pandemic to support an increased demand for mail-in voting. **Four Directions funded a research study in the summer of 2020 to test the time it took to request a mail-in ballot, receive the mail-in ballot, and return the mail-in ballot as Tribal members grew concerned they would be unable to process all their mail-in ballots before Arizona’s deadline to receive them.**

The research concluded that it took at least 6 days for first-class mail-in ballots to arrive at a post office on the reservation in Arizona. By comparison, it took less than 18 hours to reach the Maricopa County office from Scottsdale, Arizona. Thus, even though efforts were made to accommodate more mail-in voting due dates within the state of Arizona, Tribal members did not have equitable access to vote.

Further, even if Tribal members were to go in person to pick up ballots and drop them off, there is only one postal location per 681 square miles on the reservation, compared with one per 15 square miles in Scottsdale. Moreover, if Tribal members wanted to deliver mail ballots in person, early-voting sites accept mail ballots, but there is only one per 1,532 square miles on the reservation, compared with one per 17 square miles in Scottsdale.

Four Directions used these findings to file a lawsuit against the Arizona Secretary of State to sue for a deadline extension. The lawsuit was eventually ruled against, and Four Directions continued efforts to ensure Tribal members’ votes were counted in the 2020 election.

In the survey, grantees were asked how the partnership with HDF helped their organizations create momentum for pro-voter policies. Grantees mentioned:

- Democracy reforms
- Local outreach volunteers and municipal election official engagement
- Pro-voter reforms
- Voter turnout
- Legislative advocacy
- Digital organizing
- Voter protections
Furthermore, 25% of all grantee reports noted the impact their organizations had on pro-voter policies in 2020, by way of strategies focused on making voting easier and more accessible to all Americans, with a focus on those whose voting rights are most at risk.

Grantees were also asked whether HDF’s four 2022 priorities aligned with grantees’ 2021 civic engagement priorities (see Figure 16 for results).

**Figure 16: For this upcoming year of funding (2022), HDF has identified four priorities listed below. Please drag, drop, and rank these priorities in order from most aligned to least aligned with your organization’s 2021 civic engagement priorities. If a priority is not aligned, move to the "Not Aligned with my Organization’s Priorities" section. (n = 43)**

Twenty-five percent of all grantee reports reviewed noted positive impacts of pro-voter reforms. Furthermore, grantees also identified democracy reform, the engagement of local outreach volunteers and municipal election officials, and sustained pro-voter reforms as the top three ways their partnership with HDF helped their organization contribute to creating momentum for pro-voter policies.

**Sample grantee quotes include:**

- “We’ve had a lot of success in advocating for early voting sites […] and avoiding precinct, consolidations and closures, but we also, don’t just always want to be reactive. We want to be proactive.”
“The funding we received from HDF helped us build a volunteer base during the height of the election that we carried into the legislative season. The same people we organized to get out the vote in 2020 are now helping us build support [for a state bill protecting voter access] and thwart voter suppression attempts in our state.”

Actionable Insights

Learning Questions: What actions can be taken based on the insights from the learning?

1. What can we learn from data collection to inform future grant rounds and HDF programmatic structure?
   a. What improvements to the grantmaking process and strategy, as identified by grantees, should the Tides team prioritize in 2022?
   b. What additional grantee requests should Tides prioritize in 2022?
   c. Where are there opportunities for Tides to elevate its voice within the broader funding landscape and internally to other Tides-led initiatives?

2. How should we communicate what we learned with grantees going forward?

What can we learn from data collection to inform future grant rounds and HDF programmatic structure?

Following a report of preliminary findings from our review of grantee reports, survey responses, and interview content, the Project Evident team led a smaller group of Tides staff through a prioritization exercise, focused on what insights are actionable in 2022.

Improvements to grantmaking process and strategy

Grantees offered suggestions for improvements to the grantmaking process, including:

- Further fulfilling the commitment to trust-based philanthropy. Grantees suggested ways that Tides could reduce their administrative burdens, such as limiting their attachment requests, replacing progress reports with phone calls, and offering a page range for application responses.

- Prioritizing the funding of grassroots organizations that lack fundraising capacity. As one grantee observed, “It is important to remember that many times, the infrastructure questions/expectations of a ‘healthy org’ will not be met [by younger, grassroots organizations]. These systems have been accessible to us and many times we are trying to figure out both how an org functions and the important work needed. Just a reminder to offer grace but also support to help us close those gaps […] such as paying for an ops person/development person, etc.”
• **Clarifying Tides’ staffing leads.** As reported by one grantee in the survey, “We still are a little uncertain about the leads and **who we should be regularly communicating with at HDF**, and how likely we are to be able to reapply for funding.”

• **Proactively reaching out to applicants.** Grantees mentioned that they would appreciate more communication about upcoming opportunities, whether that be additional funding from HDF or other funding opportunities from the broader network of funders interested in supporting civic engagement work.

• **Providing timelines for funding decisions and time estimates for application and reporting requirements.**

**Additional grantee supports**
Beyond the logistic improvements to the grantmaking process, grantees also mentioned additional support they would benefit from, including:

• Professional development opportunities for grantee staff responsible for fundraising.

• Shared contact lists for grantee communication and networking.

• A “digital application platform” that would allow for multiple donor applications.

• Tides-sponsored mentorship program(s) to support emerging organizations and BIPOC leaders.

• Sharing of lessons learned from individual grantees with the full cohort of HDF grantees.

**Thought leadership opportunities**
The Project Evident team identified opportunities for Tides to elevate its voice (and, by extension, the voices of grantees) within the broader funding community, such as:

• Collaborating with grantees to create culturally sensitive and linguistically diverse get-out-the-vote and voter-education materials.

• Conducting and/or commissioning an analysis of the role disinformation played in the 2020 election.

• Educating the field about the expanded definition of civic engagement that many grantees have employed in their activities.

The Project Evident team also identified opportunities for the HDF team to elevate its voice within Tides to emphasize what can be learned about a Tides-directed grantmaking initiative.
**How should we communicate what we learned with grantees going forward?**

Project Evident asked grantees during interviews how Tides should communicate learnings to grantees from these evidence-building activities going forward. Grantees proposed the following ideas:

- Host grantee networking events and town hall meetings.
- Share an end-of-year impact report, similar to the donor impact report.
- Hold an end-of-year outcome or impact call with grantees.
- Provide communication assets or content on grantees’ impact on the 2020 voter turnout in their communities.
Conclusion

Through the sequential process of surfacing learning questions, determining a measurement approach to answer those questions, and analyzing the data to inform decisions about the efficacy of HDF, Project Evident has helped Tides execute an evidence-building learning mission.

In initial planning conversations, HDF staff and the Project Evident team surfaced prioritized learning questions, including:

- What was easy for grantees about the process and what was hard?
- Have we honored our commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy?
- How do grantees perceive Tides through their involvement with HDF?
- What were the activities grantees focused on to promote civic engagement and turnout?
- What does the publicly available data suggest about the voter turnout gap for underserved communities in select geographies?
- How did partnering with HDF help grantees pivot planned activities and/or leverage the expansion of pandemic-related pro-voter reforms?
- What can we learn from data collection to inform future grant rounds and HDF programmatic structure?
- How should we communicate what we learned with grantees going forward?

From that initial set of prioritized questions, the Project Evident team, through a mixed-methods approach to data collection and analysis, found the following key takeaways to be considered as Tides determines the future direction of HDF:

- Overall, Tides was considered an effective grantmaker by grantees. Grantees found the grantmaking process relatively easy compared to similar funding opportunities, and 96% of respondents agreed that Tides honored their commitment to engaging in trust-based philanthropy.

- By and large, based on feedback from grantees and publicly available voter data, Tides HDF made a meaningful contribution toward creating a healthy democracy that reflects the entire population in the 2020 election cycle.

- Grantees requested that Tides continue to offer a trust-based philanthropy approach to grantmaking, including keeping funds as unrestricted grants and minimizing the amount of work required to apply to the fund.

- Grantees offered suggestions to improve the grantmaking process, including prioritizing grants to grassroots organizations that lack fundraising capacity and providing time estimates for application and reporting requirements.
Beyond logistic improvement to the grantmaking process, grantees expressed interest in receiving additional support from Tides, such as piloting a "digital application platform," allowing for multiple donor applications, and considering a Tides-sponsored mentorship program to support emerging organizations and BIPOC leaders.

Finally, the Project Evident team identified opportunities for Tides to elevate its voice (and, by extension, the voices of grantees) within the broader funding community, including educating the field about the expanded definition of civic engagement that many grantees have employed in their activities.

As Tides determines the ongoing direction of HDF, these key takeaways and the project’s broader findings will inform the critical decisions that Tides staff will need to make before future rounds of funding.

Measuring the success of each HDF funding cycle will allow for accountable and continuous evidence-building opportunities. The process described throughout this document can be repeated, and the HDF logic model can be updated each time the process is adapted.
## Appendix 1: Grantee Survey and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the background information correct?</td>
<td>• Organization Name&lt;br&gt;• President and/or Executive Director Name&lt;br&gt;• Primary Contact for HDF-Related Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please select the category that best describes your organization’s civic engagement scope.</td>
<td>• Regional&lt;br&gt;• State&lt;br&gt;• Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the 2020 election cycle, HDF aimed to prioritize investment in organizations led by individuals from underrepresented communities. Do the following answer choices describe your organization’s leadership?</td>
<td>• Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) Leadership&lt;br&gt;• Female Leadership&lt;br&gt;• Youth Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the best of your knowledge, what year (YYYY) was your organization founded?</td>
<td>Open Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Tides Foundation, we seek to honor the principles of trust-based philanthropy in our grantmaking. As you reflect on your experience as a grantee of HDF in 2020, rate your level of agreement with whether we fulfilled each of the following principles.</td>
<td>• Ensuring all communication was open, honest, and transparent&lt;br&gt;• Reducing the amount of information grantees needed to provide in application&lt;br&gt;• Prioritizing adaptability as grantees’ needs evolved&lt;br&gt;• Supporting grantee discretion over funding&lt;br&gt;• Facilitating rapid response grantmaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other principles of trust-based philanthropy that HDF should practice in the future not listed above?</td>
<td>• Yes&lt;br&gt;• No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to grants of similar award amounts, how would you rate the level of effort that was required of you as a grantee of HDF?</td>
<td>• Significantly lower than comparable grants&lt;br&gt;• A bit lower than comparable grants&lt;br&gt;• About the same as comparable grants&lt;br&gt;• A bit higher than comparable grants&lt;br&gt;• Significantly higher than comparable grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which aspects of your experience as a grantee were particularly burdensome? Select all that apply.</td>
<td>• Application process&lt;br&gt;• Reporting requirements&lt;br&gt;• Amount of communication from HDF&lt;br&gt;• Amount of time to complete tasks&lt;br&gt;• Other (write in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did becoming an HDF grantee change your organization’s perception of Tides? Please explain.</td>
<td>Open Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you share one thing that HDF did really well?</td>
<td>Open Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you share one thing that HDF could do to improve its process or better understand the needs of organizations like yours?</td>
<td>Open Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the 2020 election cycle, HDF sought to invest in key democracy reform strategies. Below is a list of those strategies. Considering your own organizational priorities during the</td>
<td>• Pivot Planned Activities&lt;br&gt;• Election Security&lt;br&gt;• Voter Protection&lt;br&gt;• Democracy Reform&lt;br&gt;• Year-Round Organizing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020 election, please note for each strategy whether it was a High, Medium, or Low priority for your organization.

- Voter Registration
- Voter Turnout
- Other (write in)

For this upcoming year of funding (2022), HDF has identified four priorities listed below. Please drag, drop, and rank these priorities in order from most aligned to least aligned with your organization's 2021 civic engagement priorities. If a priority is not aligned, move to the "Not aligned with my Organization's Priorities" section.

- Investing in the sustainability of our grantees / ending boom and bust election year funding cycles
- Making pandemic related pro-voter reforms permanent and defending against voter suppression efforts
- Investing in opportunities for gains via redistricting and defending against gerrymandering
- Funding effective counters to disinformation campaigns targeting communities of color

Please list any civic engagement priorities for your organization that are missing from the list above.

Open Text

Please share a story or example of how the partnership with HDF helped your organization close the voter gap in the 2020 election cycle.

Open Text

As applicable, please share a story or example of how the partnership with HDF helped your organization contribute toward creating momentum for pro-voter policies.

Open Text

What are the top two challenges that your organization currently faces?

- Primary Challenge Open Text
- Secondary Challenge Open Text

Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience as a grantee of HDF?

Open Text

Would you like to participate in a 30-minute grantee interview in the next 3 weeks to further discuss feedback?

- Yes
- No
Appendix 2: Examples of Grantees Implementing Priority Activities

Pivot Planned Activities

- The A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund created Facebook Live events, including a town hall and DJ watch parties; updated their website with interactive voter engagement tools; and conducted regional, virtual training sessions in the Northeast, Southern, Midwest, Southwestern and Western regions of the U.S.

- The Voteria Voter Registration team from the Arizona Center for Empowerment created an online digital solution for people to register to vote.

- Engage Miami shifted their organizational strategy toward more robust engagement of non-student Gen Z and millennials than they were able to previously and have reduced their focus on the ability to physically access campuses and faculty.

- Florida for All Education Fund reported that their digital engagement reached more people than ever before, with a reach of 8,543,747 people and 55,388,882 impressions.

- Forward Justice helped hold the Boards of Elections accountable to provide virtual access to canvass meetings. This ensured that all community members could rightfully observe and advocate for the restoration of the right to vote for those who were wrongfully denied during the post-election count.

- Forward Montana Foundation collaborated with state entities to create and launch an online voter-registration portal.


- Maine Voices Network sewed more than 500 masks in one week, was instrumental in assisting members in applying for individual and business relief, helped process unemployment insurance claims, and held community conversations with Rep. Jared Golden and Maine Speaker of the House Sara Gideon to discuss the ways that existing loan programs failed to meet the needs of immigrant-owned businesses in Lewiston.

Election Security

- Arizona Advocacy Foundation hired a team of 13 staff, trained 1,300+ people on voting rights and anti-bias and/or de-escalation methods, and recruited hundreds of volunteers to help make sure that every person that wanted to cast a ballot was able to do so.

- Florida for All Education Fund trained over 2,000 individuals, including staff, volunteers, and canvassers on election protection and poll monitoring; stationed their “guardians of
democracy” at key early voting locations every day of early voting; recruited 222 active volunteers who completed 362 actions (shifts); offered 13 different actions for volunteers to use and of those 362 actions completed, performed (attempted) 7,164 and reached, guided, and properly informed 5,064; trained over 300 canvassers and 1,644 poll monitors and poll workers through Path to Power election protection curriculum and more than 20 organizers through their Local Theory of Change program; recruited and trained nearly 50 leaders and trainers.

- **Pennsylvania Voice** put in place voter-protection and election-security measures, drafted an FAQ with legal guidance about guns in polling locations, monitored and assessed the movements of extremist groups, and responded to elevated tickets concerning voter intimidation on Election Day.

**Voter Protection**

- **Media Democracy Fund** created a Disinformation Rapid Response Protocol, formed and facilitated Disinformation Simulations, developed Communications Tools with weekly meetings to discuss updates, and launched Disinfo Defense Toolkits to assist coalition partners with communications strategies.

- **Florida 501(c)(3) Civic Engagement Table** trained hundreds of volunteers through their partners and grantees and provided each Poll Monitor with the essential information and supplies that they needed to fulfill their responsibilities.

- **MOSES (Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength)** sent a team of 15 volunteers to act as challengers at the TCF Center in Detroit the day after the election to protect vote-counting integrity and vote counters themselves (frequently people of color) from harassment.

- **The Voter Purge Project** initiated field tests to determine the accuracy of purges implemented by secretaries of state in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, and Georgia.

**Democracy Reform**

- **The Fair Representation in Redistricting** initiative provided support for civic organizations and coalitions in targeted states to advance community-centered redistricting, conducted research and mitigation strategies to promote the continued use of total population for drawing districts, and provided national support services to enable fair maps across states.¹³

---

¹³ Source: Funders’ Committee for Civic Participation. Available at: [https://funderscommittee.org/redistricting/](https://funderscommittee.org/redistricting/)
Year-Round Organizing

- **ProGeorgia** reinforced their funding commitments to their partners with additional grants to ensure their voter engagement was undisturbed by any COVID- or off-year election-related cash flow shortages.

Voter Turnout

- **Blueprint North Carolina** organized phone banking through network mapping, provided limited in-person voter registration, expanded their mail-in-voter-registration strategy, engaged in advertising (both digital and targeted radio spots), and invested in new tools to promote voter turnout (such as mass text messaging platforms).

- The **Center for Racial and Gender Equity** ran an expansive Black-voter engagement campaign for the first time in Wisconsin, which they claim directly contributed to the increase in voter turnout seen there in 2020.

- **Detroit Action** distributed social media links through an SMS campaign, engaged in in-person canvassing, conducted traditional phone-banking activities, and promoted other forms of digital engagement such as digital town halls.

- **Ohio Voice** provided incubation support to many new POC-led, POC-constituency organizations focused on voter turnout and voter rights work.

Voter Registration

- **Accelerate Change** promoted digital civic engagement in communities of color, including friend-to-friend strategies and online voter registration.

- **Arizona Center for Empowerment** registered nearly 10,000 voters in the first two months of 2020.

- **The Center for Popular Democracy** registered approximately 200,000 new voters, signed up roughly 150,000 to vote by mail, and saw significantly more people vote in their communities.

- **Forward Justice** texting over 70,000 people in North Carolina to provide resources and information on their right to vote, called over 90,000 people to provide information about voting rights and registration, and spoke with over 17,000 community members via phone or text about their voting plans and community involvement.