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Executive Summary

In 2015, Cohort 3—also known as the “love” cohort—joined the Move to End Violence (MEV) Program. Building upon Cohort 1’s vision and Cohort 2’s critical analysis of race, class, power and privilege, Cohort 3 engaged in deep critical conversations that pushed the edges of their collective comfort zone, all the while remaining in Beloved Community.

This Cohort 3 Final Evaluation Report presents the findings from Social Policy Research Associates’ (SPR) comprehensive review and analysis of Cohort 3’s experience, their feedback on the MEV program design and implementation, the outcomes achieved, and key lessons and implications for moving forward. Key research methods included: document review; convening observations; interviews with 20 cohort members and three primary faculty members, and pre- and post surveys which capture outcome impact assessments and social networking among cohort members.

Reflections on the MEV Program

Although many programmatic design elements of Cohort 3 were consistent with those of Cohort 2, Cohort 3 did have a considerably different experience than earlier cohorts, both by design and due to midstream adaptations. The overall design of the Cohort 3 cycle was shaped by the experiences and feedback of prior cohorts, MEV faculty, and NoVo staff. Several key design changes were implemented to build upon the experiences of alumni and to incorporate previous program-related feedback. Program design changes included: (1) an increased focus on relationship building; (2) the inclusion of regional workshops designed to build core competencies among cohort members and organization staff; (3) a shift in convening design, including a larger focus on integrating Cohort 3 with other Movement Makers; (4) earlier introduction of organizational development coaching and work; and (5) a shift back to attendance of Rockwood Art of Leadership training as a cohort.

In addition to these intended adaptations, major adaptations were made throughout the cohort cycle based on feedback from Cohort 3 members. This feedback largely centered around the desire for more spaciousness and more opportunities to engage in courageous and critical conversations. The primary adaptations included: 1) the creation of space at Convening 5 for a day-long courageous conversation around Indigenous invisibility and anti-Blackness; 2) additional spaciousness during convenings and Rockwood Art of Leadership training; 3) conversations about adaptation to the dependent care travel policy; and 4) the creation of spaces to reflect and heal from current events during convenings. Cohort members overwhelmingly saw these adaptations as successful and meaningful to their MEV experience.

Cohort members’ reflections on the programmatic elements of the Cohort 3 cycle were generally very positive. They expressed deep appreciation for the thoughtfulness with which components were implemented and for the effect these had on individuals and their organizations. The summary table below highlights elements that cohort members identified that worked well in addition to challenges in their MEV experience.
Cohort Reflections (N=20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT WORKED</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Building beloved community</td>
<td>• Creating meaningful connections across cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cohort length and diversity</td>
<td>• Integrating MEV into organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role and integration of the faculty</td>
<td>• Lack of transparency within MEV about funding and leadership opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational coaching</td>
<td>• Understanding the role and work of Resonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication with the broader community through regional workshops and webinars</td>
<td>• Realizing the social change pivot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEV Program Outcomes

For Cohort 3 members, the impacts of the MEV program were far-reaching and multifaceted. Findings are discussed below in terms of individual, organization, cohort, network, and program level impacts:

- **Individual Outcomes:** Overwhelmingly Cohort 3 members felt that the MEV program had a significant impact on them as individuals. Three key areas of individual impact emerged from cohort interviews: 1) cohort members gained a better understanding of and felt a deeper sense of belonging within the larger movement; 2) the strong emphasis on relationship building in Cohort 3 represented an individually transformative experience; and 3) cohort members gained increased confidence in their own leadership and ability to engage in self-reflection.

- **Organizational Outcomes:** For many Cohort 3 members, incorporating MEV into their organizations represented an ongoing and sometimes challenging process. However, despite these challenges, three key areas of organizational impact emerged: 1) alignment of organization with MEV values, vision, and mission, 2) shift towards organizational focus on movement building and social change, and 3) increased intra-organization collaboration and solidarity, stemming in part from a shared movement identity.

- **Cohort Outcomes:** Cohort 3 built upon and extended the work of Cohorts 1 and 2. Cohort 3 members saw themselves as extending Cohort 1’s cultivation of shared vision through beloved community, while also integrating the critical and intersectional lens that was so central to Cohort 2’s analysis. Cohort 3 members identified three key outcomes of their cohort: 1) building trust and engaging in critical conversations, 2) articulation and naming of shared values, and 3) strengthening the movement narrative.

- **Network Outcomes:** Overall, the networking data show critical shifts in the strength of informal and formal exchanges (see Exhibits 0-1 and 02 below). Like Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, over the course of their MEV experience, Cohort 3 transformed from disconnected groups and individuals to an interconnected and strengthened network. Consistent with previous cohorts, there was a multi-fold increase in connections.
Informal network connections expanded from 11% of all possible connections to nearly 60%. In the formal network, ties among cohort members increased from 7% to 26%. Reflecting on their two years in the MEV program, Cohort 3 members reported formal collaborations with all MEV alumni except one. Not only did the breadth of Cohort 3 connections with MEV alumni expand, but so did the intensity of connections—22 of the 33 MEV alumni were identified as formal collaborators by three or more Cohort 3 members during their two years in the program.

**Exhibit ES-1: Cohort 3’s Informal Exchanges**
*From Baseline to End of MEV Program*

**Exhibit ES-2: Cohort 3’s Formal Collaboration**
*From Baseline to End of Program*
• **Program Outcomes:** As shown in Exhibit ES-3, Cohort 3’s ratings of the impact of the MEV program were generally higher than for Cohorts 1 and 2.

**Exhibit ES-3: Assessment of Impact of MEV Program Over Time by Cohort**

- Cohort 3 indicated that MEV had made significant contributions in aligning the movement, and they ranked MEV’s contribution higher than any of the previous cohorts.
- Cohort 3 members both came into and left the MEV program believing that it was making a good impact on the capacity of individuals and organizations.
- As was true of Cohort 2, at the end of their experience, Cohort 3 members were more critical and skeptical of MEV’s influence building on the capacity of the movement to advocate for social change than they had been at the beginning of their experience.
- The area of greatest growth for Cohort 3 was the influence of MEV on building a critical mass within the movement and other movements.
- As was true of previous cohorts, MEV’s engagement of funders was viewed as the weakest of the three outcomes, though cohort members rated it more positively than when they began the program.

**Lessons Learned and Implications for Moving Forward**

The following are key lessons that emerged from Cohort 3’s experience:

- **Lesson 1:** Relationships are critical to building beloved community, and they cannot be short-changed.
- **Lesson 2:** Building alignment within the movement does not mean that Movement Makers need to share a common destination.
• **Lesson 3:** Spaciousness is achievable and is crucial to supporting breakthrough conversations.

• **Lesson 4:** Co-creation and power sharing are muscles that take time and trust to develop.

• **Lesson 5:** Racial equity and liberation is a fundamental cornerstone for the Move to End Violence.

• **Lesson 6:** Movement Makers are eager to re-center the conversation on gender-based violence and gender justice.

• **Lesson 7:** In order to mobilize for shared goals, cohorts need better information on what each member can contribute.

• **Lesson 8:** The movement and the broader domestic and sexual violence field are ready to be engaged more broadly by MEV.

• **Lesson 9:** Movement habits are best addressed through transparency and consistency.

**Recommendations for Cohort 4**

Cohort 3 members were overwhelmingly positive about the core design features of MEV, including the cohort structure and the length of the overall cohort experience, as well as the structure and sequencing of convenings. When asked to reflect on what changes or enhancements they would like to see for Cohort 4, Cohort 3 Movement Makers identified the following:

• Continue to promote leadership and the voices of those who are at the margins of the violence prevention movement.

• Deepen practical support to enhance organizing and engagement in social change strategies.

• Create more spaces for cross-cohort interaction and exchange earlier in the cohort experience.

• Enhance possibilities for collaboration by sharing more about the work of cohort members and their organizations.

• Introduce Resonance and the plans for post-MEV engagement earlier in the cohort experience.

• Use more of a “menu” approach to providing leadership and organizational coaching.

• Increase transparency, particularly about funding and leadership opportunities.

In conclusion, as MEV enters the last four years of its 10-year initiative, the care, dedication, and love that has been put into the program by staff, faculty, and cohort members has yielded returns on multiple levels. MEV alumni have been engaging in broader movement conversations about self-care, racial equity, Forward Stance, and the importance of addressing root causes of violence. The program has brought to the forefront voices that have historically been
marginalized in the movement, helping to make visible the work of women of color, Indigenous women, young women, men, and those in allied movements. In turn, they have helped build movement leadership that is more diverse and that is willing to push the envelope on how to address key challenges facing the movement.
I think we took a lot of the gifts from Cohorts 1 and 2—particularly the vision that Cohort 1 created and then the racial equity and liberation that Cohort 2 did—and really took it even further in terms of alignment. There were some hurdles that we needed to get over, one of them being the relationship of Black liberation and Indigenous invisibility in the context of race, equity, and liberation. Not to say that we solved it, but breaking open that conversation and doing it in the context of beloved community was a huge step forward in terms of alignment.

—Cohort 3 member

In May 2015, Cohort 3 joined the Move to End Violence (MEV) program. This cohort engaged wholeheartedly in the MEV program and, with the support of the faculty and NoVo Foundation staff, helped to bring about a series of adaptations to center courageous conversations and reflection and healing. Their willingness to adapt and reflect, along with the flexibility of the MEV faculty, allowed them to “experiment with” and “center” constructs laid down by previous cohorts, helping them to embody and live out these values in a new way.

With the completion of Convening 6 in February 2017, Cohort 3 reached the end of its time as a cohort and transitioned into the role of alumni Movement Makers. Building on the evaluation data gathered from May 2015 to June 2017, this report presents the findings from a review by Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) of Cohort 3’s experience, their feedback on the MEV program design and implementation, the outcomes achieved, and key lessons and implications arising from their experience. This report focuses exclusively on Cohort 3’s experiences; SPR is producing a companion “field-level” report that is focused on the external-facing elements (e.g., regional workshops and webinars) that MEV incorporated into their model over the last two years.

Overview of MEV Program

Move to End Violence (MEV) is a 10-year initiative designed to strengthen the collective capacity of the movement to end gender-based violence in the United States. The comprehensive program is guided by four interconnected and mutually reinforcing fundamentals: (1) transformative leadership development, (2) organizational development (OD), (3) movement building, and (4) social change. Through these fundamentals, the program seeks to make deep investments in and have an impact at the individual, organizational, and movement levels—all of which will ultimately contribute to a strong, innovative, and sustainable movement to stop gender-based violence.

To this end, the program endeavors to provide an intensive and holistic two-year experience to five cohorts, each of which is connected to and builds upon the work and experience of preceding cohorts. Over the life of the program, as many as 100 individuals from a wide range of organizations will have participated in this cohort experience. In June 2015, Cohort 3
embarked on an experience that consisted of several main components: (1) a series of six convenings in restorative locations, including an international learning exchange; (2) interim work and trainings, including self-care and strategic thinking workshops for cohort organizations and allies; and (3) ongoing OD, including support through both a significant general operating grant and an organizational capacity-building grant.

**About the Evaluation**

SPR’s overall approach is driven by a dual focus on capturing the multi-level outcomes of the NoVo Foundation’s investment in the MEV program, while simultaneously drawing out key learnings emerging from this innovative field-building project. We designed the evaluation to allow for flexibility in making mid-course changes to ensure that our efforts can evolve with any changing directions that MEV work may take.

Our evaluation is guided by the MEV logic model (Exhibit I-1), which framed our data collection and analysis and which builds upon the more in-depth MEV theory of change. The model identifies 15 short-term (1–3 years) to intermediate (3–6 years) outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit I-1: MEV Program Logic Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NoVo Foundation Strengthening the U.S. Movement to End Violence Against Women &amp; Girls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening a movement with the capacity to imagine, align around a vision of and advocate for social change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aligning the Movement</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate to Long-term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> Facilitate the development of a common vision for the movement that uses a critical race, class and gender analysis and is deeply embraced by promising leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide strong leaders who are intersectional &amp; have the propensity for social change (time, opportunities, restorative setting to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Understand the field and power dynamics of movement building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Align around a vision for the future of the movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Foster commitment to and capacity for collaborative relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Develop a model to guide in an analysis of challenging issues in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A cluster of leaders committed to working together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A unified and directional vision for the future of the movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhanced capacity to build alliances and increase collaborative efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A shared critical analysis with an intersectional and aligned approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A sophisticated and evolved social change movement functioning outside the NoVo program structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cohort leaders actively engaged in social change and movement-building efforts in their local, state, and national communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2:</strong> Promote a healthy, thriving movement by exponentially increasing the capacity of individuals and organizations to end VAWG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Invest in transformative leadership development for individuals serving as organizational and movement leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Invest in organizational development and provide general operating support to ensure that participating organizations have the necessary capacities and resources to engage in social change advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A shift towards collaborative, shared leadership models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhanced awareness of self and social identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizations develop, understand and align their mission, vision, values and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adoption of models to best advance organizational missions and organizing work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased organizational capacity to think strategically and engage in social change strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A stronger bench of organizations with shared leadership and management in the next generation of leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainable and healthy leadership and professional practices throughout the movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A thriving ecosystem of organizations working on ending violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement of Other Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3:</strong> Develop a funder engagement strategy to inform and generate greater interest and investment in the work of the movement to end VAWG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage other funders and encourage their investment in collaborative social change campaigns supported by this initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funder engagement strategy developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in funding for social change advocacy to end VAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New funders engaged and resources committed to support collaborative social change campaigns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancing Movement’s Capacity to Advocate for Social Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4:</strong> Promote and equip participants to use cutting edge social change theories and tools as the primary strategy to advocate for ending VAWG in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensure that leaders have the inspiration, training and resources necessary to develop a clear social change vision and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Create opportunities to apply these learnings and skills to collaborative projects or campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased knowledge of &amp; capacity to use fundamental and cutting edge advocacy, organizing, and campaign tools and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased capacity across cohorts to gauge, target, and shift attitudes &amp; behaviors related to gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective research and messaging to inform social change efforts and support projects/campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bold strategies created for ending VAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased time, energy and resources going towards collaborative social change campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased engagement of communities in ending VAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shift in public opinion, attitudes, and behaviors as a result of these social change campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased political and social will to end VAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shifts in laws and policies that address the root causes of VAWG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Critical Mass within the Movement and with Other Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5:</strong> Define and mobilize a critical mass of transformed leaders and organizations such that the movement’s narrative and direction is impacted and incorporates global perspectives and cross-movement collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Design an experiential program structure that will reach tipping point in 5-10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Create opportunities to learn from &amp; exchange ideas w/allied activists inside and outside the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Foster collaboration and partnership around joint strategic campaigns to end VAWG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased connection and engagement with allies outside of the U.S. and usage of a global frame for ending VAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The issue of VAWG is framed in a more holistic, intersectional way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased engagement of anti-VAWG organizations in collaborative campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased understanding of the opportunities for engaging in the global movement to end VAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A network of social justice organizations will integrate anti-VAWG analysis and agenda into their work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Move to End Violence**

*Program of the NoVo Foundation*
The key components of the MEV program design reflect the hypothesized critical elements that need attention and nurturance to build a healthy, thriving, and sustainable social change movement. The overarching goals of the MEV program, outlined in Exhibit I-1, include:

**Aligning the movement** to facilitate the development of a common vision that uses critical race, class, and gender analyses and is deeply embraced by promising leaders.

**Strengthening individuals and organizations in the movement** to promote a healthy thriving movement by experientially increasing the capacity of individuals and organizations to end gender-based violence.

**Enhancing the movement’s capacity to advocate for social change** by promoting and equipping participants to use cutting-edge social change theories and tools as the primary strategy to advocate for ending gender-based violence in the United States.

**Building critical mass within the movement and with other movements** to define and mobilize transformed leaders and organizations such that the movement’s narrative and direction is impacted and incorporates global perspectives and cross-movement collaboration.

**Engagement of other funders** through a strategy to inform and generate greater interest and investment in the work of the movement to end gender-based violence.

The major outcomes that SPR has been tracking since the start of the MEV program are identified below in Exhibit I-2. In addition, we have folded in three additional long-term outcomes (presented in italics) to the logic model outcomes.

**Exhibit I-2. MEV Outcomes Tracked**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aligning the Movement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement-Building Cornerstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A cluster of leaders committed to working together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A unified and directional vision for the future of the movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enhanced capacities to build alliances and increase collaborative efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A shared critical analysis with an intersectional and aligned approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement:** |
| Organizational Development and Transformational Leadership Cornerstones |
| 5. A shift towards collaborative, shared leadership models |
| 6. Enhanced awareness of self and social identity |
| 7. Organizations develop, understand, and align mission, vision, values, and practice |
| 8. Adoption of models to best advance organizational missions and organizing work |
| 9. Increased organizational capacity to think strategically and engage in social change strategies |
| • A stronger bench of organizations with shared leadership and investment in the next generation of leadership |
| • Sustainable and healthy leadership and professional practices throughout the movement |
- A thriving ecosystem of organizations working on ending violence.

### Enhancing the Movement’s Capacity to Advocate for Social Change

**Social Change Skills Cornerstone**

| 10. Increased knowledge of and capacity to use fundamental and cutting edge advocacy, organizing, and campaign tools and strategies |
| 11. Increased capacity across cohorts to gauge, target, and shift attitudes and behaviors related to gender-based violence |
| 12. Effective research and messaging to inform social change efforts and support projects/campaigns |

### Building Critical Mass within the Movement and Other Movements

**Movement-Building Cornerstone**

| 13. Increased connection and engagement with allies outside of the United States and usage of a global frame for ending violence against women and girls |
| 14. Framing of the issue of violence against women and girls in a more holistic, intersectional way |

### Engagement of Other Funders

| 15. Development and implementation of a funder engagement strategy |

Unlike in previous cohorts where there was a task or body of work assigned to each cohort, the outcome emphasis for Cohort 3 was more broadly focused on transformative capacity building. The objective of this third cohort cycle was to produce a group of Movement Makers grounded in the same fundamentals as Cohorts 1 and 2 and equipped to engage in campaigns and collaborations as a network.
Data Sources

Following are key sources of data gathered between May 2015 and June 2017 that informed the data analysis in this report. As much of the data have been analyzed and reported in the Cohort 3 Baseline Report, this report emphasizes data collected from January 2016 to June 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Document review | From May 2015 to June 2017, we reviewed key planning, implementation, and product documents generated by the MEV staff, faculty, and cohort. These documents include:  
- Convening planning and follow-up documents, including annotated convening agendas with learning objectives, expected outcomes, and presentation materials and handouts;  
- Reported cohort activities and interactions (through forwarded emails); and  
- Web-based and other online activities including cohort emails, cohort blogs, cohort organizational newsletters, and announcements. |
| Observations | We observed key events between May 2015 and June 2017, including Convening 1 and Convening 6, a regional anti-oppression workshop, and a regional strategic thinking workshop. To capture the key decision points and dynamics between and within the cohort and faculty, we took semi-structured observation notes. |
| Cohort Convening Evaluations and Faculty Reflections | For each convening, we prepared evaluation and reflection forms for the cohort and the faculty to complete. These forms were tailored to the convening objectives and were typically completed onsite or within a few days of the convenings, after which we held oral briefings to summarize the quantitative and qualitative results and themes. We examined the cohort’s progress, the extent to which convening objectives were met, what worked, what did not, and key insights and outcomes experienced by cohort members. We also presented our recommendations for improvements to the next convening and next cohort cycles. The highlights of our observations were presented at post-convening faculty debriefing conference calls. |
| Interviews | Throughout the 24 months of Cohort 3’s participation, we had periodic check-ins with the 20 Cohort 3 members, informally at the convenings and formally at the baseline (after Convening 1), mid-point (after Convening 3), and at the end (after Convening 6). The formal, semi-structured interviews lasted between one and two hours. All interviews were fully transcribed and covered topics such as: assessment of MEV program elements; personal and organizational impacts; within and cross-cohort collaboration; movement-wide networking activities; movement-building activities; challenges, successes, and lessons learned; and recommendations.  

We also conducted interviews with three faculty members after the final convening. |
| **Surveys** | As an accompaniment to the baseline, mid-point, and final interviews, we administered surveys to all 20 of the cohort members at two points in time. These surveys were designed to capture: (1) the cohort’s ongoing networking and collaboration activities with each other and movement allies; and (2) their assessment of movement strengths and impact of the MEV program. |

---

**Overview of the Report**

The remainder of this report consists of three chapters. In Chapter II we present an overview of the Cohort 3 program design and curriculum, as well as highlights of the cohort’s feedback on MEV program elements, examining what worked well, what was challenging, and what adaptations were made to improve the program design. In Chapter III we present our assessment of the achievement of overarching MEV outcomes, as well as Cohort 3-specific outcomes to date. Finally, Chapter IV surfaces lessons learned and implications as they pertain to next steps in advancing the movement-building work of the MEV program.
II. REFLECTIONS ON MEV PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

While many programmatic design elements of Cohort 3 were consistent with those of Cohort 2, Cohort 3 did have a considerably different experience than earlier cohorts, both by design and through midstream adaptations. This chapter discusses the elements of the Cohort 3 cycle, both intended and actual, and summarizes the adaptations that were made in response to mid-cycle cohort feedback. The chapter concludes with cohort members’ feedback on the elements of the program design that worked well and the elements that were challenging.

Major Shifts in the Design of MEV Program Structure from Cohort 2 to Cohort 3

The overall design of the Cohort 3 cycle was shaped by the experiences and feedback of prior cohorts, MEV faculty, and NoVo staff. Several key design changes were implemented to build upon the experiences of alumni and to incorporate previous program-related feedback. Though not exhaustive, some major programmatic shifts are described in Exhibit II-1 below.

Exhibit II-1: Overview of Intended Design Changes for Cohort 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Design Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on relationship building</td>
<td>Similar to the experience of Cohort 1, Cohort 3 started with an intense focus on building the relationships necessary to realize beloved community. Learning from the lessons of Cohort 2—which shifted the program focus to accelerating social change efforts—Cohort 3 returned its focus to deep individual and group transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional workshops</td>
<td>In order to build core competencies across the movement in critical areas (e.g., self-care, strategic thinking, etc.), MEV offered the Cohort 3 fundamentals workshops as a series of regional trainings to expand the reach of the workshops, and to make them more convenient for Cohort 3 members and their organizational colleagues and allies to attend. Some regional convenings were also available to MEV alumni who wished to deepen their learning in the topics offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenings</td>
<td>The Cohort 3 convenings differed from prior cohort cycles in topic and location. For example, the international learning exchange for Cohort 3 was in South Africa, while it had been in India for Cohorts 1 and 2. Throughout the Cohort 3 cycle, MEV also aimed to strengthen the sense of community amongst all Movement Makers, rather than solely focus on the community within each cohort. All Movement Makers were encouraged to attend Convening 6 and some alumni were invited to attend select portions of other convenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development work at the beginning of Cohort 3’s experience</td>
<td>Unlike prior cohorts, Cohort 3 began their OD work early in the cohort cycle, and completed many of the activities—such as the organizational self-care workshop—in the first year of the MEV experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift back to attendance of Rockwood Art of Leadership training as a cohort</td>
<td>Whereas Cohort 2 did not attend Rockwood as a group, Cohort 3 returned to the original model of experiencing Rockwood as a cohort. This was ultimately a positive change for the cohort members, in that they went through an intense experience of asking for adaptations to be made as a collective, which most cohort members believe deepened their relationships with each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit II-2 below provides the original timeline of Cohort 3’s major activities.
Exhibit II-2: Original Cohort 3 Roadmap
Cohort 3 attended six convenings throughout their MEV experience. Convenings were intended to provide an opportunity for cohort members to build mutual trust and respect and to learn about transformative practices together. A description of each convening’s purpose, intended outcomes, and key activities is included in Exhibit II-3 below.

**Exhibit II-3: Overview of MEV Convenings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convening</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Outcome Objectives</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1: Ground and Building Community</strong></td>
<td>Launch Cohort 3 and begin the work of training, practicing, and exploring collective liberation together.</td>
<td>○ Orient and ground in the purpose and expectations of MEV&lt;br&gt; ○ Understand the importance of beloved community in this work and begin to practice becoming a beloved community as a cohort&lt;br&gt; ○ Understand some principles of movement building&lt;br&gt; ○ Begin the work of discovering the cohort’s role(s) in the movement&lt;br&gt; ○ Better understand and experience the principles and ways of transformational practices&lt;br&gt; ○ Cultivate a vision of liberation</td>
<td>○ Who we are: Introductions through love notes and conversations&lt;br&gt; ○ Introduction to beloved community&lt;br&gt; ○ Reflections, context, and grounding&lt;br&gt; ○ Introduction to organizational development&lt;br&gt; ○ Vision/horizon&lt;br&gt; ○ Resonance across cohorts&lt;br&gt; ○ Cross-cohort conversation&lt;br&gt; ○ Healing and recovery&lt;br&gt; ○ Tai Ji and self-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2: Transformational Leadership Development</strong></td>
<td>Transform and develop Cohort 3 as leaders, build community, and continue exploring foundational practices.</td>
<td>○ Reconnect with MEV and fellow Movement Makers&lt;br&gt; ○ Connect to purpose and vision&lt;br&gt; ○ Increase effectiveness through communication, feedback, and courageous conversations&lt;br&gt; ○ Gain insight into the impact of leadership on others&lt;br&gt; ○ Increase resilience in the face of challenge&lt;br&gt; ○ Deepen relationships for a lifetime of activism&lt;br&gt; ○ Understand and prepare for the next phase of MEV, including Forward Stance and South Africa</td>
<td>○ Reconnection on liberation and equity&lt;br&gt; ○ End-of-life visualizations&lt;br&gt; ○ Vision stands and feedback circles&lt;br&gt; ○ Future travel and POP&lt;br&gt; ○ 360-degree surveys&lt;br&gt; ○ Resilience exercises&lt;br&gt; ○ Authenticity work&lt;br&gt; ○ Practicing courageous conversations&lt;br&gt; ○ Leading Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Outcome Objectives</td>
<td>Key Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3: International Learning Exchange: South Africa&lt;br&gt;Jan. 31-Feb. 12, 2016</td>
<td>Increase connection with a global frame and new ways of thinking; strengthen relationships with cohort members and global colleagues; build collective power and energy together in service of networked movement leadership.</td>
<td>o Build authentic relationships between movement leaders in the United States and South Africa&lt;br&gt;o Inspire a learning stance/practice based on reflection, dialogue, and connection&lt;br&gt;o Engage in mutual learning and sharing of strategies&lt;br&gt;o Ground in South African grassroots-led practices, pedagogies, and participatory appraisal&lt;br&gt;o Generate conditions for shared collective power and deeper sense of connection between frontlines&lt;br&gt;o Work towards advancing an intersectional and human rights-based movement-building approach</td>
<td>o Meeting with Mmatshilo Motsei&lt;br&gt;o Tour of Salt River Community House&lt;br&gt;o Meeting with May Tal of WWWA&lt;br&gt;o Visit to local craft market or Cape Town coastline&lt;br&gt;o Community site visits with Surplus People Project&lt;br&gt;o Meeting with Nozizwe Madlala-Routledge and Embrace Dignity, Fatima Dike, Beverly Soldaat, Shirley Gunn, Sibongile Ndashe, (ISLA), Talent Juno, Katwe Sistahood, JDI, and Lesley Ann Foster (Masimanyane)&lt;br&gt;o Visit to the Apartheid Museum&lt;br&gt;o Tai Ji and Wisdom Circles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| C4: Social Change and Movement Building&lt;br&gt;June 12-17, 2016 | Define areas where there is energy to engage; use frames and fundamentals of social change and movement building; build culture and practices connected to engaging in social change and movement building. | o Ground in experience of South Africa and reset in Forward Stance&lt;br&gt;o Practice and experiment with new habits and thinking grounded in MEV fundamentals&lt;br&gt;o Be ready to integrate skills and concepts from throughout the MEV arc into existing practices&lt;br&gt;o Engage in meaningful community conversations&lt;br&gt;o Learn social change fundamentals within the context of movement building&lt;br&gt;o Learn from and connect with the history of the Civil Rights Movement and the Black Lives Matter Movement | o Tour of the King Center&lt;br&gt;o Group reflection&lt;br&gt;o Community conversations&lt;br&gt;o Movement building and social change: Integration and framing&lt;br&gt;o Fireside chat with Alicia Garza&lt;br&gt;o Purpose, values, and vision horizon&lt;br&gt;o Strategic navigation: Social change and transformation&lt;br&gt;o Tai Ji |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convening</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Outcome Objectives</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C5: Social Change and Movement Building</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for Cohort 3 leadership in convening design, and build on prior convening.</td>
<td>o Ground in ability to hold conflict and disagreement in beloved community and have courageous conversations  &lt;br&gt; o Practice holding simultaneity, mutuality, and differentiation  &lt;br&gt; o Understand that liberation is interdependent and no one is disposable  &lt;br&gt; o Clarify and more deeply align around a shared approach to social change, common arenas for action, and the pivots needed to get there</td>
<td>o Regrounding in beloved community  &lt;br&gt; o Common ground conversations and work groups  &lt;br&gt; o Habits and practices small groups  &lt;br&gt; o Conflict and dialogue in beloved community  &lt;br&gt; o South Africa learning exchange debrief  &lt;br&gt; o Interrupting Indigenous invisibility story circle  &lt;br&gt; o Cohort 3 offerings to the broader community  &lt;br&gt; o Planning for Convening 6  &lt;br&gt; o Tai Ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6: Movement Convening</td>
<td>Close Cohort 3 and continue building relationships across cohorts; practice Movement Maker leadership over own space; generate momentum for moving forward together.</td>
<td>o Complete the Cohort 3 experience  &lt;br&gt; o Engage with Movement Makers from previous cohorts and be part of the network moving forward  &lt;br&gt; o Build beloved community across the cohorts  &lt;br&gt; o Practice how to live deeper in the values and radical love, including holding tension and disagreement  &lt;br&gt; o Share learning, skills, and lessons about how to manifest MEV outside the convening space  &lt;br&gt; o Participate in critical conversations with other Movement Makers  &lt;br&gt; o Understand the network and how to stay connected to it</td>
<td>o Cohort caucuses  &lt;br&gt; o Relationship building  &lt;br&gt; o Storytelling by cohort  &lt;br&gt; o Network: Overview and bringing it all together  &lt;br&gt; o Common ground  &lt;br&gt; o Intersectionality framing and World Café  &lt;br&gt; o Roles and strategy session  &lt;br&gt; o Worldview session  &lt;br&gt; o Critical conversations  &lt;br&gt; o Tai Ji and spirit space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Convening Evaluation Ratings

As shown in Exhibit II-4 below, convenings were generally rated highly by Cohort 3 in comparison to those rated by Cohorts 1 and 2. Of note is that, while Cohort 2 gave an overall experience rating of 2.5 to their international learning exchange, Cohort 3 rated the South Africa trip as 3.7 for overall experience, on par with the experience of Cohort 1. Consistent with the qualitative feedback from Cohort 3 members, Convenings 1, 3, and 5 were particularly impactful for the cohort. Each was given an overall experience rating of 3.7, indicating that the desired outcomes for those convenings were likely achieved.

![Exhibit II-4: Multi-Convening Ratings Summary by Cohort](image)

Note. Convening ratings were measured on a 4-point scale, with 1 indicating poor quality or strong disagreement, and 4 indicating high quality or strong agreement. Ratings above are the average for each element across all evaluation respondents.

Interim Work

Between convenings, cohort members connected through participation in the interim work, which primarily took the form of regional three-day workshops. These activities provided cohort members with additional training and application of knowledge and skills related to transformational leadership development, social change, and movement building, as well as helped them to prioritize sustainable and strategic practices at the individual, organizational, and movement levels. Each workshop was held in three regions throughout the country. Interim work included:

- **Anti-Oppression Workshop.** Led by MEV faculty Monica Dennis and Rachael Ibrahim, these regional workshops focused on dismantling issues of race, class, power, and privilege from the individual to movement levels. All 20 Cohort 3
members participated in one of the regional workshops and many brought organizational colleagues or allies outside of the cohort.

- **Self-Care for Sustainability and Impact Workshop.** Cohort 3 members and their organizations were invited to participate in this two-day workshop hosted at their respective sites that emphasized the importance of cultivating self-care practices at the individual and organizational level. Led by various members of the OD team of the faculty, 19 out of 20 organizations participated in the spring of 2016.

- **Forward Stance and Transformation Workshop.** Norma Wong led these regional workshops around applying Forward Stance principles to movement work. All but one of the cohort members attended a workshop, and most brought organizational colleagues to attend the training with them.

- **Strategic Thinking Workshop.** MEV coordinated this regional workshop for cohort members, their organizations, allies, and alumni Movement Makers. The training, led by Norma Wong, was a skills-building workshop to increase and deepen the capacity of Movement Makers to see, analyze, create, and make decisions more strategically. Thirteen of the 20 Cohort 3 members attended, many of them with organizational colleagues.

- **Organizational Development.** Led by Maura Bairley, all Cohort 3 organizations partnered with one of five coaches to assess cohort members’ organizational and individual needs and goals.

- **Design Teams for Convenings 4, 5, and 6.** The design team was composed of a number of Cohort 3 members who worked with the MEV faculty and staff to design Convenings 4, 5, and 6. The composition of the team varied by convening.

- **Train the Trainers.** MEV held two “train the trainer” sessions that were open to all Movement Makers on Forward Stance and anti-oppression. These trainings were designed to help current practitioners of Forward Stance and anti-oppression work deepen their own practice and prepare to share it with others. Participants in the Forward Stance session were practitioners of Forward Stance from either cohort and were approved by Norma Wong. The anti-oppression training session was primarily for Cohort 2 alumni as a way to further their work as a cohort.
Summary of Adaptations

Through adaptations and intended design shifts, some Cohort 3 experiences were different from what was originally designed. Exhibit II-5 below provides some examples of the intended program design and the realized programmatic elements of the Cohort 3 cycle.

Exhibit II-5: Examples of Adaptations to Program Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Intended Cohort 3 Design</th>
<th>Actual Cohort 3 Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Convening 1 | Day 4 Agenda:  
- Movement Moment—Opportunities and Challenges  
- Building a Bigger We  
- Bowl of Light  
- Reflection and Possibilities | Day 4 Agenda:  
- Open Conversation to Reflect on Charleston Shootings  
- Bowl of Light  
- Healing and Recovery |
| Convening 5 | Day 2 Agenda:  
- Landscape Analysis  
- OD for Transformation  
Day 3 Agenda:  
- Reflection  
- Essential Dialogues  
Day 4 Agenda:  
- Leaps and Seeds  
- OD Transformation  
- Next Steps as a Cohort | Day 2 Agenda:  
- Common Ground Conversations on Values  
Day 3 Agenda:  
- Interrupting Indigenous Invisibility Story Circle  
Day 4 Agenda:  
- Cohort 3 Offerings to Broader Community  
- Common Ground Work Groups |
| Convening 6 | Day 4 Agenda:  
- Common Ground  
- Critical Conversations  
- Values Revolution | Day 4 Agenda:  
- Roles and Strategy Session  
- Worldview Session  
- Small Group Critical Conversations |

Major Adaptations Made in Response to Cohort 3 Feedback

Based on feedback from Cohort 3 members—both in real time and in convening evaluations—major adaptations were made throughout the cohort cycle that reflected the desire for more spaciousness and more opportunities to engage in courageous and critical conversations. NoVo Foundation and MEV staff attended to these adaptations seriously and with graciousness, and were able to move forward positively with Cohort 3. The primary adaptations are described below.

1. **Creation of space at Convening 5 for day-long courageous conversation around Indigenous invisibility and anti-Blackness.** Based upon the experiences of some of the Indigenous and Black cohort members in South Africa—and the charged dialogues that followed—Convening 5 was re-configured to focus strongly on having breakthrough
conversations about the hypervisibility and invisibility felt by both Native and Black cohort members. This was ultimately a watershed moment for Cohort 3 as they deepened their interpersonal and group relationships and practiced living in the values of MEV.

2. **Additional spaciousness during convenings and Rockwood Art of Leadership training.** During the Rockwood experience, many cohort members felt that there was not sufficient time to process and reflect individually and as a collective. While some of the Rockwood design could not be controlled by the MEV staff, there were adaptations made to provide more spaciousness for the cohort. This emphasis on increased spaciousness continued throughout the remaining convenings.

3. **Discussed adaptation to the dependent care travel policy.** Initially, the dependent care travel policy indicated that cohort members could bring their dependents to convenings and workshops, and that MEV would provide accommodations and care for their children. However, this policy did not extend to the international learning exchange in South Africa, which—for many cohort members—felt inconsistent with MEV’s values. While no formal adaptation was ultimately made to the international dependent travel policy, this was a breakthrough moment for the MEV faculty and the cohort members in acknowledging harm done and moving forward with deeper trust.

4. **Creation of spaces to reflect and heal from current events during convenings.** Throughout the Cohort 3 cycle, several events occurred nationally that deeply impacted the cohort members and faculty, including the shootings in Charleston, South Carolina, and Orlando, Florida; protests at Standing Rock; the 2016 election; and more. MEV faculty made significant space for reflection and healing during the convenings to address the emotional needs of all people present.

**Feedback on Adaptations**

In Exhibit II-6 below we share cohort members’ feedback on proposed and realized adaptations made to Convening 5, Rockwood, travel policy, and other convenings. These changes were based on the needs of the unique cohort members and the trust that was built between the cohort and the faculty.

**Exhibit II-6: Feedback on Proposed and Realized Adaptations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptations</th>
<th>Exemplary Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The most important adaptation made during the Cohort 3 cycle was the flexibility and scheduling changes around Convening 5, specifically making space for the cohort conversation around Indigenous invisibility and anti-Blackness. While some cohort members felt that the faculty were slower than the cohort to begin the conversation, nearly all Cohort 3 members themselves sort of determining what needed to happen in order to have those critical conversations. | **Breakthrough moment for Cohort 3:**
|                                                                 | I think that Convening 5 was a beautiful adaptation that was a combination of MEV faculty and the cohort members. And it was incredibly powerful, and made us a better cohort, and it built our community even deeper. But it                                           |
members described Convening 5 as a breakthrough moment—both for them as a cohort and for breaking open constructs around the last girl. Cohort members felt that the faculty beautifully created the space for this critical conversation to happen. wasn't something that, I think, was planned in advance, because it was responding to things that had happened.

**Building trust with the faculty for co-creation:**

I think we were on a delightful learning curve together. I would say a few of us leaned pretty heavily on the faculty to say, “You've got to stop managing us so much, and we're adults, and we can have these conversations and we're all committed to the same values, don't try to manage it and facilitate it so much.” It took a few days, but the faculty finally allowed us to have the conversation that we needed to have. And it was good and it was hard. And my reflection on that is the cohort can’t be ahead of the faculty in terms of preparation and willingness to practice. Everything that we're talking about, not just self-care, shared leadership and all. That, but the racial equity and liberation, how we hold conflict, and things like that. The staff needs to be at the same place as the cohort in as far as that’s concerned, and not hold us back because of their own insecurities or lack of readiness to engage on that level.

**How the adaptation was made:**

I truly thought that I would get a couple hours on the agenda for the Indigenous invisibility circle, but it turned out to be the whole day because we adapted with that. So they adapted to the needs of the group with that conversation. And that was really powerful because that is to me the essence of how we break down silos, how we come to an understanding of each other as spiritual beings. So I think that they adapted beautifully to that. They adapted beautifully to the whole Indigenous invisibility and hypervisibility thing.

Now it was just supposed to be in the morning but they were flexible enough to realize that this was a lot we were unpacking and so we spent all day on it. And it felt transformative to me by the end of the day. I can't really comment on anybody else's experience but I think it did have a pretty deep lasting impact in at least the selective few who participated in that. They just threw the agenda out and let what needed to happen, happen. So I also want to acknowledge that if we had tried to do what we did at Convening 5 at any other point it wouldn’t have worked. We needed the crisis of Convening 4 to occur.

**A few Cohort 3 members mentioned the adaptations made in the convening spaces when events in broader society deeply impacted the cohort, such as the shootings in Charleston, South Carolina, and Orlando, Florida.** One cohort member used the example of MEV allowing Monica Dennis to leave in the middle of Convening 1 as communicating a commitment to serving the needs of the cohort and faculty. I thought MEV was really quite responsive, both the faculty and the facilitators around, like, things that came up. So adaptations were made in our first convening when there were the Charleston shootings, and when we were in Atlanta, there was the Pulse Nightclub shooting. I think folks did make really thoughtful adaptations towards reflection and building for making space for what was going on in the world.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The considered adaptations around the dependent care travel policy were frequently cited by Cohort 3 members as an important and successful moment. While the discussion around adaptation was ultimately handled gracefully by the MEV staff, cohort members also appreciated their transparency around the fact that they did not get the policy right initially.</th>
<th>I was one of the folks trying to decide whether to bring my son, and I was very heartened by the thoroughness and I felt like the MEV team and the NoVo team, they like really took it to heart and really tried to, like, walk the talk and make sure that they were making all avenues accessible and options possible. And so I definitely think that adaptation was taken on fully and gracefully. They were very transparent that they didn’t get this one right. I think that was super important to me because I also think if we’re doing women and girls’ work, that our babies have to be centered—and I don’t even have kids. So that was one that was very important.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The primary adaptation that emerged during Rockwood was more spaciousness to process the experience. Many cohort members identified this as the first time they realized they could take ownership of adaptations to their experience.</td>
<td>It was really interesting at Rockwood. I think that was the first time we felt like, “Oh, we can steer this a little bit more. And this isn’t working for us.” What I thought was really beautiful was that this was a real important moment of camaraderie for our cohort. Because we came together and said, “No. We need to meet alone, and we need to really talk about what we need for ourselves as a group.” And so I actually think, even though it was an uncomfortable, awkward experience, that it was a really important one for us as a community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Twelve cohort members expressed deep appreciation for not just the large programmatic adaptations, but for the smaller, constant adaptations that were made to attend to their needs. Several people felt that this was a true example of MEV putting its theory into practice. A few Cohort 3 members also identified that, as they had an increasing sense of trust in the faculty and vice versa, they realized their own capacity to ask for adaptations to be made. While cohort members admitted that not all adaptations were handled perfectly by the faculty, they expressed appreciation for the transparency and authenticity with which changes were considered and made. | Small, constant adaptations made: 
I think that there was kind of a constant string of adaptations. And that was perhaps one of the strengths of the faculty and leaders, is that they were constantly taking a look at where we were at with our agenda—that were packed to the gills to solve the entire question about how to end violence against women and girls. And folks were always working really hard to listen to what was going on and get us in a place where we were able to thrive. I feel like they were prudent and that they were responsive, and they’re agile, and I do believe that they’re putting their vision and their theory into practice. I saw complete alignment with theory and practice. And, to me, that’s the level of integrity that inspires us. Trust in the faculty and sense of agency in making adaptations: 
I think after [South Africa] we had this sense of ownership as cohort members that if we need something or we want to see something, we need to ask and also trust that the faculty is responding and creating this container for us. |
What Worked Well in the MEV Program Design and Implementation

Cohort 3 members commonly described the programmatic elements of the Cohort 3 cycle as highly successful. They also expressed deep appreciation for the thoughtfulness with which components were implemented and for the effect these elements had on individuals and their organizations. Exhibit II-7 provides summaries of feedback on program elements for Cohort 3, accompanied by illustrative quotes from cohort members.

**Exhibit II-7: Feedback on Program Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Elements</th>
<th>Exemplary Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine cohort members felt that the current length of the cohort experience was sufficient. They felt that the right balance had been struck between intense learning and working and room to breathe and reflect.</td>
<td>Length was sufficient: MEV has figured out how to find the sort of sweet spot. It’s an investment. It’s enough time to get very deep and intimate with one another. And it’s just barely at the place where it doesn’t tip you over the edge in the rest of your work and organizing and adult life. That I think is a pretty good balance. I’ve been a part of other leadership programs where it’s a year long, and it was great, [but] a lot of us still aren’t in relationship with each other after that. So I feel like the length of the program is kind of amazing, even with its sort of challenges that I’d expect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four cohort members were concerned that the cohort experience was a bit too short, particularly wishing it had been the full two years.</td>
<td>Need for more time: There’s a certain degree of feeling like we were just starting to get into our groove as a cohort and then it was over. So it did feel kind of short to me. It probably would have felt more complete if we would have actually gone the whole two years. I think it takes time for folks to arrive at a place of trust where they can begin to deal with more than just surface issues. I think once we got to that place, however, the cohort experience was done. And so we’re at a place now where we really can begin to dismantle [violence] and now you have to survive on your own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine cohort members expressed appreciation for the diversity of the cohort, citing their lived experiences and professional expertise as critical to the relationships built.</td>
<td>Appreciation for diversity of cohort members: I felt that the number of participants was awesome. I appreciated getting the combination of some of the organizations that had been there before along with bringing out new partners. The diversity of the groups that was there, I really valued a lot—having young leaders and not just old people like me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirteen Cohort 3 members expressed deep love and appreciation for the MEV faculty. Nearly one-third specifically highlighted the faculty’s ability to be vulnerable and authentic throughout the MEV experience, and to model different types of leadership for the cohort members. In addition, seven cohort members found great meaning in the fact that some faculty members were so deeply integrated into the cohort experience. In particular, having Monica Dennis and Norma Wong continue with the cohort throughout the cycle felt essential in MEV’s aim to center the margins, have necessary critical conversations, and allow for adaptations throughout.

Deep love and appreciation for faculty: The faculty are all amazing. I really think just clearly that MEV knows how to find the right people to be part of it. I think they [faculty] connect a lot of the different pieces of the theory of change, so the community builder, the race and liberation, the personal transformation work, strategy—So I think they’ve kind of worked well together and offered really important pieces to the MEV experience for me. I do think faculty is just critical. Who they pick and choose for faculty is essential to the experience. I think faculty’s ability to engage one another is important and how well they work together shows, and who they select for faculty is key to the experience. Every single one of them had incredible things to bring to us, and having them there made the experience really rich.

Faculty’s ability to be vulnerable and authentic: You can’t do this work without [the faculty], without folks that have tried and failed, and tried and succeeded, and offer language, and the life experience, and humor, and grace, and love, and authenticity, and that model what’s possible. There was some genuine engagement around habits and practices or leaning into vulnerability and authenticity. You need folks who are going to go there. I think that the faculty held us as members of beloved community. They’ve been very vulnerable themselves, which I really appreciate. And I loved seeing how our leadership is held in different ways. And we’ve been able to see them grow and transform throughout this process as well, which has been really wonderful to witness. I would say that every single person that we worked with just really brought their very best selves to their time with us. And they just really demonstrated such deep respect and consideration for us.

Faculty deeply integrated in cohort experience: I think they [faculty] have to be right in the middle of it with us to really understand the process of how we got to certain things. I don’t ever feel abandoned by them. That’s the faculty and staff trusting the cohort—trusting that we’re all working towards the same purpose and that we’re all in this together. And they’re trusting us to fill in the spaciousness with good conversation or good dialogue. And we’re trusting them to hear us and to see us. I do think it’s a really important idea to have folks together from the very beginning.
Eleven Cohort 3 members thought that the organizational development coaches were an essential component of MEV, on both the individual and organizational levels. These cohort members greatly appreciated the support their coaches offered them in their leadership, in their roles within their organizations, and in coping with personal life issues. Particularly for those cohort members who are executive directors at their organizations, the OD coaching was critical to guiding organizations in navigating the MEV framework. OD coaches were commonly referred to as the “bridge” between the tenets of MEV and actual implementation in organizational contexts.

OD coaching is an essential component:
I think it's a great idea to have people paired with folks who know how to think about organizational leadership and development. You just need that. If you're going to go through MEV you need people who can help you think more deeply about what this means to your own leadership, to how organizations function. I think [OD coaching] is critical and I think it was such a great way to reflect on what I was learning and then how it was impacting me in my personal leadership, but also reflecting back to the organization. So I feel really lucky to have my coach. I felt like it was a really great match and really helped to like contextualize the work also.

It's been really, really helpful, and it's the kind of assistance that we would never otherwise have or get. We would never have the funding or the resources to support strategic planning or thoughtful work about who and what we want to be, thoughtful work about how are we living or envisioning our mission, thoughtful work about how we bring MEV home.

Support for personal and organizational lives:
I personally got an understanding of how I can strategize; how I can move into my leadership; how I can cope, and sort out, and figure out what I need to do within my organization. And then [my coach's] work with us as an organization and helping see where we were as an organization, who we were, how we would work together with others was really helpful.

Through this process I've [got my coach], not only as a colleague, but as a friend. I've gained a sister through this process who was a strategic and professional companion and advisor, but also a spiritual support and guide. So I felt like the way that they made the decisions about who the coaches should be was very thoughtful and important and critical, and I don't think I would have been able to deal with some of the things I had to deal with organizationally without her support.

OD coaches supporting implementation of MEV framework:
There is incredible value in having an OD coach who's someone who can help or guide the fellow in pushing out [MEV] at his, her, or their organization. The OD coach can often operate as a bridge between that value system and that framework as only an outsider can do.

I found [my coach] not just helpful for me personally, but helpful for our organization. And I feel like having that person to help translate and help me bring home the practices that I was learning for these last two years was invaluable. But also to have this person that could see me and my organization and my team and help me make decisions about how best to do that and when to hold off on doing that.
Having an organizational coach helps you bring the concepts and practices back to your organization. It makes it really tangible, having an organizational coach who was coming in and delivering a set of practices and concepts, and then also somebody who could be reflective about what was going on in the organization, it was very helpful.

For nearly all Cohort 3 members, beloved community was an essential component of the MEV experience and their beliefs around creating lasting change in the movement. Sixteen cohort members expressed feeling as though they could count on one another, that they had deep trust and faith in each other, and that building beloved community was necessary for them to delve into hard and critical conversations. A few cohort members also mentioned that, in order to maintain the beloved community that had been built, they would like additional supports from MEV to guide them in expanding their relationships with each other and others in the movement.

Beloved community is an essential component:

With all our cohort members, and across cohorts, we have a very warm and loving relationship among each other. That’s something that you can feel and experience in our interaction, and the fact that we know we can count on each other for different purposes. You could tell that the folks [cohort members] were really enjoying themselves, very transparent, very honest, very candid, very themselves, which is not easy to find anywhere.

I think that we all to some degree were human about it, but we’re also careful to build relationships as opposed to tearing down with each other. So that is beloved community, right? It is having the hard conversations and trying to understand each other. It is just understanding what each person’s definition of it is, and what liberation means to each of us.

For me, [building beloved community] was some of the best learning and growth opportunities around how to show up with my peers in a movement space. So I felt like that was wildly effective, and, I think, will have impact beyond this.

I think trusting the relationships to fuel the work that we’re doing has happened in many ways for me personally. And I think I strongly agree that that has really sort of shifted the way that I view the work and also sort of sent a few people back into the movement, which I think is really helpful.

How is it that as we build this beloved community, that we build a beloved community across all sections of humanity, with a common purpose and a common vision? I think sometimes we lose that perspective. Although I think the focus on beloved community and building that critical mass has just been so powerful. And I loved every minute of it.

Need for more support to maintain beloved community:

I think people come away from the first few meetings together with this profound sense of beloved community, and it feels like being ripped out of a cave and thrown into this other place where this is not the way of being. And I think people should just be encouraged to reach out for support about how to bring some of that back to the organizations.

I think the challenge is how then do we continue [beloved community] after the cohort ends or after that experience ends, both on a stage where folks can engage with other MEV folks
and their organizations, and the people in those communities, but also specifically with the folks from my cohort.

[I would like] some support in doing that [building beloved community] outside, because I think just because we did it in the cohort doesn’t mean it’s going to come as naturally outside, although I think the skills that we’ve built will be helpful for that. I just think it needs some kind of additional support going forward doing that.

Four Cohort 3 members reported that communication about MEV with the broader movement has been building and getting stronger. At this point, the majority of communication about MEV occurs through word-of-mouth, as faculty and cohort members share their experiences informally with others in the movement. Awareness of MEV is also building through the open events and workshops (e.g., self-care challenge; Race, Equity, and Liberation workshops) and through conferences with partners such as the Movement Strategy Center. Some cohort members did elevate the growing excitement and awareness about MEV, especially in mainstream spheres.

There are elements of what we are doing that’s resonating and being pushed out pretty far and wide.

The sense that I’m getting is that [MEV is] starting to have a greater reach than just the individuals who have been part of it, and it’s really starting to attract other people to want to align more.
What Was Challenging in the MEV Program Design and Implementation

While Cohort 3 described many successful experiences during the cohort cycle, all members agreed that there were also challenges. Exhibit II-8 provides a summary of cohort members’ feedback on what presented challenges for the group, as well as supporting quotes to elaborate on these key issues.

**Exhibit II-8: Feedback on Challenging Program Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Exemplary Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A primary challenge mentioned by eight Cohort 3 members was the need to balance their commitment to MEV and to their other life and work commitments.</strong> Because MEV requires cohort members to be fully present, many struggled with being disconnected from their organizations and falling behind on work-related responsibilities.</td>
<td>Every single moment was super challenging. We were asked to bring our full selves, and we were asked to be rigorous in our approach to the work with MEV. And I entered MEV with the intention of doing that, of doing all I was asked to do. And so of course it was super-challenging. It’s not just a time at the meetings, but the pre-work and the downtime afterwards and the need to have some time. You can’t just get back from an MEV convening and jump into something tough, because there’s a lot of processing and emotional work to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Six Cohort 3 members felt that there was a missed opportunity, in that the social change pivot of MEV was not realized for their cohort.** For five cohort members, the lack of focus on gender analysis for ending VAWG was also keenly felt throughout the MEV experience. | Social change pivot not realized:  
I didn’t think anything was missing, other than the rigor around what it looks like to start incorporating social change strategies in the work.  
I felt like at a certain point I wanted to get to rolling up my sleeves and getting to the action, and know—what’s the strategy? And what’s the plan?  
Lack of emphasis on gender analysis and ending violence:  
The lack of focus on ending violence against women is my main concern. I really wanted for us to be laser focused on that and on everything having to do with that policy on community building. How do you actually build a movement to end violence? |
| **One of the biggest challenges reported by Cohort 3 members was the difficulty in bringing lessons from MEV back to their organizations.** Six cohort members found it a struggle to integrate some of the lessons learned from MEV into their organizational contexts, especially when balancing other work | Difficult to bring lessons back to organizations:  
Coming home is kind of hard after you get a week or two-week period of time with folks and you’re focused on these questions and you’re learning and you’re growing. You have these relationships, and then you come back and it’s a struggle…to figure out how to be a conduit to make what’s happening in the MEV space happen in other spaces.  
I wish I had more ways to plug my organization into the conversations that were happening. But I always, I think, struggled with getting back and bringing this information back to my |
responsibilities. This challenge was exacerbated by the dynamics of some OD coaching set-ups, as noted by four cohort members. Those who had strained relationships with their organizations found that their organizations were not very receptive to the OD coaching—a situation that was particularly tricky to navigate if the cohort member was not the executive director. Without support from the organization, OD work focused primarily on individual leadership for some cohort members, limiting their capacity to bring back transformative practices from MEV.

**Challenge with OD coaching and organizations:**

It’s really hard for the organization to be coming on board knowing that I already have this big intimate history with the coach. So the coach is super steeped in seeing the organization through my eyes. I just wonder if some other entry point to MEV would have been more effective [for my organization] and would have had them welcome MEV in more to the organization. That, if anything, I think closed them off more, which is sad but true.

The coaching turned into coaching of me, but I didn’t know exactly how to hold that. Like, on the one hand, it was really supposed to be OD, but then my coach was telling me, like, “It’s okay. This is about supporting you as a Movement Maker.” And so then, when the question came of, is my organization going to do the organizational assessment process, I felt a lot of both confusion and responsibility to make sure that they had access to a great resource if they wanted it. But I didn’t know exactly how to be the ambassador to that resource, so that part was really difficult to navigate in my particular situation.

Our organizational coach was fine, but I don’t think there was ever a full connection between our executive director and the organizational coach we were assigned.

**Eleven cohort members indicated a desire for more connections and engagement within their own cohort and across cohorts** in order to facilitate collaborative work outside of the MEV space. While 13 cohort members expressed a desire to be involved in Resonance, eleven also described confusion around the relationship of the network and MEV and where they might fit in as MEV alumni.

**Desire for more intra- and inter-cohort engagement:**

I see the value of a cohort gelling, but if we are indeed intended to be a movement and they have put so much energy into creating a movement of leaders, it would be helpful to have greater interaction with other cohorts.

I definitely felt at times I was hungry for a more structured way to engage with my peers in the cohort. And I don’t just mean at the convenings, but in ways we could collaborate outside of it and work together. There’s definitely times where I was interested in seeing if there was maybe a way we could practice some of what we were learning in structured ways together—and I actually wonder if that might be missing from the program.

**Confusion around the relationship between MEV and Resonance:**

It was very hard for my cohort to understand what the relationship of the program was to the network, and so collaboration outside of the cohort was unclear.

I definitely think the one thing that could have been probably done a little better was as Resonance, the network, was forming, better
Half of the cohort members said there was a lack of transparency in MEV communications to the cohort, particularly around funding resources and information. A few people cited the example of hiring and job opportunities with MEV and Resonance as another area with limited transparency, and others pointed out an apparent disparity between cohort members who typically had more access to emergent opportunities than others.

I think that there is a lot of conversation around access to information—is communication reflecting equality of all the cohort members?

I think some people believe that [communication] might be improved if there was a very transparent structure that was put into place to help people understand where they are in the MEV ecosystem as it relates to opportunities and resources. And I don’t disagree that that could be helpful.

Transparency is the answer. A lot of people’s blood really boils around money. Folks have access to grants that other folks don’t know anything about, and they don’t know why. And there’s an implication that some folks are more valuable than other folks. So just transparency would be really helpful.

[We need] consistency in the delivery of the communication rather than some sort of light nepotism, where if I know you or I’m close to you, you’ll get this information.

Several Cohort 3 members brought up some challenges they experienced regarding the involvement of the MEV faculty. Four cohort members felt some confusion and stress around the roles of different faculty members and the spaces in which they were present while others were not. They wished they had known if and how they could have connected with faculty outside MEV organized spaces. Another cohort member mentioned noticing when there was tension among the faculty, and would have appreciated more transparency around the faculty’s growth and struggles.

Confusion about faculty roles and presence:

It’s always sort of jarring going from the Race, Equity, and Liberation faculty to Movement Strategy faculty. My experience was sort of a jarring event. I think a lot of this could be avoided with a much more thorough overview in the beginning: “Here’s all the things we’re doing and here’s why we’re doing them. Here’s what we anticipate we will get out of these various tracks.”

I think [the faculty] tried their best, and they tried to engage with us socially as much as possible, but even that could be a little bit more intentional so you feel more comfortable.

Transparency around inter-faculty tensions:

We trusted the faculty in where they were at and the decisions that they made. I think there were opportunities for them to have at times been more transparent about conflicts they were experiencing. It’s such an intimate process that when information is left out, it’s almost more obvious.

Internally, communication was overwhelming for some cohort members, and many felt that external cross-movement communication could be strengthened. While there is internal communication was overwhelming:

There’s a lot of communication. So much so that people, including me, sometimes will check out after a month or so because there’s just lots of different group emails coming through, blogs, all the
Growing awareness of MEV outside of the immediate community, four Cohort 3 members indicated that they knew of many organizations and actors who are currently aligned with MEV’s values and mission but do not know anything about the initiative, particularly if they are outside the domestic violence/sexual assault field.

**External communication is still lacking:**

I think most folks who I would consider pretty aligned with MEV in terms of theory of change and vision and values who are not directly interfacing with the violence against women and girls’ movement, probably don’t know about it or don’t know what it does, or don’t know how it interfaces with broader social justice.

There needs to be a very savvy communications team because NoVo has such an opportunity. There’s such a niche to define the movement or to help define the movement informed obviously by us, but they could really amplify our work and amplify how we see liberation and how we see ending violence against women, what models we put out.

Four Cohort 3 members were challenged by the underlying concept of beloved community and the impact it can have on lasting changes in the movement. These individuals explained that their understanding of beloved community is somewhat different from MEV’s framing, in that there must be a balance between beloved community and bold action—there does not always need to be consensus. Most of these cohort members believed in the power of beloved community as a starting point, but wanted to wait and see how it can or will change the movement.

Beloved community is wonderful, but there’s got to be this sort of expectation that one day you will need to take up arms. So I don’t know if it’s effective, I really don’t know. I don’t know if we are going to win through beloved community, but then again that depends on how you define winning.

I think that I fundamentally do want to believe in it from a utopic standpoint. But when I think of the division we have in our country right now, when I think of major polarities we have in our movement, we can’t fully get to a robust sense of beloved community when there are certain fissures. So, I think that having it be the goal is really important, but having a broad view of what that means, and beloved community does not always mean agreement, it does not always mean compliance.

I think it’s a good starting point. I don’t think it’s effective. My challenge around the model that they are implementing is that so much time is spent on trying to develop the individual cohort community that when we move to a larger ecosystem, that same detail of attention has not been given, and I think we have adjustment issues. By the time our cohort has gotten to a place of trust, which is necessary for beloved community and necessary to be able to dismantle the underlying causes of violence against women and girls, the cohort experience is done.
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Informed by survey and interview data, this chapter discusses the individual and organizational impact of the MEV program on Cohort 3 members. Additionally, we highlight cohort-level outcomes, such as Cohort 3’s signature work surrounding critical conversations. Finally, this section details Cohort 3 members’ perspectives and reflections on progress towards the overarching goals of the MEV program, including aligning the movement, strengthening individuals and organizations, enhancing the movement’s capacity for social change, building critical mass, and engagement of funders.

Individual Outcomes

Overall, Cohort 3 members felt that the MEV program had a significant impact on them as individuals. In interviews, 70% of individuals described being personally impacted by their participation in MEV. They reported that MEV not only had a powerful influence on their professional lives but also on their personal lives. One cohort member explained, “I’m a completely transformed person. It changed me.” Another articulated, “The effect on me individually has been tremendous. I would say it’s probably right there along with the top three most influential things that I’ve done in my life.”

Three key areas of individual impact emerged from cohort interviews. First, as a result of their participation in MEV, cohort members gained a better understanding of and felt a deeper sense of belonging within the larger movement. Relatedly, they began to see their work as part of the larger movement and to recognize themselves as movement leaders. A second key area of impact revolved around relationship building as cohort members suggested that the strong emphasis on relationship building in Cohort 3 also represented an individually transformative experience. And third, they reported gaining increased confidence in their own leadership and ability to engage in self-reflection, which they felt made them stronger leaders at their organizations and in the movement. Exhibit III-1 provides summaries of the key areas of individual-level impacts Cohort 3 members described, as well as illustrative quotes.

Exhibit III-1: Individual-Level Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual-Level Impacts</th>
<th>Exemplary Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enhanced understanding of the movement ecosystem and their role in the movement. Eleven cohort members articulated that their participation in MEV fostered a deeper understanding and feeling of connection to the larger movement. Cohort 3 members also described becoming more aware of their role in the                                                                                                     | Deepening their connection to the larger movement:  
I would just say, it’s just getting more of a grounding of what’s happening in the movement, outside of my kind of siloed section of it. I think that was probably the number one thing—to kind of see how, within the movement, to end violence against women and girls, just, like, the different aspects of it.  
It has had a huge impact on…my understanding, appreciation of the movement as a whole, since I wasn’t really a participant or didn’t consider myself a participant of the movement as many of the others in the cohort did [before MEV]. |
Fostered transformative relationships. Seven cohort members discussed how their relationships with other cohort members and Movement Makers were transformative for them as individuals. They noted the ways in which being a part of a nexus of movement leaders allowed them to grow professionally and personally and to break down barriers across movements.

Identifying their role in the movement:

I think overall the experience let me think broader about [my] role, how I play in the broader ecology of the movement.... I mean, it's similar to where I saw myself before, but I now just see that it's part of the bigger vision....And I've always been a bridge, but I feel like I'm now able to bridge to something bigger.

It totally has shifted the way that I see myself and my work, which I think is something really important and was really needed for me....I think it really has kind of given me a space to do some of my visioning work, to be creative, to think and feel like a part of something bigger. So I think that sense of belonging for myself and reconnecting me to my work and why I do my work has been really important.

I do see my role more in the movement. It took a long time; it really wasn't until 5th convening that I started to see where I had a role both in that cohort as well as in the movement as a whole.

Reframing their role as a movement leader:

I'm seeing what it could mean to be a movement builder in a broader way. So I think about potentially not holding the space that I hold anymore in terms of my job title, or wanting to liberate the work to a new form. I do feel like I'm embracing more possibilities because of it.

Creating a nexus of movement leaders with shared vision:

I really would say that MEV, like, completely changed my life entirely, I think on a couple different levels. One was just sort of the relationships that I've built through MEV. Like, looking back and comparing sort of what my network of relationships was before MEV and now, not only do I feel like I've built really deep professional relationships that are grounded in shared values and shared vision and shared experience, but also some lifelong friendships, which is not something that I would ever have anticipated or thought possible.

Being able to do it together sort of transformed the way that I think about movement building and movement building with other leaders in the same space. I think that helps me both professionally and personally. It alleviated a lot of the burden that I feel or that I have felt as a leader in the movement and a lot of the isolation. That's the kind of thing that can completely drive you out of a movement.

Breaking down silos and linking the movement through relationship building:

What MEV has really done to me or done for me or done with me is just being around other people doing this work that isn’t, like, mine, but is exactly like mine....And we don’t get the luxury of that very often because, you know, our work is brutal and
hard, and understaffed and underfunded. So to have this access was really powerful and has changed the way I do business personally and professionally.... So that's how it's helped me the most I think, is giving me time and space. Mostly time set aside to build relationships with other people in other… modalities of the work.

I've become a lot more present in the work and really have developed new skills around collaboration, developing trust, especially with my MEV brothers and sisters. Prior to being part of the cohort it was very difficult for me to really trust that the other leaders in the movement, that we were working in alignment, that they were also working with integrity. That really changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed organizational and movement leadership. Eight cohort members reported that the MEV program bolstered their leadership skills in organizational and movement contexts. Through the MEV program they developed greater confidence in their abilities as leaders. Further, cohort members described how the enhanced awareness (developed through MEV) of their social identities and positionalities gave them more confidence in their leadership.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhanced confidence in leadership skills and role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

One of the benefits I got from MEV—this experience—truly has been more confidence in myself as a leader and a leader who has experience and a voice that may challenge some of the longstanding principles within the movement.

[Before] I was quite happy being small and invisible, and I was always behind the scenes. Like I was behind the camera and let everybody else kind of be the face of things. And now I know that I can't. And also I'm a lot more comfortable just putting it out there. That's really changed me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed a deeper self-awareness:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I wasn't very confident in my own abilities and my own sort of sense of what I could bring to the world. That has been supported and increased significantly. I'm a straight white guy who is in this program and I came into the program, you know, as a really strong racial equity, anti-racist sort of person in my community. But now I have a sense of my own identity, a sense of where I come from place, a sort of narrative around who I am in this world.

It gave me a deeper understanding of the things that have held me back from being a really good leader, and gave me some tools to improve my leadership. And I see that playing itself out all the time....I've been able to explore my own experiences as a person who, within the context of a system of domination, my own experiences as a white person, but also as a lesbian and a woman in our society. So that's been really helpful for me. It's deepened my understanding of my place in the world and my role in the world, and deepened my understanding of how I can maximize my impact.
Organizational Outcomes

For many Cohort 3 members, incorporating MEV into their organizations represented an ongoing and sometimes challenging process. Some suggested that integrating the immersive and multifaceted MEV experience in tangible and concrete ways was a struggle, or they noted that they faced pushback from organizational staff or leadership. Notably, however, several cohort members who articulated challenges felt that now, after having completed their cohort cycle, they would be better able to facilitate change at their organizations.

Despite these challenges, cohort members discussed the ways in which they were putting MEV into practice and were working towards aligning their organizations with MEV values, vision, and mission. Additionally, as a result of their participation in MEV, cohort members identified an increasing focus on movement building and social change at their organizations. Relatedly, they also discussed a shift towards intra-organization collaboration and solidarity, stemming in part from a shared movement identity. Exhibit III-2 presents summaries of these themes, as well as illustrative quotes from cohort members.

Exhibit III-2: Organizational-Level Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational-Level Impacts</th>
<th>Exemplary Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aligned and integrated organization with MEV practices, values, vision and mission.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Putting MEV into practice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve cohort members reported integrating MEV practices, values, and vision into their organizations. They discussed how MEV prompted them to create space to have important organizational conversations. Relatedly, cohort members articulated how these conversations allowed them to align their policies and practices with their stated values.</td>
<td>With my team, my unit, the people that I work with, [the focus on MEV values has been very explicit. But it's been like bringing home material, coming home and talking about the experience, talking about what's been shared, and, where possible, inviting them to workshops, inviting them to participate in webinars.... So, in that way, we're shifting the approach in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aligning organizational practices with organizational values:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aligning organizational practices with organizational values:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the things that we've really explored is this idea of embodiment. And so, what does it mean for our organization to have that purpose if we engage in actions, beliefs, and systems that are oppressive? Our staff are held down and burdened and— We've always prided ourselves on having a high-quality work space. But what does it really mean to power share? What do employees need to thrive? And how do we make that happen? And what are our values? Our values are love, respect, and integrity. And we've really worked on figuring out what that means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopted a social change lens and enhanced their organization’s movement building focus.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shifting towards movement building:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven cohort members reported their organizations had shifted towards a focus on movement building and</td>
<td>[I] think also the conversations that we've had as an organization have been really helpful—about how do we shift to think more about our work as movement building? And that is a shift for us. So we're kind of starting there. And how do we situate ourselves, and where are our best assets? So even those</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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had re-conceptualized their work through a social change lens. Cohort members also described an increasing organizational commitment to engage in activism and movement-building work. Conversations that are just happening now have been super helpful in terms of how we see this as movement-building work.

**Enhancing social change lens:**
I went from explaining that we're a direct service agency—you know, providing housing and kind of just overview of what we do—and now I pretty much sum it up that we are an agency focused on healing the effects of colonization in our community…. I would say it's also affected the agency as well, in that, you know, when Standing Rock happened, my staff were, at any given moment, a third to a half were gone because of all the multiple trips that were made out there to show solidarity and support for what was going on, which is in my homeland…. I don't know if that would have happened a few years ago or if we might have been hesitant to kind of participate in that kind of a political movement.

I would say that we see ourselves as aligned in ways that in the past we perhaps would not have…. Everything from our…relationships in our work with Native folks to the way that we approach things like Black Lives Matter and Standing Rock—and, you know, these big emergent issues to the sort of types of opportunities that we’re interested in exploring and jumping on to that are— I guess maybe one way to describe it is, it kind of forced us to get out of the box of what we were comfortable calling innovative and social change work and has sort of put us into alignment with other leaders.

**Cohort Outcomes**
The trust and relationships Cohort 3 built were cited as powerful features of this cohort, allowing them to push their shared analyses forward and providing the grounding necessary to engage in critical and courageous conversations. Cohort members also felt that the articulation and naming of shared values was an important outcome of their work. Finally, Cohort 3 members noted the ways in which they amplified the movement narrative, by expanding who is part of the movement or who is a stakeholder in the movement, as well as by spreading awareness of the movement. Below Exhibit III-3 summarizes these themes and offers supporting quotes from Cohort 3 members.

**Exhibit III-3: Individual-Level Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort-Level Impacts</th>
<th>Exemplary Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built trust, relationships, and community. The trust fostered among members was a significant outcome of Cohort 3. Thirteen members highlighted the fact that the cohort was able to cultivate deep</td>
<td>Creating shared foundations: I think that we have a commonality of, you know, we're all part of the same family, and so there's a shortcut sense of working together and of a shared experience, a shared intention, a shared philosophy of practice. I think that's definitely there more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
trust, relationships, and community. They noted that the community they built with one another provided a shared understanding and foundation for their work. Many cohort members suggested that the trust and relationships they were able to build allowed them to have transformative critical conversations.

so for my cohort, but still even for other cohorts, across cohorts. So I definitely think that the MEV experience produced that.

With my cohort in particular, there was a collection of folks that really over time developed a lot of deep trust and faith and community with each other....The premise is, if we put people together so they can live authentically, dare boldly, and be themselves, and to challenge each other in a loving way to think about the work differently. And I continue to believe that that is the key to lasting change.

**Trusting each other to have courageous conversations:**
The part of building beloved community [that] has been the most powerful part for me...as the cohort, not as a community, [is] I think we've made breakthroughs, and we're able to talk about especially really tough issues around race in a way that— And I've been in a lot of different progressive spaces in a way that I haven't done before. And so I think that's really powerful.

Cohort 3 was known as the love cohort, so that tells you a lot right there. We were just respectful of each other, but we did raise what we needed to raise.

**Naming and articulating shared values.** Seven cohort members suggested that a key outcome of Cohort 3 was naming and clearly articulating the values behind Cohorts 1 and 2. Cohort members suggested that this represented a primary mechanism through which Cohort 3 helped to align the movement.

**Living into values:**
I would say the values resolution work that we have done, like naming and articulating what the values are of the world that we're trying to live into. So where Cohort 1 had the vision, us really wrapping the values around that and starting to hone in on what is the alternative world view.

**Integrating and pushing forward Cohort 1 and 2's vision and values work:**
I think we took a lot of the gifts from Cohort 1 and 2—particularly the vision that Cohort 1 created and then the racial equity and liberation, like introducing that, that Cohort 2 did—and really took it even further in terms of alignment.

**Amplifying the narrative and broadening the movement.** Five cohort members suggested that amplifying the movement narrative and broadening the boundaries of the movement represents a key outcome of Cohort 3. They discussed the ways in which Cohort 3 members are communicating MEV vision and practices to a broader audience. Further, members suggested that Cohort 3 has opened up the boundaries of the movement.

**Amplifying the narrative:**
I've seen Cohort 3, along with others, play a pretty central role in shaping the narrative....And I think that examples of that would be everything from, you know, the folks who spoke at the White House summit, the conference keynotes that I've seen people are doing, the, even the white supremacy stuff that we've done. I think that many of us are working in many different ways as far as building capacity to advocate for social change. But it feels to me like the moment that we were in Cohort 3 was one of really amplifying the narrative.

**Broadening the movement boundaries:**
[Cohort 3 is] thinking more broadly of our movement and who could be included, and who is included, and who we work with, and the ones who we're aligned with. I think that definitely we
are engaging in different ways with all kinds of folks in ways that we weren't before.

[For Cohort 3, I think that happened with the women’s movement—the Women’s March [and] I think Black Lives Matter....I think we are able to coalesce and we were able to come together around those two things, despite the differences in some of our ideology.

Signature Work: Making Space for Critical Conversations

Cohort 3 built upon and extended the work of Cohorts 1 and 2, seeing itself as extending Cohort 1’s cultivation of shared vision through beloved community, while also integrating the critical and intersectional lens that was so central to Cohort 2’s analysis. Cohort 3 members described their cohort as putting into practice both the cultivation of beloved community and the centering of race, class, privilege, and power. One cohort member articulated, “I think that Cohort 3 was building off of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2—the last girl analysis plus an explicit critical race analysis….Cohort 3 was the practice of the experimentation of what it was like when those things were centralized.”

Cohort 3’s work to put these pieces into practice was exemplified by the conversations and analyses that emerged surrounding Native invisibility and anti-Blackness. This conversation came to fruition at Convening 5 and emerged in response to mounting tensions following the South Africa trip. At the close of the trip, some Indigenous cohort members articulated the ways in which they identified with Black South Africans’ experiences of apartheid, noting parallels with the Indigenous experience living under occupation in the United States. Some Black cohort members responded by suggesting that the trip was more centrally connected with their experiences, and they questioned if Native people really were standing in solidarity with Black Americans. This left some Native cohort members feeling upset and silenced. Reflecting on this, one cohort member articulated: “The experience in South Africa kind of peeled the layer away from that suppressed conflict between the anti-Blackness movement and Indigenous [movement].”

At Convening 4, one Indigenous cohort member was upset to learn that the convening so heavily focused on Atlanta’s historical role in the Civil Rights Movement, while the long history of Indigenous people in Atlanta—including the Cherokee government and resistance—had not been discussed. This omission prompted her to question whether MEV was really a movement of anti-Blackness and whether there was any place for her in the program as an Indigenous leader. She explained: “I came back deeply disturbed and fairly convinced there was no place for me in the movement, as it was shifting, and that to stay in it and to accept the money and pretend that I was part of that focus it was going towards would be disingenuous and dishonest.” After seriously considering leaving the program, she spoke with MEV Director Jackie Payne and was convinced to voice her concerns to the cohort, which she did in an email.

I essentially wrote up a letter, an e-mail, to the entire group explaining how I felt after that last Convening [4]—that there was a sense of [being] invisible, being not seen or heard, and that the movement seemed to be grounded towards a
focus that the last girl is Black, which is fine….But I didn’t see how I could contribute to that movement.

In response to cohort members’ feedback, the schedule of Convening 5 was adapted to provide the space for cohort members to respond and engage, and cohort members overwhelmingly saw these adaptations as a success (see Chapter II for detailed discussion). The feedback after Convening 5 was the most positive of any MEV convening to date, mostly because cohort members saw the conversation about anti-Blackness and Native invisibility as being extremely transformative. The Indigenous cohort member who raised the initial concern described it: “It really was a transformative experience; I think for everyone in different ways….When I left that convening I was very happy that I hadn’t left MEV.” A Black cohort member also described the effect:

[Convening 5] facilitated the space, the independence, the flexibility that we needed to facilitate brave space and have courageous conversations with each other as Black and Native sisters.

Cohort members identified the work that emerged out of Convening 5 as a key example of the ways in which they were able to put into practice beloved community and make space for critical conversations. They suggested that the trust they had cultivated so early in their cohort cycle was in part what allowed this conversation to be so transformational. One cohort member described Convening 5 as “a tremendous example of how people who build trust and a relationship with one another and knowledge can get to a completely new place together.”

Cohort 3 members also saw this conversation and the work that emerged from it as important in terms of aligning the larger movement and providing a model for engaging in these types of conversations. One member explained that the cohort “has actually produced a model of how those conversations can happen that can spread.” As quoted at the beginning of this report, another Cohort 3 member said:

There were some hurdles that we needed to get over, one of them being the relationship of Black liberation and Indigenous invisibility in the context of race, equity, and liberation. Not to say that we solved it, but breaking open that conversation and doing it in the context of beloved community was a huge step forward in terms of alignment.

**Network Outcomes**

To better document Cohort 3’s connections to each other and program alumni, SPR collected social networking information on their informal exchanges and formal collaborations at two points in time: prior to joining MEV—what we call the baseline—and after Convening 6, the conclusion of their participation in MEV as a cohort. As with previous cohorts, our definition of informal exchanges included sharing information on events, campaigns, and program services, as well as trading notes on strategies and best practices. Formal collaborations included participating in the same coalition or network, presenting at summits and conferences together, or working on advocacy efforts together. At both the beginning and end-point of Cohort 3’s participation in MEV, we used in-depth interviews to triangulate and build on survey results.
Drawing on the social network analysis, this section presents maps and measures of the evolving MEV network over time.

**Connections Among Cohort 3 Members**

Like Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, over the course of MEV Cohort 3 transformed from disconnected groups and individuals to an interconnected and strengthened network. Reflecting on their time together, Cohort 3 members described specific formal collaborations that emerged during the MEV program as well as the foundation the program laid for future work together. As one cohort member reflected, “It feels like we built a bunch of trust and we went on a journey together and [we’re] like family and close friends…I could write a little paragraph about ideas that we had talked about that haven’t come to fruition yet.”

Other themes that emerged from the interviews were a broadening of horizons of who is part of the movement and expanding cross-movement work:

> [We are] looking at each other in a different way in terms of having a common experience around MEV to bring those approaches to those conversations and ideas, and then one level of really feeling comfortable working with each other.

> We were able to connect with coalition folks that we never connected with before…Now we have relationships with a variety of coalition folks across the country, and so we don't necessarily have to go through this third party. And that's been a beautiful thing. And, like I said, I think that idea of who is on the same team as part of this movement has really expanded.…We'd never have necessarily thought of how to work with domestic workers before. And MEV has helped open up the idea of who is part of this movement.

Furthermore, the last year provided opportunities for cohort members to stand in solidarity with one another across difference. One Cohort 3 member, for instance, described how the connections she and her organization made helped to counter her staff members’ experience of Indigenous invisibility and isolation. She said that there was an “impact [on our organization] of seeing true solidarity from some of the cohort members. She explained that they “showed solidarity around the Standing Rock issues, both locally in their areas as well as making trips out to Standing Rock to be there in person as well.”

Exhibits III-4 and III-5 show the evolution of the informal and formal networks from Spring 2015 to Spring 2017. The dots (called nodes) representing cohort members are sized by *betweenness*, a measure of the degree to which individuals lie between others in the network and act as brokers, connecting people who are not connected directly to each other. Key findings related to changes in connections among Cohort 3 members include:
• **Consistent with previous cohorts, there was a multi-fold increase in connections.** Prior to joining MEV, several Cohort 3 members were not connected to each other: Alexis, Ariel, and Maria did not report any informal connections; Alexis, Maria, Ana, Edith, and Jamila did not report any formal collaborations. Similar to Cohorts 1 and 2, by the end of their participation in MEV, all Cohort 3 members were connected to each other, both formally and informally, reflecting the enduring power of the MEV program to bring together diverse individuals and build a foundation of both informal and formal connections over the two-year program.

---

- **In the informal network, connections expanded from 11% of all possible connections to nearly 60%** (Exhibit III-4). Examples of informal connections identified at the end of the MEV program include: ongoing communication and information sharing on topics like sexuality and intersectional communities; sharing of strategies and best practices around prevention, engaging girls of color, youth safety, social-emotional support, and the transnational feminist movement; informal advising and referrals for speaking opportunities (e.g., White House Summit on Women); and mutual support and coaching on professional transitions.

---

- **In the formal network, ties among cohort members increased from 7% to 26%** (Exhibit III-5), following patterns of growth similar to those of Cohort 2. Not only did the number of formal collaborations increase, but the shape of the network transformed from an inefficient and relatively weak long, kite-like pattern of three connected clusters to a more stable and reinforced network with cohort members connected to each other more directly and in multiple ways. Over the course of their two years together in MEV, Cohort 3 members engaged in various forms of formal collaboration such as co-presenting at national conferences (e.g., National Sexual Assault Conference, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence) and participating in conferences put together by cohort organizations (e.g., Black Women’s Blueprint’s Words of Fire conference; 

---

1 This contrasts with Cohort 1, which increased from 9% to 80% of all possible informal connections, and Cohort 2, which increased from 4% to 47%. Given the different sizes in networks—both Cohort 2 (18 members) and Cohort 3 (20 members) were larger than Cohort 1 (15 members)—and the variation in cohort experiences, it is not surprising that cohorts reached different levels of interconnectedness.

2 Between the beginning and end of participation in the MEV program, formal connections among members of Cohort 1 increased from 9% to 40% of all possible ties. In a pattern similar to Cohort 3, Cohort 2 did not reach this same level, increasing from 4% to 24%. Important to keep in mind is that density—or the proportion of connections of all existing connections—is inversely related to network size, making it less likely that larger cohorts will achieve the same level of connectedness as smaller cohorts.
MIWSAC’s annual conference; providing trainings to staff from cohort member organizations; formalizing White Ally popup groups as part of Resonance; collaborating around public events like the Women’s March, and launching projects with support of the Resonance Innovation Fund.

Exhibit III-4: Cohort 3’s Informal Exchanges
From Baseline to End of MEV Program

Exhibit III-5: Cohort 3’s Formal Collaboration
From Baseline to End of Program
• **Mutual recognition of connections increased at the informal level and decreased slightly at the formal level.** In the informal network, reciprocity increased from 33% to 45%, a robust change considering the growth in the number of connections (from 40 to 224). However, at the formal level, the increase in connections (from 27 to 98) was accompanied by a decrease in reciprocity, from 59% to 51%. This suggests that while new formal connections developed over the two-year program, some are still in the early stages and not necessarily recognized and identified by both partners.³

• **Network maps illustrate the movement of new leaders to the center of the network.** The baseline MEV maps for Cohort 3, particularly the formal collaboration maps, show a strong central role for individuals like David, Karen, and Lynn who are state or national leaders in the domestic violence and sexual violence movements. The post-program maps show that individuals in allied social change efforts, like Edith, moved more to the center, as did individuals like Alexis and Ed, illustrating what MEV can do to increase the role of “humble rock stars” in the movement. The increased centrality of Alexis and Ed may have something to do with their deep level of involvement with Resonance practice groups.

### Exhibit III-6: Examples of Formal Collaborations Among and Across Cohort 3 Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Collaboration</th>
<th>Examples of Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and technical assistance</td>
<td>Resource Sharing (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Girls served by Sadie Nash (Lorena) use the Black Women's Blueprint (BWB) house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainings and Workshops, ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Executive Director Faith Trust (Mary) attended CONNECT trainings (Quentin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lynn gave presentations on multigenerational workplaces at Praxis (Sandy) and spoke at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Fordham conference organized by the Lawyers Committee (Andrew)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alexis provided trainings to A Call to Men with Ted (Cohort 1) and Tony (Cohort 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Edith provided a full-day institute at the BWB’s conference (Farah), Words of Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- David and Lorena collaborated on five Rape Prevention Education conferences for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programs working with girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences, presentations, and productions</td>
<td>California Partnership to End Domestic Violence (March 6–7, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- David Lee (Cohort 3) and Andrea Lee (Cohort 2) gave a presentation, “Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberation: White People’s Responsibility to Dismantle White Supremacy and Privilege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Our Movement”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ In Cohort 1, reciprocity increased from 28% to 74% in the informal network and from 50% to 58% in the formal network. In contrast, in Cohort 2, reciprocity increased from 38% to 40% in the informal network and decreased from 60% to 54% in the formal network.
National Sexual Assault Conference (August 31–September 2, 2016)
• David, Vivian H., and Lynn (all Cohort 3) co-presented “Building a Movement: Inspired to Action”
• Alexis (Cohort 3), Archi (Cohort 2), and Scheherazade Tillet (Cohort 2) co-presented “Building an Intersectional Movement”
• Nan Stoops (Cohort 1), David Lee (Cohort 3), and Kelly Miller (Cohort 2) co-presented “Building a Movement: Huge Pivots and Leaps”

11th Annual Conference of the Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition (co-organized with Men as Peacemakers; April 2017)
• Cristine and Alexis (both Cohort 3) co-presented on work related to Black and Indigenous solidarity

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence Conference (October 2016)
• Lynn presented with Ed, David, and Karen (all Cohort 3) on intersectionality

Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence Conference (April 2016)
• Corrine (Cohort 2), Edith (Cohort 3), and Joanne (Cohort 2) presented on the intersection between storytelling and organizing

White House Women’s Summit (June 2016)
• Plenary speakers included Lynn (Cohort 3), Quentin (Cohort 3), and Joanne (Cohort 1), along with presentations and attendance from many other MEV participants

Mother Tongue Monologues (February 2016)
• Alexis and Farah (both Cohort 3) co-chaired a multimedia production and performance

Resonance activities and groups

Innovation Fund Grants
• Numerous MEV participants engaged at different levels with Innovation Grant Funds. Innovation Grant Fund projects included youth focused “training the trainer” training (Alexis, Lorena, Ariel) and restorative justice training (Quentin and Andrew) as well as participation in events (Ed, Lorena, David, Karen) (all Cohort 3)

Practice Groups
• Ed co-led the practice group on Communities/Building the Power of the Margins; Alexis helped to lead the Race, Equity, and Liberation practice group (both Cohort 3)

Pop-Up Groups
• A White Ally group included Karen, Ed, Lynn, David, (Cohort 3) and Heidi (Cohort 2); a Spirit group was led by ML (Cohort 3)

Campaigns and emerging coalitions and groups

Women’s March (January 2017)
• Ed and Andrew (Cohort 3) developed a statement of support
• Lynn and Farah (Cohort 3) served together on a post-march panel to discuss lessons and next steps

Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women’s March (February 2017)
• Cristine and Patina (Cohort 3) participated in the march to raise awareness about the impact of domestic violence on communities of color and Native communities Truth and Reconciliation Commission (spring 2016)

• Farah organized a multi-day tribunal, with Lynn serving as commissioner; Jamila and Quentin gave speeches and Karen, Ed, and David’s organizations provided sponsorship (all Cohort 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other formal collaborations</th>
<th>California Advancing Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) (ongoing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three-year collaboration between Just Detention International (JDI; Vivian) and California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA; David) to connect prisons with local rape crisis centers to ensure incarcerated victims receive services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Support

• Karen serves on the advisory committee for Vivian’s organization (JDI) (both Cohort 3)

Connections to MEV Alumni

In addition to tracking connections to other Cohort 3 members, we also tracked connections to MEV alumni to understand the extent to which the program fostered new and strengthened connections across cohorts.\(^4\) (Note that some formal connections between Cohort 3 members and MEV alumni are captured in Exhibit III-5, above). Information on informal connections and formal collaboration with MEV alumni were collected prior to Cohort 3 joining the MEV program and at its conclusion.

As illustrated in Exhibit III-7, Cohort 3 members identified informal connections with most but not all MEV alumni prior to beginning the program. At the beginning of the program, Cohort 3 members did not report any informal connections with several MEV alumni from non-mainstream organizations (e.g., Tamar, Nancy, Jodeen, and Marcia), and had the most informal connections with well-known individuals in the movement from more mainstream institutions (e.g., Beckie, Ted, Nan, and Suzanne).

Over the course of the program, Cohort 3 engaged in numerous informal exchanges with all MEV alumni, both from mainstream and less traditional organizations. At least half of Cohort 3 members reported informal exchanges with Annika, Trina, and Kelly, which is no doubt because of the central role these alumni play in MEV, Resonance, and Engaging the Mainstream.

Examples of informal collaboration with MEV alumni included ongoing discussions (e.g., about moving the mainstream); attending roundtables, convenings, and other events together (e.g., MSC Transitions Lab, OVW men’s roundtable, Race, Equity, and Liberation convening); and seeking advice (e.g., on pending criminal legislation).

\(^4\) Importantly, this analysis only takes Cohort 3 members’ perspectives into account. It does not reflect connections Cohort 1 or Cohort 2 members may have reported with Cohort 3 or with each other. Furthermore, because the maps include all Cohort 3 survey responses, their central role in the network is overemphasized.
As shown in Exhibit III-8, many Cohort 3 members were weakly connected to MEV alumni in terms of formal collaborations during the two years prior to joining MEV. Incoming Cohort 3 members did not report any formal collaborations with nine of the 33 MEV alumni, and only six MEV alumni were identified as formal collaborators by three or more of the incoming Cohort 3 members. Reflecting on their two years in the MEV program, Cohort 3 members reported formal collaborations with all MEV alumni except one (Corrine). Not only did the breadth of Cohort 3 connections with MEV alumni expand, but so did the intensity of connections—22 of the 33 MEV alumni were identified as formal collaborators by three or more Cohort 3 members during their two years in the program. Examples of formal collaborations with MEV alumni during the program included intensive engagement through Resonance work and Reliance think tank; participation in the White Ally group; co-presentations at conferences (e.g., NSAC, Race Forward); co-sponsoring conferences; and providing services through contracts.

Overall, the networking data show critical shifts in the strength of informal and formal exchanges. As discussed further in the next section, this strengthening network is clear evidence that MEV is reaching a tipping point in its efforts to build critical mass in the movement. This work is supported and enhanced by active and well-connected alumni (such as Nan Stoops), cross-cohort collaboration, and the increasingly outward-facing communication efforts of MEV.
Exhibit III-7: Development of Cohort 3’s Informal Connections with MEV Alumni

Spring 2015: Two Years Prior to Joining MEV Program

Spring 2017: During Two Years of MEV Program
Exhibit III-8: Development of Cohort 3’s Formal Collaborations with MEV Alumni

Spring 2015: Two Years Prior to Joining MEV Program

Spring 2017: During Two Years of MEV Program
Program Outcomes

Finally, in addition to individual, organizational, cohort and network outcomes, Cohort 3 members were asked to assess the progress MEV has made towards overarching program outcomes. As articulated in the logic model presented in Chapter I, the MEV program has five overarching program-level goals: aligning the movement, strengthening individuals and organizations, enhancing the movement’s capacity for social change, building critical mass, and engagement of funders. These goals map to 15 short-term and three intermediate initiative-level outcomes that SPR is tracking as part of the evaluation.

In this section, we briefly highlight findings associated with each of the five overarching goals and the 18 outcome areas at the end of Cohort 3’s participation in the program (see Appendix A for detailed findings). Assessments include information gathered through an online survey and an interview with each of the cohort members.

As shown in Exhibit III-9, Cohort 3 had a less positive assessment of the state of the movement at the start of the MEV program than Cohort 1, with lower ratings more similar to Cohort 2. At the beginning of the MEV program, the lowest area of capacity for Cohort 3 was “engagement of other funders” (1.50, compared to 1.73 and 1.80 for Cohorts 1 and 2, respectively); the highest area of capacity was “enhancing the movement’s capacity to advocate for social change” (1.94, compared to 2.38 and 1.74 for Cohorts 1 and 2, respectively).

Coming in with relatively low expectations provided much room for growth, and Cohort 3 members’ overall ratings at the end of the program were notably higher than at the beginning of the program, as well as higher than previous cohorts at the conclusion of the program. As shown in the middle of Exhibit III-9, at the end of their participation in the MEV program, Cohort 3’s assessments of the movement were higher than both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 for all overall areas, with significant differences for “aligning the movement” (2.54, compared to 1.98 and 1.96 for Cohorts 1 and 2, respectively) and near significant differences for “building a critical mass within the movement and other movements” (2.18, compared to 1.83 and 1.79 for Cohorts 1 and 2, respectively).

As further shown in the bottom of Exhibit III-9, not only was Cohort 3 the only cohort to exhibit growth in their assessments in all areas, they also showed the greatest positive growth, with significantly larger gains than Cohorts 1 and 2 in all areas. Within the broader outcome areas, the outcomes with the largest changes for Cohort 3 were awareness of identity (+1.28); stronger bench of leaders (+ 0.77); and collaborative efforts (+0.72).

5 In contrast to previous reports, outcome ratings are reported on a scale of 1 (Not at All Strong) to 4 (Extremely Strong). Previously, outcome ratings were reported on a scale of 0 to 3. This change was made to ensure that both outcomes and impacts were rated on the same 1 to 4 scale. In addition to the change in scale, overall outcome scores were calculated as the average of cohort member scores. This change in methodology allowed us to conduct statistical tests to determine significant findings.

6 The exception was “building a critical mass within the movement and other movements”—an area for which Cohort 3 members provided slightly higher scores than Cohort 1.
Exhibit III-9: Assessment of Movement Strength Over Time by Cohort

### Beginning of MEV Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
<th>Cohort 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning the Movement</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Movement's Capacity to Advocate for Social Change</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Critical Mass within Movement and Other Movements</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of Other Funders</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### End of MEV Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
<th>Cohort 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning the Movement</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Movement's Capacity to Advocate for Social Change</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Critical Mass within Movement and Other Movements</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of Other Funders</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change from Beginning to End of MEV Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
<th>Cohort 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning the Movement</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Movement's Capacity to Advocate for Social Change</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Critical Mass within Movement and Other Movements</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of Other Funders</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Turning from overall assessments of movement strength to assessments of the impact of the MEV program, Cohort 3’s ratings were generally higher than other cohorts at the end of the program (see Exhibit III-10). The quantitative and qualitative data show the following key themes:

- Cohort 3 indicated that MEV had made significant contributions in aligning the movement, and they ranked MEV’s contribution higher than any of the previous cohorts (3.23, compared to 2.67 and 2.84 for Cohorts 1 and 2, respectively). Across all interviews, members of Cohort 3 identified three key mechanisms through which their work contributed to movement alignment: (1) engaging in critical conversations and breaking down silos around Indigenous invisibility and anti-Blackness; (2) the cultivation and articulation of shared values; and (3) integration of Cohort 1’s vision of the last girl with Cohort 2’s intersectional analyses. Nevertheless, several Cohort 3 members emphasized that there was still considerable work to be done in this area.

- Cohort 3 members came into the MEV program believing that it was making a good impact on the capacity of individuals and organizations; they left feeling essentially the same way. Sixteen cohort members reported that the MEV program strengthened individual leaders, and 14 noted that it had a profound personal impact on them as individuals. Further, 11 cohort members felt that their organizations had been strengthened through their participation in MEV. So, although there was no growth in this outcome between the baseline and final surveys, this was highlighted by almost all cohort members as a significant outcome of their participation.

- As was true of Cohort 2, at the end of their experience Cohort 3 members were more critical and skeptical of MEV’s influence on the capacity of the movement to advocate for social change than they had been at the beginning of their experience. Although Cohort 3 members acknowledged that the new relationships supported by MEV helped to strengthen advocacy in the movement, there was a general consensus that MEV could provide more actionable tools and techniques for facilitating social change. One cohort member explained, “I think that’s the weakest area. We all know that’s where we’re supposed to be going, but we almost never focus on it.”

- The area of greatest growth for Cohort 3 was the influence of MEV on building a critical mass within the movement and other movements (3.23 compared to 2.70 and 2.53 for Cohorts 1 and 2, respectively). Given that Cohort 3 joined midway into the 10-year initiative, joining a growing group of MEV alumni and building on the work of the previous two cohorts, this growth is not surprising. Eleven Cohort 3 members cited the ways in which the cohort’s work had rippled out as a key mechanism through which the cohort furthered this goal. One member articulated, “I think Cohort 3 has rippled all over the country—influencing organizations, individuals and helping to contribute to critical mass.”
Exhibit III-10: Assessment of Impact of MEV Program Over Time by Cohort

**Beginning of MEV Program**

- **Aligning the Movement**: Cohort 2: 2.52, Cohort 3: 2.83
- **Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement**: Cohort 2: 2.88, Cohort 3: 2.98
- **Enhancing Movement’s Capacity to Advocate for Social Change**: Cohort 2: 2.49, Cohort 3: 2.83
- **Building Critical Mass Within Movement and Other Movements**: Cohort 2: 2.58, Cohort 3: 2.60
- **Engagement of Other Funders**: Cohort 2: 2.14, Cohort 3: 2.43

**Assessment of Impact of MEV Program Over Time by Cohort**

- **Aligning the Movement**: Cohort 1: 2.67, Cohort 2: 2.84, Cohort 3: 3.23
- **Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement**: Cohort 1: 2.78, Cohort 2: 2.92, Cohort 3: 2.98
- **Enhancing Movement’s Capacity to Advocate for Social Change**: Cohort 1: 2.33, Cohort 2: 2.67, Cohort 3: 2.67
- **Building Critical Mass Within Movement and Other Movements**: Cohort 1: 1.73, Cohort 2: 2.50, Cohort 3: 2.73
- **Engagement of Other Funders**: Cohort 1: 1.81, Cohort 2: 2.15, Cohort 3: 3.23

**Change from Beginning to End of MEV Program**

- **Aligning the Movement**: Cohort 2: 0.32, Cohort 3: 0.40
- **Strengthening Individuals and Organizations in the Movement**: Cohort 2: -0.10, Cohort 3: 0.00
- **Enhancing Movement’s Capacity to Advocate for Social Change**: Cohort 2: -0.33, Cohort 3: -0.15
- **Building Critical Mass Within Movement and Other Movements**: Cohort 2: -0.05, Cohort 3: 0.63
- **Engagement of Other Funders**: Cohort 2: -0.38, Cohort 3: -0.28
As was true of previous cohorts, MEV’s engagement of funders was viewed as the weakest of the three outcomes, though cohort members rated it more positively than when they began the program. Cohort members identified the engagement of other funders as by far the weakest outcome. Fourteen cohort members were unable to identify any progress made to engage other funders.

While Cohort 3’s overall scores between joining and completing the program were relatively high compared to previous cohorts, assessments of the impact of MEV dropped in two of five areas and in one remained the same (see Exhibit III-10). This followed trends similar to Cohort 2. In fact, this is a consistent trend across cohorts, as MEV builds an increased criticality about where the movement stands on certain parameters among participants, thus leading to some areas being more negatively (and perhaps more accurately) rated at the end of the cohort experience.

As shown in Exhibit III-11, overall areas that saw a decrease from the beginning to the end of the program were “enhancing the movement’s capacity to advocate for social change” (-0.33) and “engagement of other funders” (-0.28). Cohort 3 members ranked eight of the outcomes lower (from -0.06 to -0.64) at the end of their participation. The areas of greatest negative change were “alignment of mission and practice” (-0.64), and “research and messaging” (0.62).

Overall, these quantitative ratings are very much in keeping with the qualitative data. In particular, there was a strong focus among cohort members on how stronger messaging and tools are critical to enhancing the capacity of the movement to advocate for social change. As discussed further in the next chapter, cohort members felt that the program has a role to play in developing toolkits and curricula that will help bring MEV concepts to scale.

As discussed previously, Cohort 3 came out of their experience much more positive about MEV’s influence on “aligning the movement” (+.4) and “engaging critical mass” (.63). Cohort 3 members ranked 10 of the outcomes higher at the end of participation than they did at the beginning (from +0.05 to +0.69). The two outcomes with the greatest positive change were “intersectional framing” (+0.60) and “awareness of identity” (+0.69). Again, these results are in keeping with the qualitative data, particularly given Cohort 3’s signature work in advancing critical conversations on Indigenous invisibility and anti-Blackness. The implications of these findings are discussed further in the next chapter.
Exhibit III-11: Cohort 3’s Assessment of MEV Program Impact on Outcome Areas Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Area</th>
<th>End of Program</th>
<th>Beginning of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIGNING THE MOVEMENT</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster of leaders</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified vision</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative efforts</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared critical analysis</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRENGTHENING INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE MOVEMENT</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared leadership models</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of identity</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of mission and practice</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational models</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social change strategies</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger bench of leaders</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable and healthy leadership</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thriving ecosystem</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCING MOVEMENT’S CAPACITY TO ADVOCATE FOR SOCIAL CHANGE</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting-edge advocacy</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to shift attitudes and behaviors</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and messaging</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING CRITICAL MASS WITHIN MOVEMENT AND OTHER MOVEMENTS</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Allies</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectional framing</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT OF OTHER FUNDERS</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Levels: Very little impact, Some impact, Good impact, Excellent impact
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IV. LESSONS & IMPLICATIONS FOR MOVING FORWARD

I can’t stress enough or take for granted the impact that it has had on…personal change….I think it’s just really deep, the work we’ve been doing, and [I’ve been] wanting more people to come in because the work is so important….I want this for everyone essentially….I’ve just been feeling grateful for the program…really grateful.

—Cohort 3 member

As captured in this quote and throughout this report, Cohort 3 Movement Makers as a group were profoundly thankful for the opportunity to engage in the MEV program and cognizant that they are part of something much larger than themselves. The depth of commitment that the NoVo Foundation has made to the program is a clear indicator of its belief in movement principles and in community-based solutions to gender-based violence. Having been selected for such a rare opportunity, cohort members reported feeling humbled by the experience and energized by the task of helping to spread their learnings and the MEV concepts to others.

In telling their stories at Convening 6, members of each MEV cohort positioned themselves within a much broader—and still unfolding—MEV narrative. While Cohort 1 set their frame firmly in the creation of beloved community and a focus on reaching the last girl, Cohort 2 embraced their role in centering race, class, power, and privilege. Not surprisingly, Cohort 3 members (who are part of the “love” cohort) recognized that their position put them at a key turning point in MEV, as the initiative finds itself three-fifths of the way through a “grand experiment.” With that in mind, one Cohort 3 member implored MEV leaders to not “lose heart” or “get bored.” She said, “there is a need for more of us, so see it through.”

The NoVo Foundation has demonstrated its alliance with change makers in the anti-violence field by making a long-term commitment to the model and investing in the work of program alumni through Resonance. Because of this long-term investment, MEV represents a truly unique opportunity to observe the long-term effects of individual and organizational transformation on network and movement development. Thus, lessons learned over the course of this “grand experiment” have the potential to inform many other types of social change efforts. In this final chapter, we highlight some key lessons on movement building that surfaced during the Cohort 3 cycle, as well as Cohort 3 members’ key recommendations and hopes for Cohort 4.
Lessons on Movement Building

MEV’s model is based on fundamental principles of movement building, with a focus on leadership development and the importance of sustainability and self-care to ensure that Movement Makers are equipped with what they need over the long haul.

Lesson 1: Relationships are critical to building beloved community, and they cannot be short-changed.

In Marshall Ganz’s book chapter on “leading change,” he explains that “interpersonal relationships are critical for forging the shared understandings, commitments, and collaborative action that constitute a movement.” 1 Although building relationships among diverse and intergenerational leaders is a fundamental value of MEV, its importance was short-changed for Cohort 2 because the first convening did not lay the groundwork for these relationships. Cohort 3 resembled Cohort 1 more, in part because of a renewed investment in relationship building. As one Cohort 3 member said,

One of the things that happened to Cohort 3 that didn’t happen with Cohort 2 was the immediate immersion in relationship building from the very start. I assume that that was purposeful. That really worked for our cohort…. That really set the tone for us. It set us up to be in beloved community with one another.

The primacy of relationship building is reflected not only in the cohort structure of MEV, but in the curriculum and values, which in turn help cohort members form different types of relationships outside of the cohort space. One Cohort 3 member described that her key lesson from MEV was to “stay in relationship no matter what. Moving towards is always going to be better than isolating or moving back…. Because of this, I have become much more generous in my assessment and understanding of people, who they are and the work that they do.”

Lesson 2: Building alignment within the movement does not mean that Movement Makers need to share a common destination.

For many of the Cohort 3 members, the conversation at Convening 5 on anti-Blackness and Indigenous invisibility was the ultimate manifestation of beloved community. One cohort member discovered that beloved community is the ability to have “hard conversations,” while understanding “what liberation means to each one of us.” This lesson expanded Cohort 3’s notion of what they, as a group, were trying to achieve; it helped them to better understand how movement alignment can occur across difference. Another cohort member explained:

I think where Cohort 3 landed…is a better appreciation of differences… There doesn’t have to be a single view of something, of the movement, of the outcomes, in order for the movement towards ending violence to happen.

---

This of course reflects a fundamental principal of social change efforts, which is to understand that there is not “one way” but “many ways” to achieve liberation.

**Lesson 3: Spaciousness is achievable and is crucial to supporting breakthrough conversations.**

Convening evaluations from all three cohorts show that spaciousness, a fundamental principle of MEV, has proved elusive and at times unachievable given the investment in and expectations of what will come out of every convening. It is notable, therefore, that Cohort 3 achieved a level of spaciousness in Convening 5 that had not previously occurred and that this enabled and supported the breakthrough conversation on anti-Blackness and Indigenous invisibility. The spaciousness could not have occurred without the willingness of the faculty to set aside their agenda and to “hold” rather than “direct” the conversation. This required a deep level of trust among cohort members and faculty that several cohort members said may not have occurred at an earlier point in the cohort cycle. There was an important lesson to be learned about the value of letting go, and providing the space to go deep into an issue.

**Lesson 4: Co-creation and power sharing are muscles that take time and trust to develop.**

As described in Chapter II, cohort members generally agreed that the faculty were very responsive and willing to adapt the MEV program as necessary to support cohort needs. Several cohort members mentioned, though, that it took some time for them to feel confident enough to ask for what they needed. One cohort member observed that as they became more comfortable making requests, they could approach the faculty with less fear and defensiveness:

> I saw our participants realize, we don’t always have to jump to the final possible power tactics that we have available to us right away. I saw that transition over time, of people making a request and getting feedback more comfortably and openly, in dialogue, rather than feeling that MEV was an institution that we had to organize against.

Cohort 3 members wondered out loud in their interviews whether there was a way for Cohort 4 to develop this “muscle” and understanding earlier on. One member thought it might be useful for Cohort 3 to write messages to Cohort 4, talking about their struggles with co-creation and encouraging them to step into their power earlier. Another thought that it would be wise if cohort members were responsible for helping to facilitate convenings earlier on in the process (prior to Convening 6) as a way of strengthening this skill set.

It is important to note that this process also requires a great deal of trust on the part of faculty members, both with the cohort and with one another. Having faculty who are consistently holding the space from one cohort and one convening to another is important, therefore, to ensure that this type of co-creation can occur.

**Lesson 5: Racial equity and liberation is a fundamental cornerstone for the Move to End Violence.**

The work of Cohort 2, particularly the embracing of a racial equity lens, laid a foundation for Cohort 3 to make racial equity and liberation a central dimension of their work. Cohort 3
engaged whole-heartedly in racial equity and liberation discussions and reached new levels of trust and understanding through the breakthrough conversation on Indigenous invisibility and anti-Blackness. One cohort member related:

*If the race, equity, and liberation training and practices is not integrated and woven into the next two cohort experiences, it will be a disaster. It must be the cornerstone moving forward.*

As MEV moves forward, there is a clear recognition that long-term and meaningful change must take into account how “race-neutral” social interventions have often exacerbated inequality and injustice, and that expanding awareness and understanding is necessary for diverse stakeholders to work in a united way for meaningful solutions.

**Lesson 6: Movement Makers are eager to re-center the conversation on gender-based violence and gender justice.**

Five Movement Makers indicated that there is an opportunity for Cohort 4 to re-center issues related to gender-based violence. Three of these individuals indicated that they longed for a more overt focus on gender-based justice, particularly at a time when the notion of gender is being expanded and redefined. One member said, “We really need to blow open this concept of violence against women and girls. I think that the next cohorts could continue to be grounded in the DV/SA community, but also be intentional about framing violence in a broader way.”

Another cohort member elaborated:

*I think that, as we have really done the deep dive into racial justice, it’s important for us to do a little bit more grappling with the idea of gender justice, especially in a world where gender is fast disappearing….In the LGBTQ world, they’re questioning, “If there is no gender, if gender is completely fluid, if gender is not a binary, what does that mean? What do we really think about domestic and sexual violence if gender is not a binary? What if it is not about oppression of women?” I think there is a question that sits there about what that means for Move to End Violence and its original purpose. But also, Move to End Violence has the ability to convene voices around that question.*

In keeping with this, over half of Cohort 3 members indicated that the next cohort should include transgendered and gender fluid Movement Makers.

**Lesson 7: In order to mobilize for shared goals, cohorts need better information on what each member can contribute.**

One of the unique aspects of MEV’s model is that cohort members participate in a transformative change process without having a clear picture of everyone’s position and role within the broader movement. While several recognized the value of forming relationships and connecting with each other solely as individuals, half of Cohort 3’s members said that they wanted to know more about the work of other members, including those from previous cohorts. Similarly, there emerged from Convening 6 a strong desire among some participants to map out the unique strengths and roles of members from each of the three cohorts to better facilitate collaboration and shared action. The increased focus on defining positionality of movement leaders—in terms of their roles, connections, and resources—could be a natural part of MEV’s
pivot from an inward- to an outward-facing orientation. Resonance could (and probably should) also play a key role in this process.

**Lesson 8: The movement and the broader domestic and sexual violence field are ready to be engaged more broadly by MEV.**

The external facing elements of MEV that were incorporated over the course of Cohort 3, such as the regional workshops, Self-Care Challenge, and webinars, were seen by cohort members as very successful. These outward-facing activities helped them engage colleagues and partners in MEV, broadening awareness of the program and understanding of MEV language and concepts. Particularly for cohort members who are part of larger organizations or networks, these meetings provided a unique opportunity to expose colleagues and partners to the frameworks, values, and culture of MEV. One cohort member said:

> The series of web conferences that the Movement Strategy Center did with MEV—a lot of people really resonated with that. I’ve had a lot of people who told me that they got together with their staff to watch it.

Although cohort members found these externally-facing efforts helpful as they sought to educate others in their organizations and communities about MEV, 12 of the 20 indicated that MEV could do a better job of communicating with others in the field. As evidenced by the work of Nan Stoops and other alumni who have been active in promoting MEV concepts and ideas, there is a hunger for information and tools. Given the 2016 election, there is also a need for frameworks and structures that can support beloved community and people to take action in a way that is healthy and self-sustaining.

**Lesson 9: Movement habits are best addressed through transparency and consistency.**

Half of Cohort 3 members indicated that movement habits played out within MEV, most notably in the way that leadership or funding opportunities were made available. Half of the cohort members described that MEV leaders unintentionally created an “insider versus outsider” dynamic, where some members appeared to have more access to information than others. A cohort member described, “It kind of seemed like some people knew [about opportunities], some people did not know….It could have been done in a different way so everyone is on the same page around what’s available.” The following quotes also speak to this issue, particularly as it relates to resources:

> I think some of our habits around power sharing are really hard to disrupt in a container where there are so many resources on the table and there is a lot of power associated with the allocation of those resources.

> A lot was said out loud; very little was written out. I think it contributed to people feeling like they were being left out of something. I think the first-come, first-served strategy is never smart when it comes to money and resources.

Among those who raised this issue, there was a consensus that MEV leaders need to strive for more formality when distributing information, resources, and opportunities. Making sure that all opportunities are distributed to everyone, through well-written communication, is one way to create a higher level of transparency.
Recommendations for Cohort 4

As described earlier in this report, Cohort 3 members were overwhelmingly positive about the core design features of MEV, including the cohort structure and the length of the overall cohort experience, as well as the structure and sequencing of convenings. When asked to reflect on what changes or enhancements they would like to see for Cohort 4, Cohort 3 Movement Makers identified the following:

- **Continue to promote leadership and the voices of those who are at the margins of the violence prevention movement.** One of the most powerful movement outcomes to date is the increased voice and visibility among women of color leaders within the violence prevention movement. Cohort 3 members thought the promotion of leadership of women of color and young women should continue. Furthermore, there was a near universal sentiment that Cohort 4 should include transgendered leaders. Other groups and perspectives identified as important to include are the disabled community, rural populations, Indigenous women, artists, organizers, and communicators.

- **Deepen practical support to enhance organizing and engagement in social change strategies.** There was a strong sentiment that Cohort 4 should include more organizers and that the curriculum and structure of the convenings should have a stronger focus on building capacity in this area. One cohort member said:

  *I want the social change piece to move up earlier and be consistently infused throughout the program. And, I want this community to wrestle with their ambivalence towards stepping into power building for our community. I want MEV to be the place where that happens.*

- **Create more spaces for cross-cohort interaction and exchange earlier in the cohort experience.** Cohort members were very appreciative of the opportunity in Convening 6 to exchange with leaders from previous cohorts, but felt that it would have been better for it to occur earlier. Eleven cohort members discussed the need for better connections across the cohorts. Understanding that Convening 1 is an important relationship-building time for the primary members, it was thought that these cross-cohort interactions could be introduced in Convening 2.
• **Enhance possibilities for collaboration by sharing more about the work of cohort members and their organizations.** While acknowledging the value of MEV’s approach to relationship building within cohorts, there was a strong desire among half of the cohort members to better understand one another’s work (both within and across cohorts). Several individuals noted that they knew very little about what the other cohort members do, and this in turn inhibited their ability to identify collaborative projects. One member suggested that the locations for convenings could allow for interested cohort members to host tours of their organizations and highlight some of their work. Another idea was to encourage Movement Makers working on similar issues or with similar populations to collaborate on joint webinars highlighting key issues, questions, and approaches.

• **Introduce Resonance and the plans for post-MEV engagement earlier in the cohort experience.** As reported in Chapter II, cohort members reported feeling confused about what the network is and on what post-MEV engagement entails. One said of Resonance, “it just felt very opaque—what it was, who formed it, and who was doing what.” Another cohort member said it was important to include someone from Resonance in early convenings so that Resonance staff can “speak for themselves” about activities and opportunities being supported by the group.

• **Use more of a “menu” approach to providing leadership and organizational coaching.** There was a mixed view of Rockwood, where some cohort members loved it and others felt that it was not a good fit for their needs. Similarly, although most cohort members loved their organizational coaches, a few felt like their coach was a bad fit for either their individual or organizational needs. A few who struggled with either Rockwood or the OD coaching said that it would have been useful to have been offered choices and the ability select options based on their specific needs.

• **Increase transparency.** In keeping with Lesson 9 above, cohort members indicated that MEV leaders and faculty should do everything possible to increase transparency and formalize processes in order to eliminate any perception of favoritism.

**Conclusion**

As MEV enters the last four years of this 10-year initiative, the care, dedication, and love that has been put into the program by staff, faculty, and cohort members has yielded returns on multiple levels. MEV alumni have been engaging in broader movement conversations about self-care, racial equity, forward stance, and the importance of addressing root causes. The program has brought to the forefront voices that have historically been marginalized in the movement, helping to make visible the work of women of color, Indigenous women, young women, men, and those in allied movements. In turn, they have helped build movement leadership that is more diverse and that is willing to push the envelope on how to address key challenges facing the movement. These outcomes, as well as the efforts of MEV staff and faculty over the last two years to be more externally-facing, are discussed more fully in SPR’s companion to this report on field and movement-level outcomes.
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APPENDIX A: LIST OF INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS

Cohort 3 Members

- Alexis Flanagan, Resonance¹
- Ana Romero, Women for Economic Justice²
- Andrew Sta. Ana, Day One
- Ariel Jacobson³
- Cristine Davidson, Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition
- David Lee, California Coalition Against Sexual Assault
- Ed Heisler, Men As Peacemakers
- Edith Sargon, Wellstone Action/Sheila Wellstone Institute
- Farah Tanis, Black Women’s Blueprint
- Jamia Wilson, Women, Action, and the Media WAM!
- Karen Tronsgard-Scott, Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
- Lorena Estrella, Sadie Nash Leadership Project
- Lynn Rosenthal, Biden Foundation⁴
- Maria del Rosario Rodriguez, Florida Immigrant Coalition
- Mary (ML) Daniel, Faithtrust Institute
- Patina Park, Minnesota Indian Women’s Resource Center
- Quentin (Q) Walcott, CONNECT
- Sandra (Sandy) Davidson, Praxis International
- Vivian Jojola, Just Detention International
- Vivian Huelgo, American Bar Association Commission on Domestic & Sexual Violence

Faculty Members

- Maura Bairley, Consultant
- Mimi Kim, Consultant
- Norma Wong, Consultant

¹ Alexis entered the program at HopeWorks of Howard County, Inc.
² Ana entered the program at Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women’s Network
³ Ariel entered the program at Restaurant Opportunities Centers United
⁴ Lynn entered the program at The National Domestic Violence Hotline
APPENDIX B: COHORT 3 FINAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Reflections on MEV Program Experience

1. How has your participation in MEV influenced you as an individual?

2. What have been the major challenges that you encountered in your participation in the MEV program? What was missing?

3. What adaptations were made? How well were these handled by the MEV team/ faculty and cohort leaders?

4. Thinking about the overall MEV model, what are your reflections on the effectiveness of MEV’s theory of change? In particular, what about MEV has worked well (or not so well) in terms of:
   i. The underlying assumptions—that building leadership and beloved community in this manner will lead to lasting changes in the movement?
   ii. The cohort structure, including the length of each cohort and the number of cohorts?
   iii. The engagement and role of expert faculty?
   iv. The engagement and role of organizational development coaches?
   v. The quality of communication within the MEV community and to the broader movement?
   vi. Other aspects of MEV?

5. What are the major lessons learned from MEV to date that you have been able to apply to your work?
   i. Lessons in self-care?
   ii. Lessons in how to structure critical conversations?
   iii. Lessons in co-creation, power-sharing, promotion of movement leadership?
   iv. Lessons in addressing race, class, power & privilege with a gender justice focus?
   v. Lessons in addressing movement habits (e.g., culture of scarcity, habits of White Supremacy, internalized oppression, non-profit complex)?
   vi. Other lessons?

6. Do you have any recommendations for:
   i. The MEV program’s design or implementation (MEV model)
   ii. Linkages between Cohort 1, 2 and Cohort 3’s work
   iii. Cohort 4’s participation in MEV
   iv. MEV’s engagement with you after your cohort experience ends

7. Do you plan to be involved in the Network (Resonance) moving forward? Describe.

8. How can MEV best support the collaborations and practices that are happening in the Network (Resonance)?

Movement Building Reflections

9. How has MEV helped you to leverage opportunities to advance the long-term vision to build the movement?

10. At this point, how has your own role changed, if at all in the movement? How has your organization’s role changed, if at all in the movement?
11. How have you formally or informally collaborated with your fellow cohort members? Describe relationships that have been particularly helpful or fruitful to your work.

12. How have you shared or are sharing key concepts from MEV with your organization or with others in the movement? Provide a detailed example.

**Cohort 3 Outcomes**

13. I’m going to briefly go over the overarching MEV outcomes, developed at the very beginning of the project and integrated into the logic model. As I name them, I would like you to describe if/how Cohort 3 has contributed to each outcome. Note strong and weak outcomes.
   i. Aligning the movement
   ii. Strengthening individuals and organizations in the movement
   iii. Enhancing the movement’s capacity to advocate for social change
   iv. Building critical mass within the movement and with other movements
   v. Engagement of other funders
APPENDIX C: SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARDS TARGETED OUTCOMES

Appendix C provides an assessment of progress towards each of MEV’s five overarching goals and the 18 related outcome areas. Assessment of outcome areas was informed by interview and survey data.

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Progress</th>
<th>Some Progress</th>
<th>Weak Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Cohort 3 Targeted Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment of Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aligning the movement | • Cohort 3 members assessed alignment of the movement as stronger (+0.65) post MEV and rated MEV’s impact on aligning the movement as greater (+.40) after completing the MEV program.  
• Ten cohort members felt that Cohort 3 had contributed to aligning the larger movement, while four cohort members emphasized that there remains significant work to be done before the movement is aligned. |
| A cluster of leaders committed to working together to end violence against women and girls | • Over the course of their participation in MEV, Cohort members more positively assessed MEV’s impact on this outcome (+.37).  
• Interview data reflected that cohort members felt like they were a part of a larger network of leaders. However, it is important to note that cohort members primarily talked about a cluster of leaders being formed within their cohort rather than across cohorts or the larger movement. |
| A unified and directional vision for the future of the movement | • Cohort members assessed MEV’s impact on cultivating a unified and directional vision for the future movement |
as slightly lower after participating in the MEV program (-.17).

| Enhanced capacities to build alliances and increase collaborative efforts | Survey data indicates that cohort members’ saw MEV as having a stronger impact (+.40) on enhancing capacities to build alliances and collaborative efforts at post assessment.  
In interviews, nearly all cohort members (15) discussed collaborations which have emerged with other leaders in their cohort and in some instances across cohort. |
|---|---|
| A shared critical analysis with an intersectional and aligned approach | Survey data indicated that cohort members’ views of MEV’s impact on a shared critical analysis increased over the course of their participation in the MEV program (+.28).  
Eight cohort members articulated that Cohort 3 had created a shared analysis surrounding race, equity and liberation. Further, seven cohort members felt Cohort 3 played a role in integrating the vision laid out by Cohort 1 and the analyses surrounding intersectionality put forward by Cohort 2. |
| Strengthening individuals and organizations | While cohort members reported a slight decrease in MEV’s impact on this outcome at completion of the program, they nonetheless rated MEV’s impact on strengthening individuals and organization in the movement as the same or slightly higher on post assessments than both Cohort 1 (+.06) and Cohort 2 (+.20).  
Sixteen cohort members reported that the program strengthened individual leaders and fourteen noted that MEV had a profound personal impact. Discussions of MEV’s impact on organizations were more mixed. Eleven participants felt that their organizations had been strengthened, however many discussed barriers and challenges to fully integrating MEV practices and vision into their organizations. |
| A shift towards collaborative, shared leadership models | Cohort members assessed MEV’s impact on shared leadership models (+.09) as slightly stronger at post assessment.  
Eight cohort members discussed becoming more aware and invested in shared leadership and power sharing. Four of these cohort members noted ways in which they had implement power-sharing into their organizations. |
| **Enhanced awareness of self and social identity** | • Survey data suggested that the MEV program had a stronger impact on Cohorts member’s awareness of self and social identity (+.69).  
• Eight cohort members discussed becoming increasingly aware of their own identities, histories and positionality and noted the ways in which this increased awareness strengthened their leadership. |
| **Organizations [develop], understand and align mission, vision, values & practice** | • Survey data suggested that MEV had limited impact on this outcome (-.63).  
• Notably survey and interview results diverged for this outcome. During interviews, twelve cohort members described integrating MEV practices, vision, and values at their organization. However, many interviewees suggested that this was an ongoing process with significant barriers and challenges. This distinction between process and outcome may account for differences between interview and survey findings. |
| **Adoption of models to best advance organizational missions & organizing work** | • Cohort members identified this as a weaker outcome and assessment of MEV’s impact decreased overtime (-.49). |
| **Increased organizational capacity to think strategically & engage in social change strategies** | • Survey findings indicated that cohort members post assessments of MEV’s impact on social change strategies were weaker (-.36) compared with pre assessments.  
• Six Cohort 3 members discussed MEV’s role in enhancing their organizations’ ability to think strategically about social change strategies. Relatedly, cohort members (7) also discussed the ways in which their organizations had shifted to a social change lens. |
| **A stronger bench in organizations with shared leadership and investment in the next generation of leaders** | • Cohort members assessed MEV’s impact on this outcome as stronger after having completed the MEV program (+.17).  
• Cohort members appreciated the inclusion of young leaders in their cohort and expressed a desire to have more voices of the next generation of leaders included in Cohort 4. Five cohort members discussed ways in which they are working towards and thinking through supporting the next generation on young leaders in their work. |
| Sustainable and healthy leadership and professional practices throughout the movement | • After completing the program, cohort members more positively rated MEV’s impact on sustainable healthy leadership (+.12).  
• Cohort member interviews suggested that the promotion of sustainable and healthy leadership and in particular lessons learned in self-care represented a strong outcome for Cohort 3. Nine cohort members discussed the lessons in self-care as personally and professionally transformative and seven cohort members noted the impactful ways they are integrating these lessons into their organization. |
| --- | --- |
| A thriving ecosystem of organizations working on ending violence | • Cohort members’ assessment of MEV’s impact on creating a thriving ecosystem of organizations (-.13) slightly decreased from pre to post surveys.  
• Interview data provided some evidence for progress in this outcome area. Seven cohort members described a growing network of organizations within the movement, which they suggested not only fostered collaborations but also solidarity between mainstream and marginalized organizations. |
| Enhancing the movement’s capacity for social change | • Survey and interview data indicated that enhancing the movement’s capacity for social change was among the weaker outcomes for Cohort 3 and cohort members’ rating of MEV’s impact in this area decreased between pre and post surveys (-.33).  
• Interview data provided some evidence for progress towards this outcome. Ten cohort members felt that Cohort 3 had contributed to the movement’s capacity for social change. Cohort three members discussed the connections created across leaders and movements as a primary way in which Cohort 3 contributed to enhancing the movement’s capacity for social change. |
| Increased knowledge of and capacity to use fundamental & cutting edge advocacy, organizing, and campaign tools & strategies | • Cohort members’ assessment of MEV’s impact on cutting-edge advocacy remained roughly the same before and after participating in MEV (-.05).  
• Interviews suggested that there was limited development of cohort members’ knowledge and capacity to use advocacy, organizing, and campaign tools. Several cohort members voiced the desire to have more time devoted to developing and learning specific tools and strategies for social change. |
| Increased capacity across cohorts to gauge, target, & shift attitudes & behaviors related to gender-based violence | - Cohort members rated MEV’s impact on capacity to shift attitudes and behaviors as weaker (-.18) post MEV.  
- Interview data suggested that Cohort 3’s cultivation of a shared intersectional lens and their work towards the integration of both Cohort 1’s vision and Cohort 2’s analyses increased the cross-cohort capacity to identify and shift attitudes towards gender-based violence. |
| --- | --- |
| Effective research & messaging to inform social change efforts & support projects/campaigns | - Cohort members’ assessment of MEV’s impact on effective research and messaging to inform social change decreased significantly between pre and post surveys (-.61).  
- Twelve cohort members discussed that MEV’s communication with the broader movement was limited and four emphasized this as a key area that has fallen short. |
| Building critical mass | - Over the course of their participation in MEV, cohort members saw the movement as gaining increasing strength in “building critical mass” (+.44) and assessed MEV as having a greater (+.63) impact in this area. Cohort members identified MEV’s impact on building critical mass as the strongest of MEV’s five overarching goals.  
- Eleven cohort members reported that Cohort 3 has contributed to building critical mass. They cited the ways in which Cohort 3’s work has rippled out as a key mechanism through which Cohort 3 has contributed to building critical mass in the movement. |
| Increased connection & engagement with allies outside of the U.S. & usage of a global frame for ending VAWG | - Survey findings indicate a slight increase in cohort members’ ratings of the engagement of global allies (+.13) and a large increase in their assessment of MEV’s impact on framing VAWG in a more holistic and intersectional way.  
- Two cohort members discussed gaining an increasingly global perspective on ending VAWG through their participation in MEV and one cohort member felt that Cohort 3 has made connections and built relationships internationally. Three cohort members articulated a need for more of a global perspective and the development of a global communication strategy. |
The issue of VAWG is framed in a more holistic, intersectional way

- Survey findings suggested this was a particularly successful outcome area and cohort members’ assessment of MEV’s impact on framing VAWG in a more holistic, intersectional way improved over the course of their participation (+.60).
- Cohort member interviews suggested that the cultivation of a strong intersectional lens was a strong outcome for Cohort 3 and eight cohort members discussed Cohort 3’s shared intersectional analyses.

Engagement of funders

- Engagement of other funders represented the weakest overarching outcome on both pre and post surveys. While cohort members did report an increase in the movement’s ability to engage other funders (+.32), their assessment of MEV’s impact in this area decreased on their post surveys (-.28).
- Cohort members identified the engagement of other funders as by far the weakest outcome. Fourteen cohort members were unable to identify any progress made to engage other funders. Three cohort members suggested there was some limited progress towards this goal in some cases and one cohort member identified engagement of other funders as a strong outcome.