

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**SAN FRANCISCO CHILDREN OF INCARCERATED PARENTS PARTNERSHIP
ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT**

The San Francisco Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership (SFCIPP) emerged in the early 2000s. Since its inception and through its last meeting in 2019, the Zellerbach Family Foundation (ZFF) funded SFCIPP to gather social service providers, staff from government agencies, and youth advocates to better understand this young population, uplift their needs and strengths, and improve their lives. Amongst its greatest accomplishments, the partnership developed and published the Children of Incarcerated Parents Bill of Rights, which has served as a springboard for change locally, nationally, and beyond. In early 2020, individual interviews were conducted with 14 SFCIPP members to better understand SFCIPP's impact on building the capacity of partner organizations, social capital among partners (networking), and broader community capacity (collective action).

Findings

SFCIPP presented the highest level of impact in organizational capacity building. Almost all the respondents reported engagement in activities that improved their organizational competencies in three main areas: awareness of the complex social and political systems involved in the lives of children with incarcerated parents, acquiring more resources, and improving access to services through coalition relationships. However, SFCIPP showed low levels of social capital (e.g., integrating services and building alliances), despite high levels of participation by a core number of partners. The coalition appeared to lack clarity on collaborative opportunities and organizational goals to harness the benefits of high involvement. Similarly, SFCIPP presented a low impact in community capacity, which refers to a group's ability to engage in collective action and identify solutions to its own problems. SFCIPP did not have meaningful participation from children of incarcerated parents and lacked consensus on the main problem(s) to address.

Despite these internal challenges, the coalition successfully advocated for structural changes with lasting ripple effects. New regulations, standards, and initiatives born out of SFCIPP constitute the coalition's biggest accomplishments in institutionalizing the Bill of Rights and putting children of incarcerated parents "on the map."

Key Takeaways

- SFCIPP was not clear on its goal or shared analysis; instead, the biggest area of consensus was on supporting children of incarcerated parents through the Bill of Rights.
- The generality of the Bill of Rights language allowed for all SFCIPP members to agree to them but prevented the coalition from adopting clear strategies to mobilize leaders and resources to realize these rights.
- SFCIPP served as an "incubator," providing a space to discuss gaps in services and new ideas that over time resulted in new programs.
- SFCIPP favored an "insider strategy" by keeping public agencies at the table, over the meaningful engagement and leadership development of children of incarcerated parents).



August 1, 2020

Zellerbach Family Foundation
Improving Human Service Systems Program
SFCIPP Assessment Report

SAN FRANCISCO CHILDREN OF INCARCERATED PARENTS PARTNERSHIP ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

Incarceration affects thousands of Californians every year. When individuals serve their sentences behind bars, they lose their incomes, government benefits, and most of their rights. Being parents while incarcerated means that their children also lose. Children suffer emotional, educational, and financial consequences associated with their parents' incarceration. Even though discussions of criminalization and incarceration often include mentions of the impact on families, they rarely include the particular effects on kids. The San Francisco Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership, also known as SFCIPP, emerged in the early 2000s from a desire to amplify the needs of this overlooked population.

For close to 20 years, SFCIPP brought together social service providers, staff from government agencies, advocates and supporters to better understand this population, uplift their needs and strengths, and improve these children's lives (SFCIPP, 2005). The partnership developed and published the Children of Incarcerated Parents Bill of Rights which served as a springboard for change in San Francisco while influencing the entire nation. In late 2019, SFCIPP partners held their last meeting. The dissolution of the partnership came after close consideration of its strengths, challenges, and opportunities. Although the early accomplishments of SFCIPP had great impact, many partners questioned the coalition's continued value in the present. This report offers an assessment of SFCIPP's impact on developing the capacity of partner organizations, social capital among partners (networking), and broader community capacity (collective action).

Because impact is a broad concept that could be identified in different areas of organizational work, the analysis of these interviews required defining the standards for assessment and discussion. Moreover, my background in community organizing and policymaking means that I orient myself towards collective action, particularly towards strategies that change social, political, and economic systems. In an effort to recognize the nuance of SFCIPP's impact aside from systemic change, I found nine (9) elements in the research literature that are associated with impact on organizational capacity, social capital, and community capacity.

Methodology

The postulations presented in this assessment stem from performing and analyzing individual interviews with 14 SFCIPP members/partners. The interviews were conducted in early 2020 and consisted of 14 questions spanning from individual participation rates, benefits of participating, and understanding the systems impacting the population, to building alliances, and creating structural change (Appendix A). In order to analyze these interviews, I employed concepts related to three types of coalition functioning: organizational capacity, social capital, and community capacity. Coalition functioning refers to the way alliances utilize their resources to advance their objectives (Shapiro et al., 2013). Within each category, there were three elements that helped me aggregate responses to determine impact.

The inquiry into SFCIPP's organizational capacity function focused on three aspects of each agency's engagement: the representative's understanding of the various systems affecting children of incarcerated parents, i.e., "system awareness;" the organization's ability to bring in funding and other resources, i.e., "resource acquisition;" and its ability to increase service referrals from and to other partners i.e., "utilization of services" (Nowell & Foster-Fishman, 2010).

The examination of SFCIPP's networking function, or its ability to build social capital, focused on three elements of each agency's engagement: "integrate social services" (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001); "build alliances" (Neal, 2014); "participation rates" (Nowell & Foster-Fishman, 2010).

Lastly, to study SFCIPP's engagement in collective action, the focus shifted to its function as a builder of community capacity. The three elements under community capacity that became the focus of study were youth participation in the coalition, i.e. "participation" (Bovaird et al., 2015) through "co-learning" (Zeldin et al., 2013); "leadership development" (Staples, 2012); and defining the problem that needs solving, i.e., "meaning-making" (Lehrner & Allen, 2008, Thomas & Louis, 2013).

Findings

I. Organizational Capacity (Work Efficiency)

Developing organizational capacity is central to making systemic change. Organizational capacity can increase a group's ability to identify clear strategies and execute successful tactics. It can help organizations maintain their viability for a longer period of time and, in turn, potentiate the agency's ability to make lasting change. Building capacity within an organization has been associated with improving overall work efficiency as well as the specific ability of a community to produce change (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001).

SFCIPP presented the highest level of impact under the category of organizational capacity. Almost all of the respondents reported past engagement in activities that improved their organizational competencies in three main areas: awareness of the complex social and political

systems involved in the lives of the population, acquiring more resources, including financial, and improving access to their own services through coalition relationships.

Most partners – 13 out of 14 respondents—described numerous instances of organizational development, particularly regarding an improved understanding of the complex systems affecting children of incarcerated parents and their families. Several members explained that they learned about the complex web of systems underneath the problems these children face. This new learning often replaced previous beliefs that some individuals were not acting correctly within certain institutions. One partner summarized this new system awareness saying, “I began to realize it wasn’t a question of bad actors.” Another partner asserted that SFCIPP helped her deepen her understanding by showing her “the interconnectedness of systems and the intricacies of the bureaucracies.” Many members mentioned that it was particularly insightful to hear directly from the young people who were directly impacted.

Another element that demonstrates SFCIPP’s high functionality in organizational capacity was resource acquisition. All of the respondents that represented organizations while being active in SFCIPP (11 out of 14) described how participating helped them access resources that improved their programmatic work. One member explained that learning the trauma-informed approach influenced services at her organization and another member described the creation of the One Family Program at the Sheriff’s Department as a result of SFCIPP. More than half of these partners emphasized receiving grants related to their SFCIPP involvement. From learning new approaches to improve their services, to obtaining new grants from public or private sources, SFCIPP members reported specific benefits to an active involvement in the coalition.

In addition to a greater awareness of systems impacting children of incarcerated parents and increased resources for their organizations, some SFCIPP members also reported improved access to their services. This third element under organizational capacity, “utilization of services,” refers to leveraging relationships in the coalition to refer individuals to each other’s programs. Even though only four (4) organizations reported an increase in referrals from partner agencies, this figure constitutes half of the organizations best positioned to receive service referrals.

II. Social Capital (Networking)

Networking is generally associated with a group of people getting to know each other’s expertise or roles and exchanging contact information. However, when looking at organizational performance and social change, networking refers to building cohesion amongst members of a coalition to improve effectiveness (Shapiro et al., 2013). In this sense, bringing diverse organizations together to successfully collaborate towards a common goal builds social capital within a group (Gittel & Vidal, 1998). Therefore, strategic networking with the intent to increase social capital often leads to more effective work.

Although the partnership was successful at providing a space for general networking – members sharing contact information and expert knowledge, SFCIPP showed low levels of

social capital in its ability to integrate services and build alliances. Because children of incarcerated parents usually interact with many social service agencies and systems that do not coordinate with each other, social service integration (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001) is an important measure to observe. While a few partners mentioned leveraging SFCIPP contacts for education or social service referrals, they were unable to describe reduced fragmentation in services. One partner described relationship building between community-based organizations and public agencies as “difficult sometimes, unless you got buy-in from the top.”

Service integration may be a more challenging aspect to measure during interviews, but the absence of any comments related to service integration in the many examples shared about relationship cultivation is notable. Besides social service integration, the ability to build alliances (Neal, 2014) between members is another aspect of developing social capital that is relevant for SFCIPP. Because the partnership intended to advance its Bill of Rights, building alliances would have been instrumental in realizing such rights. The primary step to building alliances is communication amongst partners; 10 respondents reported that they had engaged in such communication. However, the quality of the communication was superficial and individualized, so it rarely translated into organized group efforts.

Although there were few mentions of alliances, one relationship was repeatedly articulated as both a significant connection and a key alliance for the partnership. The Public Defender’s Office and former San Francisco Public Defender, Jeff Adachi, were mentioned in the majority of the interviews as important partners in issues related to children of incarcerated parents. One SFCIPP member shared that late Defender Adachi leveraged his political connections to support the partnership on many occasions. According to this respondent, Adachi advocated with former SF Police Chief Heather Fong on behalf of the coalition and Chief Fong ordered her Police Department to work with SFCIPP.

Integrating social services and building alliances were two elements of social capital that showed SFCIPP’s low levels of strategic networking. The one element that showed high levels was participation rates. Out of the 14 respondents, nine (9) organizations attended the meetings with high frequency, four (4) attended infrequently, and one (1) with low frequency. In addition, indicators of consistent participation revealed that eight (8) participants remained actively engaged with SFCIPP for approximately a decade or more, even when changing jobs. These participation results indicate that social capital was improving through longer involvement and opportunities to hold leadership positions (Nowell & Foster-Fishman, 2010) such as participating in hiring processes, serving on the steering committee, etc. Since opportunities for participation are a “key factor in effective coalition functioning” (Shapiro et al., 2013), the missing link to this high participation rate was providing clarity on opportunities and organizational goals to harness the benefits of high involvement.

III. Community Capacity (Collective Action)

Community capacity is a relevant concept for assessing SFCIPP’s impact because it refers to the ability of a group to find solutions for its own community problems (Nowell &

Foster-Fishman, 2010). Community capacity helps a group to engage in collective action. Similar to organizational capacity, community capacity can influence the effectiveness of work towards social change. The three elements of focus for examination under this category are youth participation, leadership development, and defining the problem to solve.

SFCIPP presented a low level of impact under this category. All of the respondents stated that children of incarcerated parents did not have meaningful participation in the coalition's work and there was no consensus on the problem SFCIPP was addressing.

In terms of leadership development, the partnership provided opportunities for growth but failed to provide opportunities to turn this development into action. All but one respondent articulated the personal and professional benefits that SFCIPP participation brought to their development. Members of SFCIPP showed increased leadership development when describing their new learnings on organizational development skills, the legislative process, anti-oppression and trauma-informed approaches, and child development tools (listed from most frequently mentioned to least frequent). A number of partners also mentioned they were able to obtain new jobs and contracts thanks to SFCIPP.

Even though SFCIPP members reported an increased understanding of the systemic impact of parental incarceration on children, each partner interpreted the information at different levels. A number of partners learned for the first time about the pervasive nature of the system that criminalizes families based on race and class while other partners learned how influencing one institution can bring desired results in another. Building skills around organizational development was the most mentioned area of growth for respondents. One partner voiced having learned from both the different types of facilitation in the coalition and direct involvement in the strategic planning processes. These important skills were mostly leveraged for individual growth, new work prospects, and individual organization's projects rather than harnessed for sustained collective action as a coalition.

The partnership was an important space for growth for this group of members interviewed, who were some of the most actively engaged in SFCIPP. However, the coalition was unable to meaningfully involve youth or define a shared analysis of the problem that SFCIPP was undertaking. Every partner agreed that youth participation was never successful, and a few stated that the presence of impacted young people felt tokenizing. Effective youth participation entails creating intentional activities for youth and adults to learn from each other as well as engaging together in the civic process, i.e. "co-learning" (Zeldin et al., 2013). Although several partners expressed learning from the voices and stories of young people, the learning did not seem reciprocal and there were no examples of collective action led by impacted youth and adults.

Engaging in effective collective action requires a group to define its shared analysis of the problem they want to solve. "Meaning-making" involves the efforts in social movements to define the social problems and the necessary actions to address them (Lehrner & Allen, 2008). The entire group of respondents believed that SFCIPP only agreed on the Bill of Rights. Furthermore, the majority of partners articulated the challenges of not having a shared analysis

as a coalition. A couple of partners asserted that SFCIPP lacked unity in understanding the Bill of Rights, to which one partner said, “[we] only agreed on helping children; that’s it.” Building consensus on the shared analysis underneath a problem might have been key not only to engaging in collective action but also to creating specific spaces for youth participation, and to identify areas for partners-in-development to lead.

Despite the internal challenges that SFCIPP faced, the coalition was successful in delivering structural changes with lasting ripple effects. Every partner spoke about the government policies, procedures, and programs born out of SFCIPP’s work. These new regulations, standards, and initiatives constitute the coalition’s biggest accomplishments in institutionalizing the Bill of Rights and putting children of incarcerated parents “on the map.”

SFCIPP claimed the following victories as part of the coalition’s impact on communities and systems:

- Mandatory requirement that every prison in the state must have a visiting center
- SF Police Department point of arrest protocols
- SF County Jails allowing contact visits
- SF Department of Children Youth and Families now prioritizes this population
- Family impact statements for criminal court proceedings and adult probation
- Inmate locator on the SF Jail website
- The SF Unified School District creating a focus on this population and allowing specific services
- Resolutions passed at the SF Board of Supervisors and the SF Board of Education supporting the Children of Incarcerated Parents Bill of Rights

Discussion

Over the span of SFCIPP’s life course, the partnership fulfilled diverse functions. This assessment offers a deeper look into the contributions this body delivered and the missed opportunities for more effective work. As a coalition that brought together public and private partners, social service institutions, law enforcement agencies, public defenders, and individual thinkers, SFCIPP successfully performed organizational development, general networking, and individual leadership development functions throughout its almost 20 years of work. Nonetheless, the partnership also missed opportunities to generate further impact through its failures to build formal alliances, integrate youth participation, and develop a cohesive analysis of the social problem in focus. These missed opportunities provide great lessons for future collaborative efforts and effective areas of investment.

Building alliances amongst the majority of the partners was an unsuccessful process for SFCIPP. Some partners believe the striking differences in missions and approaches to the work of the organizations that constituted SFCIPP at least partially accounted for its failures. One partner claimed the challenges arose from having agencies on seemingly opposite sides with “members who were [prison] abolitionists and members who had large contracts with the

Department of Corrections.” In my experience as a coalition builder and a community organizer, differences in political frameworks and approaches to the work do not preclude a coalition from defining a problem to address and determining a shared analysis of its root causes. Every respondent agreed that SFCIPP was not clear on its goal or shared analysis; instead, the biggest area of consensus was on supporting children of incarcerated parents through the bill of rights.

The coalition’s inability to articulate a shared analysis was accompanied by a constant search for tasks. One partner stated that the partnership’s “focus was on how children were impacted by the system, not the system itself.” Many respondents shared there were recurrent efforts to “try to find projects” to work on together. These comments suggest the coalition was ignoring or avoiding the challenging process of building a cohesive analysis of the problem to address. If the coalition was in fact ignoring this process, it was likely due to a lack of skills or capacity to build an effective coalition. If they were instead avoiding this process, they were likely afraid to lose some partners with less openness to engage in political and power analysis. Perhaps both barriers were at play.

Besides searching for tasks to complete, the partnership sometimes questioned if a different membership would result in more success. A few partners shared concerns around who should be part of the “SFCIPP table,” and they raised questions such as “Do we need law enforcement partners? Do we need government partners in general?” Some members wondered if there was a connection between the coalition’s effectiveness and the partners at the table. There were members stating that SFCIPP being nested at the Zellerbach Family Foundation (ZFF) was to the benefit of the work, adding that government agencies were more likely to participate because ZFF seemed “politically neutral.” Other members thought that the coalition’s dependence on ZFF for funding and guidance increased racial tensions within SFCIPP and prevented it from engaging in bolder strategies.

In my decades of experience organizing for social change as part of coalitions, the concerns around who is at the table can only be addressed by having a clear path of action. Discussing and agreeing upon a shared analysis of the problems faced by children of incarcerated parents clarifies both the targets to address and the partners to include in such work. Building a shared analysis is key to allowing organizations to either continue their commitment or end their involvement with the coalition. In addition, a shared analysis of the core problem creates a foundation of trust for effective alliances that can advance systemic change because it builds the capacity of the community to engage in collective action.

The intention at the onset of SFCIPP was to share information and network with other professionals. In just a few years, this intention evolved into developing and advancing the Children of Incarcerated Parents Bill of Rights. These intentions, however, did not translate into a clear understanding of the problem these rights were addressing. The generality of the Bill of Rights language allowed for all SFCIPP members to agree to them but prevented the coalition from adopting clear strategies to mobilize their leaders and resources to realize these rights. This lack of a shared analysis as a partnership meant that some changes accomplished during their early years, were slowly undone. One partner stated, “we accomplished some amazing things,

but if you don't ensure those successes stand the test of time, you can lose them." This partner was discussing the great success of allowing contact visits between parents in custody and their children. She added that weekly visits were allowed, but over time they became infrequent.

Some partners attribute the expedience of particular changes achieved by SFCIPP to law enforcement and other government agencies being at the table. There was some disagreement amongst respondents about this matter, questioning the benefit of having government agencies as members of SFCIPP. On the other hand, some partners believed that specific representatives from those agencies, despite their institutional affiliations, facilitated change-making processes in their agencies due to their own passions. Accomplishments were, therefore, connected to individualized efforts and not to a particular department's commitment to this population. Given SFCIPP's tendency to favor an "insider strategy," where groups attempt to convince those with institutional power to make changes at their own pace and in their own terms, another question that arises for further discussion is: what is the cost of keeping agencies at the table that promise to deliver change but do not sustain it or reflect it in their overall policies and procedures?

This question is precisely difficult to answer without a shared analysis of the target problem to address and its associated root causes. Both youth participation and a shared analysis are elements that facilitate effective collective action. Youth participation was low and sporadic at SFCIPP. A couple of partners characterized youth involvement as "tokenizing." Successful youth participation requires opportunities for co-learning between youth and adult participants and an understanding of each other's assets. In order to achieve meaningful youth participation, there needs to be clear avenues for "children of incarcerated parents to guide the work," as one respondent described. With the partnership lacking a clear path forward, it was unlikely they would be able to identify meaningful co-learning opportunities with youth.

Despite presenting low levels of impact around collective action and alliance building, SFCIPP brought strong contributions to the local criminal justice field. The partnership incubated important programs for children of incarcerated parents, helped create a supportive environment for staff at diverse organizations, and provided opportunities for leadership development. In addition, the partnership successfully advocated for the adoption of policies, procedures, and programs within city government to help children of incarcerated parents.

Many SFCIPP members described the coalition as an "incubator." During meetings, gaps in services and new ideas would be discussed, and over time some conversations would result in seed funding and the creation of new programs. Project WHAT! at Community Works and One Family at the Sheriff's Department (operated by Community Works) illustrate this type of SFCIPP contribution. Project WHAT! is a youth-focused program aimed at strengthening, honing, and mobilizing young people's voices and power for policy change benefiting children and families of incarcerated parents. The program One Family provides supportive services and education to parents inside and out-of-custody to promote positive relationships with their children. These programs were groundbreaking at their onset and continue to inspire change nationally.

The ripple effects of SFCIPP's groundbreaking work are seen in the Department of Children Youth and Families (DCYF) in San Francisco prioritizing children of incarcerated parents in their grantmaking, in discussions with the San Francisco Unified School District about taking parent-teacher conferences to folks in custody, and in newly elected SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin's policy to divert parents (Sernoffsky, 2020) into programs and away from serving time behind bars. The process of working towards these kinds of accomplishments and the quarterly meetings that SFCIPP held for over 15 years provided opportunities for professional growth. Partners recognized learning about organizational development, policymaking, anti-oppression and trauma-informed approaches, relationship cultivation, amongst others. These skills constitute leadership development for staff at the member organizations and they are an important part of building the community's capacity to engage in social change.

Besides providing opportunities for leadership development, SFCIPP created a supportive environment for staff at diverse organizations to meet and share knowledge on children of incarcerated parents' needs. This supportive environment carried personal benefits to attendees and fostered productive, non-confrontational conversations with law enforcement agencies. The majority of partners agreed that the meetings presented this kind of environment where everyone coming together was united in recognizing that children of incarcerated parents are an important population. Staff who felt isolated by their work could come to these meetings to hear about other efforts taking place in the city while connecting with caring professionals. Community-based organizations were able to push law enforcement agencies to remain accountable to their commitments without these agencies responding defensively. The benefits of this supportive environment might have contributed to a core group of partners staying involved for nearly a decade or more.

The partnership and its supporters can be proud of the great endeavors that SFCIPP engaged in, whether successfully or not. Many lessons can be drawn from both its strengths and missed opportunities to improve organizational development, strategic relationship building, and collective action efforts.

Coalitions must invest time and resources in developing a shared analysis of its target problem. Even though this process can begin at any point in the life of the collaborative, the sooner the analysis is developed, the more likely the collaborative will be able to identify goals, tactics, and allies while leveraging the leadership capacities of people in the room. To engage in this process, coalitions can choose to be guided by an outside consultant or hire a skilled organizer with previous experience in coalition building to steward the partnership. There may be more options to help a coalition develop its shared analysis, and not just a policy platform or points of unity, but I propose the two most accessible paths.

In addition to clarifying their shared analysis, coalitions must invest in the participatory leadership of the communities closest to the target problem. In this case, SFCIPP should have identified the participation of impacted youth (children of incarcerated parents) as critical for the partnership's success. Youth participation helps to ensure that the coalition's work is accountable to the needs of this population, builds the capacity of the impacted community to create further

change, and results in more lasting, multi-generational social as well as political transformation. Given today's uprisings defending the lives of Black people in the United States, and the powerful leadership demonstrated by youth organizers in the Bay Area who are creating actionable demands and organizing awe-inspiring protests, the importance of the community most impacted by a problem guiding coalition work is more striking than ever.

Conclusion

Participating in social change movements is similar to playing in an orchestra. It requires organizations to move in unity to create one harmonious rhythm (shared analysis), even though different organizations play at different paces (missions) and use different instruments (approaches). Lasting social change does not require all organizations to envision and enact work in similar ways. Instead, it requires accountable agencies and individuals committed to working together towards the same goal and building on each other's strengths. Accountable organizations must also articulate where they are in their vision for transformation or progress towards their goals, and the gains they have made in their trajectory or the results of their work. Documenting change, whether through stories or numbers, about life-affirming services or policy failures, is always fruitful. Articulating gains helps create the history that inspires multi-generational change. Articulating and recording the path traveled towards our goals is a practice of accountability and building power that benefits communities fighting for fundamental rights, dignity, and liberation.

SFCIPP was undoubtedly a trailblazer coalition that emerged in a time when few institutions and academics were discussing or attending to the needs of children of incarcerated parents. This partnership elevated the importance of this population, bringing together unlikely allies to learn about each other's expertise and begin to understand the complex systems affecting children of incarcerated parents. Despite the partnership's missed opportunities for participatory action and meaningful youth engagement, SFCIPP's victories are still notable today. The lessons afforded by SFCIPP can teach coalitions in the present and future to prioritize the most impacted communities, invest in experienced community organizers to help define and advance the work, and value accountability – such as the practice of documenting progress. Successful collaboratives nurture the fire of social movements, creating ever-expanding networks of changemakers and reminding us that in unity and shared vision, we harness our most transformative power.

REFERENCES

- Bovaird, T., Van Ryzin, G. G., Loeffler, E., & Parrado, S. (2015). Activating Citizens to Participate in Collective Co-Production of Public Services. *Journal of Social Policy*, 44(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279414000567>
- Foster-Fishman, P. G., Salem, D. A., Allen, N. A., & Fahrbach, K. (2001). Facilitating Interorganizational Collaboration: The Contributions of Interorganizational Alliances. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(6), 875–905. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012915631956>
- Gittell, R. J., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*. Sage Publications, Inc. <https://search.proquest.com/socialservices/docview/619393908/5E376B4D62144E5BPQ/49>
- Lehrner, A., & Allen, N. E. (2008). Social Change Movements and the Struggle Over Meaning-Making: A Case Study of Domestic Violence Narratives. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 42(3–4), 220–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9199-3>
- Neal, Z. P. (2014). A Network Perspective on the Processes of Empowered Organizations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 53(3–4), 407–418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9623-1>
- Nowell, B., & Foster-Fishman, P. (2010). Examining Multi-Sector Community Collaboratives as Vehicles for Building Organizational Capacity. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 48(3), 193–207. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9364-3>
- Sernoffsky, E. (2020, January). SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin launches diversion program for parents facing criminal charges. *San Francisco Chronicle*. <https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/SF-District-Attorney-Chesa-Boudin-launches-14975839.php>
- Shapiro, V. B., Oesterle, S., Abbott, R. D., Arthur, M. W., & Hawkins, J. D. (2013). Measuring Dimensions of Coalition Functioning for Effective and Participatory Community Practice. *Social Work Research*, 37(4), 349–359. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svt028>
- Staples, L. (2012). Community Organizing for Social Justice: Grassroots Groups for Power. *Social Work With Groups*, 35(3), 287–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2012.656233>
- Thomas, E. F., & Louis, W. R. (2013). Doing Democracy: The Social Psychological Mobilization and Consequences of Collective Action. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 7(1), 173–200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2012.01047.x>
- Zeldin, S., Christens, B. D., & Powers, J. L. (2013). The Psychology and Practice of Youth-Adult Partnership: Bridging Generations for Youth Development and Community Change. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 51(3–4), 385–397. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-012-9558-y>

APPENDIX A

SFCIPP Interview Questions

1. What is your name and what organizations were you affiliated with when you participated in SFCIPP?
2. When did you participate and for how long?
3. How would you describe your participation in SFCIPP?
 - a. How frequently or regularly did you attend meetings, and did it change over time? Why?
 - b. What was your role in the coalition or what did you see as your contributions?
4. Why did your organization join the partnership? What were you hoping to achieve or gain?
5. How did the quality or quantity of services that you or your organization provides change as a result of your participation in SFCIPP?
6. How, if at all, did your participation in SFCIPP changed your understanding of how various systems impact children of incarcerated parents?
7. Did you develop relationships with organizations that are different in nature from yours as a result of your participation in SFCIPP? (Please provide an example).
8. In terms of your overall relationships with other partners at SFCIPP, did any of the relationships extend beyond the quarterly meetings? (Please provide an example).
9. How did you personally or professionally benefit, if at all, from participation in this partnership?
 - a. Did the partnership provide trainings, workshops, or skill-building opportunities (please provide an example)?
10. What kind of participation did children of incarcerated parents have in the partnership? Can you describe an example?
11. Were the members of the partnership able to unify around a common understanding of the main problems SFCIPP was attempting to address?
12. What impact did the coalition have on communities and/or structures?
13. What do you think are the biggest lessons for the coalition? What do you think could have been done differently?
14. Anything else you would like to add?