

U.S. Programs Strategy Memo

September 6, 2013

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary.....	2
II. Foundation History and Context.....	2
III. Goals and Priorities.....	4
A. Core Efforts: Equality, Democracy, and Justice	
A1. Democratic Practice.....	5
A2. Rights and Access of Racial Minorities and Marginalized Groups.....	7
A3. Advancing Fair and Effective Justice Policies.....	9
B. New Features of U.S. Programs: Anchors, Places, and Opportunities.....	12
C. Operational Approaches	
C1. Tools.....	12
C2. Partnerships and Collaborations.....	14
C3. Shared Frameworks.....	14
IV. New Capacities to Enhance Our Impact and Outstanding Organizational Issues.....	15
V. Appendix.....	16

I. Executive Summary

In revisiting the United States' approach to the "war on terror," President Obama recently emphasized that this nation must remain "an open society." In the coming years, the nation faces profound shifts that threaten this aspiration. These include the expanded influence of the private sector in public affairs, growing economic inequality that reinforces the marginalization of racial and other minorities, increasingly paralyzed government institutions, and fundamental challenges to fact-based discourse.

In the face of these trends, and following George Soros' request to the U.S. Programs board to undertake a thorough review of our activities and budget, which concluded in 2012, we have initiated a reorganization and refined our approach within three core areas: (1) democratic practices to create a robust public sphere amidst rapid technological change; (2) the rights and inclusion of racial and other minorities; and (3) fair and effective justice and drug policy and programs. The restructuring includes deeper engagement with key grantees that cross multiple fields; a new initiative to develop long-term, sophisticated civic capacity at the local level; and the use of a Reserve Fund made up of 20% of our budget to expand our ability to respond to opportunities.

Over the next four years, we will:

- Promote core democratic institutions by (1) combatting threats to civic and political participation and judicial independence, (2) ending the federal government's wartime counterterror frame, including the expansive use of drones and indefinite detention, (3) identifying and scaling economically sustainable and effective models of public media and broadband access, and (4) seeding and growing effective, participatory government and transparency norms.
- Respond to the seismic demographic shifts accompanying the growth of communities of color throughout the United States by (1) securing comprehensive immigration reform and effectively integrating newcomers to the United States, (2) building on initial but scattered successes at reforming practices that undermine the ability of African-American and other minority youth to access quality public education, (3) promoting equity mechanisms within the contested frameworks for the federal budget and the rebuilt housing and credit systems, and (4) developing a new racial narrative and steps to address racial profiling.
- End the United States' unparalleled overreliance on incarceration and misguided drug laws by (1) using growing recognition of criminal justice system waste and failure to transform systems in select states, including California, and at the federal level, (2) continuing the steady progress toward abolition of the death penalty and other forms of harsh punishment, and (3) using U.S. health care reform and the trend toward marijuana legalization to advance drug policy reform.
- Build local initiatives to advance open society interests in the face of federal budget cuts, technological innovation, and demographic change in at least three new places, and continue our support for OSI-Baltimore.

In the next four years, U.S. Programs will help reinvigorate democracy and broaden economic and political opportunity in this country, furthering open society for all who live here and in other places touched by U.S. influence.

II. Foundation History & Context

History & Identity

George Soros made his first investments in the United States in the early 1990s based on a set of personal concerns about threats to open society in America. He felt that U.S. policies related to death and dying and the 'war on drugs' were misdirected, and were therefore exacerbating rather than solving core social problems. Following early initiatives in these areas, he launched U.S. Programs in 1996 to address more broadly the flaws in, and threats to, open society in the U.S. Although U.S. Programs' priorities have evolved over time, we have

consistently focused on the most significant threats to open society and their impact on the most vulnerable and marginalized communities in the U.S. We strive to ensure a robust, inclusive democracy in which especially these communities can meaningfully participate in civic, economic, and political life, and in which the core institutions of civil society are effective and accountable.

The early programs on transforming the culture of dying and reducing the harms of drug use and drug prohibition, grew to include work on prisoner re-entry, access to legal services for the poor, and the corrupting influence of marketplace values on professional standards. In the mid-1990s, responding to a surge in anti-immigrant sentiment, we began to address the rights of those new to our country through the creation of the substantial Emma Lazarus Fund. In 1997, we added a field office in Baltimore as a laboratory in which to try out a comprehensive, locally-based approach to inter-connected urban problems. Since then, we have continued to respond to new and serious challenges, such as the nation's continued reliance on mass incarceration or the violations of civil liberties and departure from democratic norms and the rule of law that accompanied the response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

U.S. Programs is unusual in having both geographic and thematic aspects, and a specific delegation of authority to its board. By resolution of the Trustees of OSI-NY,¹ the U.S. Programs board (now 14 members) is appointed by these Trustees, and delegated by them the authority to approve program strategies for U.S. Programs and approve grants over \$2 million. In February 2011, George Soros asked the U.S. Programs board to undertake a sustained review over the budget, strategy and evaluation of programs, operations and direction of U.S. Programs.

Role in U.S. Philanthropy

U.S. Programs occupies an important space in U.S. philanthropy. Even among several foundations with interests in similar social issues, we are distinct in that our “open society” approach is a broader perspective than our partner foundations’ focus on democracy and social justice concerns. We are largely, though not entirely, a grant-making entity. Often the first donor to tackle a controversial issue such as drug policy reform (and make substantial, multi-year commitments to the issue), we also simultaneously strive to create a “safe” space for others to partner with us. We are known for our support of sharp-edged advocacy and individual scholarship and leadership cultivation. We also continually engage in strategic interventions to expand funding for especially challenging issues, such as excessive incarceration, targeted killing policies, the undue influence of private money in politics or fiscal policy and the role of government. We lead or play key roles on issues including media policy and national security and human rights, areas with few other funders. While we have more company in the immigration reform field, we remain a substantial player and strategic partner. Given that Atlantic Philanthropies is winding down and leadership is changing at the Ford Foundation, we are likely to play an even more significant role in the next few years.

We strive to maintain an entrepreneurial approach. We have seized unanticipated opportunities for reform, as we did when we made grants to a set of state coalitions to ensure the transparency, equity, and accountability of the funds states received as part of the 2009 \$750 billion federal recovery package. Similarly, we stepped in to fill funding gaps caused by the unexpected collapse of the JEHT Foundation in 2008, an important partner that closed down because its donors had their wealth invested in Bernard Madoff’s Ponzi scheme. And we continue to respond to unexpected needs or opportunities, as reflected in important, largely successful investments to address voter suppression and ensure voter engagement in the run-up to the 2012 U.S. elections and, currently, in support of comprehensive immigration reform.

¹ OSI-NY is the U.S. entity of which U.S. Programs and the other U.S.-based programs of OSF are part. Along with the Foundation to Promote Open Society, a private foundation that makes grants in collaboration with OSI, it is the entity that receives George Soros’ donations in the U.S. and is responsible for all expenditures of that money. OSI-NY’s governing board is its Trustees: Chris Stone, George Soros, Jonathan Soros, Alex Soros and Leon Botstein. The Trustees are the ultimate authority over U.S. Programs and all other programs operating out of the U.S. The Executive Committee of the Trustees – Chris, George, and Jonathan – is authorized to act on behalf of the Trustees. The U.S. Programs board includes all three Executive Committee members.

Salient markers of the U.S. political and socio-economic landscape in which we work today, and which inform our priorities, include:

- **Shifts in demographics and political power:** The U.S. is experiencing a significant shift in racial and ethnic composition and in the political force of non-whites, and is on track to become a majority-minority nation, even though racial inequity and exclusion remain incorporated into the structures of opportunity and power.
- **Growing economic inequality:** Federal tax and economic policy, the changing nature of work, market fundamentalism, and the consequences of the recession have led to a significant increase in economic inequality over the last three decades, exacerbating ongoing racial wealth and income gaps.
- **Contested role and ability of government:** Attacks on the role of government in society have taken a toll on its effectiveness. This, combined with deeply polarized government at the state and local levels, has resulted in political paralysis that limits, if not outright prevents, resolution of critical issues.
- **Increasing private influence in the public sphere:** Wealthy interests play an outsized role in American elections and policymaking today, leaving the public's interests marginalized in critical decisions on matters including bank regulation, communications policies, and prison privatization.
- **Rapid spread of technology and automation:** The fast move from a manufacturing economy to an information economy has meant heightened opportunity for civic engagement and new platforms for innovation, but has also meant increased job dislocations, real threats of corporate and government surveillance, and a troublingly large accessibility gap.

Collectively, these trends pose great challenges and some opportunities for American democracy. Overall, open society interests are threatened by the decline of key civil society institutions, a fragmented and increasingly challenged consensus on the role of the public sphere, and growing constraints on the ability of individuals to participate in public life. These are seen in the declining access to quality education, especially for historically marginalized groups, transformative changes in the media that have led to a decline in accurate reporting on civic matters, and growing partisanship in Congress and the courts that threaten their legitimacy. Yet, even in the face of these powerful trends, there are also positive signs, such as the growth of new constituencies more naturally aligned to open society interests and uses of technology that further effective, accountable government and collective undertakings. All told, the U.S. stands at a critical inflection point in which the new ways in which power and politics in the country play out will have long-term influence over social policy, public practice, and individual engagement.

In developing goals, we are mindful of the importance of our efforts for those within the U.S. and beyond, as American policy can have broad international consequences, whether related to marijuana legalization, the fairness of our election system, or harm stemming from the extraordinary rendition policy. Broadly speaking, we are aware that the U.S. often influences other nations and peoples struggling for more open societies. But our entanglement in controversial wars and counter-terror practices, our inability to rein in our financial industry, our treatment of undocumented workers and our record-high rate of incarceration, have all damaged our credibility and image internationally and eroded our ability to press for democracy and human rights abroad. Whether for good or ill, we are aware that other nations look to the U.S. for leadership on political, financial and economic matters.

III. Goals and Priorities – Strategy Overview

While the rest of OSF is engaging in zero-based strategy and budgeting this year, the U.S. Programs Board-led strategy process last year resulted in a set of substantive and structural shifts. As part of that process, we not only sharpened the focus of our work and significantly reduced our programmatic budget by roughly 20 percent but also analyzed its impact, studied the role of the public narratives in our fields, considered the use of a broader array of tools, and identified near and long-term opportunities and challenges. As we explain further below, we are now implementing the strategies we developed with the U.S. Programs board last year.

U.S. Programs’ substantive work falls within three broad areas: (1) promoting democratic practices and a robust public sphere despite the growing influence of the private sector and rapid technological change; (2) furthering the rights and access of racial and other minorities in the face of demographic change and growing economic inequality; and (3) advancing fair and effective justice policy and programs. These are discussed in more detail below. (Please note that the appendix contains additional information in the form of one to two page charts for each component of U.S. Programs, reflecting our approaches to fields and foundation-led concepts. In the subsequent section of this overview, we identify three new elements of how U.S. Programs approaches our work that emerged from the strategic review process. While U.S. Programs did not formally use the terms “field” or “foundation-led concept” in our strategic review, these ideas and the idea of “shared frameworks” infused our approach to and across each of our three major areas of concentration: Democracy, Equality and Justice. These terms will have implications for how we, and all other components of OSF, work going forward.

A. CORE EFFORTS: DEMOCRACY, EQUALITY & JUSTICE

U.S. Programs continues to maintain its core substantive commitments to: 1) democratic practice; 2) rights and access of racial minorities and marginalized groups; and (3) fair and effective justice policy and programs.

A1. Democratic Practice

American democracy is faced with multiple threats. A decades-long attack on government and its role in society has constrained its ability to act as problem solver. Broad political and ideological polarization has resulted in a deeply divided government at the federal and state levels. Political paralysis in Congress limits, if not outright prevents, resolution of critical issues, while in the national security context, the Executive branch shrouds important decisions in secrecy. It is also worrying that the Supreme Court is undermining key voting and human rights protections, and the authority of government to address fundamental problems. As a sharp ideological debate rages over whether government is the cause of or solution to current problems, Americans lose trust and confidence in public institutions and discourse, even as internationally, the U.S. loses credibility as a model of human rights and the rule of law.

Wealthy interests feature prominently in the debate over the role of government. Corporate money in particular floods national and state legislative and judicial elections, influencing the decisions that follow, and leaving the poor and middle class with little influence over their elected representatives. A record-breaking \$10 billion was spent on the 2012 national elections, when for the first time corporations spent unlimited amounts on “electioneering.”

It is clear that a very small number of special interests will now wield extraordinary influence over the terms and outcomes of American elections and policy-making. The starving of public education systems and the dismantling of the social safety net are driven not simply by hostility to the poor and people of color, but also by the demands of political benefactors who wish to see taxes low and government limited. Criminal justice and drug policies are shaped by private prison corporations that seek to keep inmates incarcerated to turn a profit. Corporate special interests also dominate our media and communications infrastructure. While digital platforms, services, and devices now mediate human relationships of all kinds, including the relationship between citizens and government, the globally networked public sphere is largely shaped, built, owned, and operated by the private sector.

The rapid spread of technology, while offering new platforms for information, innovation, and civic engagement, is not equally accessible to all. A small handful of corporations with enormous political power, and a strong incentive to avoid regulation, effectively control access to the Internet. So even as the Internet increasingly assumes the hallmarks of an essential public utility, more than 30% of American households don’t have it or can’t afford it, with low-income communities of color most shut out. The demise of the news industry makes access even more important, as resource-intensive investigative and watchdog reporting, and fact-based discourse more broadly, are continuing to diminish. We’re also mindful that, for all its benefits, corporations

and the government can take advantage of technology in ways that endanger civil liberties, invade privacy and chill the exercise of First Amendment rights through data mining and intrusive surveillance (or the threat of it), particularly under expansive national security powers. Recent NSA revelations have stirred public debate about privacy and surveillance and created opportunities for potential reform of intelligence policy and oversight.

Democracy issues have been at the core of U.S. Programs' mission since its inception. Work on journalism and media policy, elections, the courts, and transparency has been expressed, over the years, through various programs, which we united in 2008 as a related set of transparency and integrity concerns (with an affiliated campaign on national security and human rights). Core civil society institutions working on these 'democracy reform' issues face two key challenges. While grantees that anchor our national work have the capacity for sophisticated research, litigation, elite advocacy and communications, they cannot mobilize the requisite state and local support. As a result, neither federal nor state reforms get the leverage they could, and sometimes fail for lack of it. A second challenge: issue advocates in other areas do not see democracy reform as fundamental to the success of their work. We therefore prioritize work that builds bridges between national groups on one hand, and state and local groups on the other, and also focus efforts on explaining, for example, why fair courts matter to immigration reformers. With respect to our elections-related work, our efforts to forge national/state links may get a boost from the promising new multi-sector "Democracy Initiative," led by civil rights groups, environmental groups and labor unions, who are deploying their own and allies' extensive memberships, as opportunities arise, to battles on voting rights, money in politics, and Congressional reform.

In our review process last year, the U.S. Programs Board reaffirmed the value of our work on journalism and media policy, open and effective government, and elections and fair courts, but pushed us to meaningfully narrow our goals and strategies. We limited journalism-related goals most dramatically and shifted some of those resources to work on media and Internet policy. Because the journalism business is undergoing a dramatic technological, economic and cultural transformation, we thought it made sense to shift our focus from addressing broader problems such as declining investigative work to supporting innovation. We have also decided to wind-down our municipal open government efforts in New Orleans. The effort had achieved its major goals of baking open government values into the work of a range of advocacy groups and into the city's political culture. Given this, and that the project demanded a great deal of OSF staff time, we decided to make this the final year of funding. We also made difficult strategy choices related to our national security campaign, as discussed below. All told, between 2012 and 2014, U.S. Programs reduced its democracy reform-related budget by 28% (excluding national security and human rights work, which was reduced by a greater amount.). In refining our strategies, we identified discrete interventions to better inform and engage the public, and developed new approaches to defending the open society institutions that ensure public voice, guarantee justice, and protect democratic practice, through both field-building and foundation-led concepts.

For example, we have taken a field approach to the media/Internet policy portfolio because we believe that successful public interest advocacy in this area requires a combination of legal, technology/engineering, and policy expertise, combined with a robust messaging and communications capacity and grassroots, netroots, and constituency engagement. We support the very small number of highly-coordinated, mutually-reinforcing, largely D.C.-based organizations that each excel in one or more critical field capacities. Together, they ensure that rules developed to govern the Internet aren't dominated by special interests, and do protect and advance free expression, privacy, shared economic opportunity, and civic participation. But these groups need a broader base, so we also support grassroots leadership and organizing on media policy to strengthen their efforts. Civil society's capacity to advocate – including with regulators – is essential to our goal of getting broadband to the over 30% of American households that do not have it. Our now enhanced focus on media and Internet policy builds on close partnerships with the few other funders in the area (the Ford Foundation and the Media Democracy Fund), and on collaborations with OSF's Media and Information Programs. We intend to support nascent work on affirmative privacy norms and protections for the digital environment. In addition, we are exploring enhanced work on whistleblower protections and protection of journalist sources and the practice of journalism, especially national security reporting.

In our elections work, our elections priorities have long been implemented by a complementary field of civil rights, good government and civic engagement organizations. Given staff and board expertise, we play a relatively significant role in the field, and intervene to focus the field in various ways, including to press forward on affirmative reforms no matter how full its defensive plate, and most recently, to prioritize the need for unified communications and messaging strategy: In 2011, after sweeping midterm election victories, state Republican legislators swiftly moved to curb voting rights, and networks of private actors began developing plans to suppress the vote in the forthcoming national elections. The field became fully absorbed in defensive fights, and couldn't pay attention to a deteriorating narrative or the long-term need for affirmative reform, which we thought were equally crucial. The extent of the attacks meant the field's capacity was already strained, and public opinion research and messaging on these issues was stale. We added Reserve Funds to previously programmed funds to develop a strategic communications campaign that changed the media narrative and influenced a string of court victories and the outcome of ballot initiatives. More recently, the field suffered a serious setback when the Supreme Court's in *Shelby County v. Holder* invalidated the most important tool to protect minority voting rights, and we've been working closely with the field to develop a response. At this time, we see the response as having three components: litigation, federal policy reform, and local mobilization and activism.

A.2. RIGHTS AND ACCESS OF RACIAL MINORITIES AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS

Issues of race are embedded in American institutions and structures of power, with social, political and economic disadvantage built into our public and private institutions. Particularly for African Americans, the legacy of slavery and decades of apartheid-like Jim Crow laws continue to have present day implications. But in 20 years, people of color will constitute the majority of young Americans, and in 30 years they will be the majority of all Americans. At the same time, the dynamics involving racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S., which have long animated U.S. Programs, are undergoing notable changes. Not only is the country on track to become a majority-minority nation in roughly three decades, but Latinos and Asian-Americans account for much of this growth and are beginning to demonstrate resonant political influence. In the 2012 presidential election (which obviously resulted in the reelection of the nation's first President of color), non-whites accounted for more than 30% of the electorate for the first time. In combination with the increase in young, gay and lesbian, and unmarried women voters, this trend suggests the possibility of a long-term electorate more interested in open society values. One consequence has been the growing challenges as historically disadvantaged groups seek influence, reflected currently in debates over access to the ballot and opportunities for citizenship. Notably, and in contrast to historic demographic shifts, racial and ethnic population growth is geographically widespread. It is and will be reshaping the economies, politics, and institutions of places throughout the country, including in suburban communities and states largely unfamiliar with the challenges of inclusion.

At the same time, the racial and ethnic disparities in access to economic, social, and political opportunity remain stark. For example, the Schott Foundation for Public Education's 2012 report on high school graduation rates of black and Latino males reveals that 52% of black males and 58% of Latino males graduate from high school in four years, compared to 78% of white, non-Latino males. The most distressed areas in our country remain deeply poor and racially concentrated. Core institutions, such as our public school and law enforcement systems, have largely failed to address these disparities, and in some instances have exacerbated them. Moreover, these challenges are deepened by growing economic inequality and policies that reinforce it.² Especially in the face of a mainstream economic narrative that posits that growth can only come at the expense of equity, there are long-term as well as short-term challenges to expanding full inclusion and ensuring that life's opportunities are not dictated by race, postal code, or the income of one's family.

In the face of these challenges, the core civil society institutions concerned with race and equality face a set of challenges, and only mixed success in responding to them. One involves, perhaps counter intuitively, the

² Key questions for the future concern whether global economic shifts have created a "new normal" of high unemployment and under-employment, a rising dependence on low-wage service employment, and increases in both automation and contingency workers.

election of an African-American president who appointed an African-American Attorney General and, more broadly, the most diverse cabinet in U.S. history. The Obama Administration has mostly been reluctant to address issues of race, presumably for political reasons, and the public narrative about the ongoing significance of race has been complicated by his success. Further, while there are important and long-standing institutions, and increasingly a new set of actors led by a new generation of leaders (many of whom are U.S. Programs grantees), they range considerably in their capacity to engage all tools necessary in the current policy environment. This is exemplified by the ups and downs of new leadership at the NAACP and Urban League, and the most recent (and dramatic) evidence that the federal courts are actively hostile to the ongoing significance of race in America. Finally, there are a set of substantive policy challenges as many of the issues critical to advance inclusion involve highly complicated issues outside traditional civil rights advocacy (such as the domestic mortgage finance system and health care reform). All told, the field is at a stage which requires the adaptation, and even rethinking, of the traditional narrative, tools, and tactics as economic disadvantage and some racial progress complicate the policy setting. Any new narrative must force decision-makers to think about the legacy of discrimination, in order to set contemporary manifestations of race and ethnicity in their proper context.

Against this backdrop, U.S. Programs, in its recent strategic review, reaffirmed its commitment to racial and ethnic inclusion – both as a core value that informs all our work and for a set of activities and initiatives specifically intended to address relevant issues. In doing so, U.S. Programs refined its approach. As set forth more fully in the attached summaries from the Equality Fund and the Campaign for Black Male Achievement, we are focusing on several distinct areas, including:

- Advancing the prospects for youth of color by challenging barriers to the key conduits to economic success (schools, employment) and changing negative perceptions, particularly of black males;
- Furthering the integration of new and undocumented immigrants into U.S. society and attacking efforts at exclusion;
- Selected efforts to address economic inequality, including targeted investments related to the federal budget fights and fair access to housing and credit systems (still under development); and
- Reasserting a human dignity frame in key areas, including a concerted set of challenges to racial profiling and the updating of the racial narrative in light of growing demographic and economic changes in the nation.

At the same time, U.S. Programs has discontinued work in several specific areas of activity, such as programs specifically dedicated to women's and LGBTQ issues and issues concerning low-wage workers.³ In other areas, U.S. Programs refocused and curtailed our commitment, such as diminishing our work related to naturalization in the immigration field. All told, we have reduced our budget related to race and equality issues by over one-third.

Pursuant to this refined strategic orientation, we continue to integrate building fields and foundation-led concepts. In the immigration arena, for example, U.S. Programs (dating back to George Soros' creation of the \$50 million Emma Lazarus fund in 1997) has invested heavily in building the immigration movement. Especially after the painful defeat of the proposal for comprehensive immigration reform in 2007(despite the support of a Republican president) and the subsequent defeat in 2010 (after health care diverted attention and political will), the multi-pronged strategy involved supporting the development of more sophisticated and multi-faceted national organizations, challenging anti-immigrant efforts at the state level through litigation and organizing, building a credible factual record regarding the economic and social benefits of immigration, and raising up significant voices such as the so-called Dreamers (undocumented children raised in the U.S.). Due to this significant field-development effort, the movement was in a position to pursue the unexpected opportunity for comprehensive immigration reform that emerged in the aftermath of powerful showings of Latinos and Asian-

³ Leaving a program area does not necessarily mean that we fully and/or forever abandon it. With respect to the work on women's rights, for example, also in the last year, our board made a large grant to Planned Parenthood.

Americans in the recent election. To help realize the opportunity, U.S. Programs is investing substantial sums from its Reserve Fund (in conjunction with the Open Society Policy Center and OSI-DC) to supplement its baseline funding of the immigration field, as well as serving as convener and helping lead the rapid response effort.

In its efforts to promote black male achievement, U.S. Programs has adopted an alternative approach. Recognizing that a contributing factor to the multi-faceted challenges faced by the black community involved the perception of young men and boys of color, U.S. Programs launched the Campaign for Black Male Achievement (CBMA) in 2008 as a foundation-led concept to challenge negative perceptions of black males, identify effective policy interventions to support them, and build momentum in philanthropy and elsewhere for targeted investments to this end. Among the most significant components of this effort has been a \$30 million partnership with New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg featuring, among other elements, a public education reform initiative in 40 city schools focused on overcoming the lack of college readiness for low-income black and Latino males. The initial three year commitment was extended in 2010, and now CBMA strategy is being refined to increase focus on getting the support of other funders and key actors, building a record of success in educational programs in four areas around the country, addressing family dynamics that contribute to the marginalization of black males, and growing the capacity of organizations that focus on improving the life outcomes of black men and boys.

Finally, we are pursuing work that combines both foundation-led concepts and field building/refinement. Over the past several years, U.S. Programs has identified the issue of school push-out -- public school use of suspension and exclusion to disproportionately penalize minority youth -- as a matter which had not been widely recognized, but where significant reform was both possible and of significant importance. U.S. Programs has invested both at the national level (successfully getting the federal government to significantly expand data collection) and at the local level where several jurisdictions, including Baltimore, have significantly reduced the inappropriate use of suspensions. In a number of cases, we have partnered with OSI-DC and its federal advocacy capacity to achieve important results. To harness the good work happening in multiple components of U.S. programs, we have developed a coordinated strategy, approved by the U.S. Programs Board in September, to prioritize comprehensive reform in six states (Colorado, Maryland, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania and Texas) and more limited but significant progress in an additional nine. These efforts will impact two-thirds of all public school students in the US.

Even as we pursue these and other selected strategies, we are refining aspects of our program that will be further developed later this year, such as the effort related to rethinking the racial narrative. We are also coordinating with other U.S. Programs efforts with equality dimensions, ranging from criminal justice reform to supporting Muslim, Arab and South Asian communities facing hostile responses related to national security.

A3. ADVANCING FAIR AND EFFECTIVE JUSTICE POLICIES

U.S. Programs began its criminal justice reform work in the mid-1990s, in the midst of an unparalleled growth in incarceration, which continued unabated for much of the next two decades, establishing the U.S. as the world's largest jailer. There is a growing understanding by policymakers and the public at large, however, that current levels of incarceration are not sustainable, that imprisonment is not always the answer, and an increased openness across the political spectrum (as evidenced by the "Right on Crime" coalition of prominent conservatives promoting reform) to consider more rational and cost-effective approaches to public safety.

Still, resistance to reform poses significant challenges. While there have been efforts to reduce or eliminate imprisonment for low-level offenses, little attention has been paid to a major source of prison growth: the substantial numbers of people serving life sentences and those required to serve high percentages of extremely long sentences for serious offenses or because of mandatory imprisonment due to prior convictions. Perhaps even more challenging, the racial and ethnic dynamics of crime and punishment in the U.S. continue to result in

disturbing disparities and sometimes interfere with rational debate. Despite the nearly universal acknowledgment of the failure of the so-called War on Drugs, insufficient attention to the development of alternative approaches to drug markets and inadequate availability of drug addiction treatment, harm reduction services and other needed health programs contribute to acceptance of the status quo of addressing these issues through the criminal justice system.

Through its more than 15 years of investment in this criminal justice field, U.S. Programs has substantially strengthened the capacity of a host of organizations pushing for reform across a broad spectrum of issues. This field includes research and policy shops that have gained credibility with decision makers and are able to engage in “inside” efforts to advance change; grassroots and grass tops advocacy organizations pursuing bolder agendas for systemic reform; and public interest law firms that provide direct legal assistance and engage in impact litigation. The range of sophistication and capacity among these organizations is uneven, however, particularly at the state level where most criminal justice policy is made. The vast majority of criminal justice reform organizations are relatively small and, given the limited philanthropic support for this field, many struggle to develop the financial base that would sustain a more robust range of activities.⁴ The strength of the field also varies widely across the U.S. with relatively strong capacity in larger states like New York, California and Texas, contrasted with limited infrastructure in the Deep South, where some of the negative impacts of criminal justice policy are most pronounced.

U.S. Programs plays a similarly important role in the drug policy reform arena. Our long-standing, substantial support for and partnership with the Drug Policy Alliance (DPA) -- a relationship originating with George Soros’ establishment of the Lindesmith Center – has been at the center of this work. We have remained the primary funder of drug policy reform, and our steady support for field leaders, including like the DPA and the Harm Reduction Coalition, has been critical to the ability of advocates to advance their work. This field, even more than criminal justice reform, is largely made up of small, under-resourced organizations. The Campaign for a New Drug Policy, which the U.S. Programs Board authorized in 2010, has sought to expand and strengthen the field through support of a diverse array of voices and initiatives for non-punitive approaches to drug use and misuse.

These fields have, not surprisingly, had mixed success. Current efforts to identify ways to reduce corrections spending and to redirect the savings into other systems, best known as a “justice reinvestment” framework, have been successful in stemming the growth in incarceration and the costs associated with it. However, the approach has been critiqued by some advocates for not focusing on reducing prison populations, and because in many instances the savings have been ploughed back into law enforcement and supervision enhancements – fiscal choices that undercut reform efforts and that do little to strengthen the communities most adversely impacted by high rates of imprisonment.

U.S. Programs has engaged in a blended foundation-led concept/field building approach in our efforts to abolish the death penalty. Together with funder partners and in collaboration with field leaders, in 2008 we created Funders for Alternatives to the Death Penalty, through which we support the Campaign to Abolish the Death Penalty by 2025. The campaign brought litigators, grassroots advocates, and policy, research, and communications experts together to coordinate the campaign through a steering committee that works closely with the funders to make targeted, strategic investments designed to decrease the number of executions and new death sentences in heavy use states, and promoting reform or repeal in other states. This coordinated approach has had promising success to date; the death penalty has been abolished in New Mexico (2009), Illinois (2011), Connecticut (2012) and, most recently, in Maryland (2013), and executions and new sentences are down nationally. There are still parts of the country in which reform is a challenge, particularly the south, and the ultimate goal of having the Supreme Court rule capital punishment unconstitutional based on sufficiently declining use

⁴ While we have also helped to attract other funders to the field, the numbers remain small, and OSF continues to be a leader in the total amount of support provided to criminal justice reform issues. The Ford Foundation and Public Welfare Foundation also fund reform efforts nationally, the Pew Charitable Trusts devotes substantial resources to reform activities, through both direct operations and grant support to other organizations, and the relatively new John and Laura Arnold Foundation plans to work nationally, with an initial focus on “front-end” systems improvement. The MacArthur Foundation has traditionally focused on the juvenile justice system but is exploring expanding its work to focus on mass incarceration through the adult system. Annie E. Casey Foundation is a leading national funder of juvenile justice system reform efforts as well.

across the country is still an elusive one.

In the drug policy arena, our support for the field has contributed to public opinion at an all-time high supporting treatment instead of incarceration for drug offenses.. This past fall voters chose to legalize marijuana in Colorado and Washington State. (Ironically, however, in some cities in the U.S. arrests for possession of small amounts of marijuana, particularly of black and Latino youth, remain disturbingly high). The Affordable Care Act, which makes health care available to millions of uninsured Americans, presents the opportunity for individuals leaving jails and prison to have access to adequate health services as they transition back into their communities, and the law's requirement for inclusion of substance abuse treatment as part of mandated services presents the opportunity to address substance abuse issues entirely outside of the justice system.

It is within this context that the U.S. Programs board reviewed and refined our criminal justice strategies and priorities.⁵ The board reaffirmed its commitment to our leadership role in this space, and determined that the political and financial climate in the country presented an opportunity to make substantial headway on our goal of reducing mass incarceration if we devoted substantial resources to targeted strategies. At the same time, the board recognized that U.S. Programs plays a critical leadership role in efforts to challenge harsh punishment practices from which we should not retreat, and that we had invested in campaign work on the death penalty and to address abusive police practices in New York City that were bearing fruit. It also acknowledged the significant opportunity national health care reform presented for our goal of a radically different response to drug use and misuse.

With this broad framework, and in light of reductions in the criminal justice budget of 20% and the drug policy budget of 30%, U.S. Programs has focused and refined the priorities to which it will devote particular attention in the justice arena. As set forth more fully in the attached charts from the Justice Fund and the Campaign for a New Drug Policy (subject to strategic review later this year), we will focus on several distinct areas, including:

- Targeted efforts to substantially reduce the levels of incarceration in the U.S.;
- Challenging extreme punishment practices, including efforts to abolish the death penalty and the prosecution, sentencing and incarceration of children as adults; and
- Promoting alternative drug policy and practice.

To bring more focus to our work, we have shifted approximately 60% of our criminal justice resources to efforts to reduce incarceration, and will use the majority of our drug policy funds (beyond core support for the Drug Policy Alliance) to advance implementation of health care reform to meet the needs of drug users, and support community-level efforts to establish operating systems of non-punitive drug policy. We have also identified a number of areas in which we will discontinue efforts or shift focus. These include ending our work to promote “green jobs” and service opportunities for people with prior justice system involvement and support for in-prison higher education programming. (We will continue support for policy change in this area.)

In our efforts to challenge mass incarceration, we will maximize our continued support for the field of national and state-based nonprofits by developing better coordinated and targeted efforts in three to five states (including the work of OSI-Baltimore in Maryland) and the federal system.

At the same time, we are pursuing a foundation-led concept that U.S. Programs conceived in partnership with other funders: the creation of a new entity to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by a federal court order mandating prison reduction and a state fiscal crisis. While California has a number of criminal justice reform organizations, some of them quite strong, they collectively lack the breadth of relationships and orientation to move the agenda. The reforms the campaign seeks are not new, but the approach we are spearheading is.

Pending a full review of its strategies later this year, the Campaign for a New Drug Policy will seek to integrate the activities of the health and justice fields it supports to focus on targeted state and local efforts to establish health-centered, non-punitive drug policy. We will support projects that engage state and local health care stake-

⁵ The board did not engage in a full review of our drug policy strategies. Those strategies are still being refined and will be presented for board review later this year.

holders, as implementation of the Affordable Care Act continues to shift from the federal level to the states, and seek to align private, government and community interests around a reform agenda.

B. NEW FEATURES OF U.S. PROGRAMS: ANCHORS, PLACES, AND OPPORTUNITIES

As a consequence of the strategic review, U.S. Programs not only refined aspects of its substantive focus but also how it is structured and goes about its work. As an initial matter, we recognized that U.S. Programs has a qualitatively different interest in, and relationship with, a number of long-term, high-impact grantees who occupy key spots in fields of significant interest. Given this reality, we created a new designation of “anchor” grantee and created a new component, the Special Initiatives and Partnerships Unit, to lead our engagement with them. While still in the early stages of implementation, we envision that this new orientation to significant non-profit organizations will promote new grant-making and evaluation dynamics and a refined partnership with them. To date, we have designated 10 organizations as anchor grantees.⁶ Anticipating that these institutions will also play significant roles in helping us identify opportunities and also engage in long-term thinking about core open society issues, this new unit is also expected to take a role in developing relationships with leading institutions that may not appropriately become grantees (e.g., national labor unions). It will also vet and at times pursue short-term advocacy priorities that do not fit elsewhere within U.S. Programs.

Similarly, we decided to develop a new strategy to build on our commitment to local places and our belief that core open society issues require a locally informed and led civic capacity. While U.S. Programs has always made investments in specific places as part of national initiatives, such as our multi-year effort to expand transparency in New Orleans given the problematic investment of funds in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, it has also pursued a more dedicated place-based strategy through our field office in Baltimore. For over 15 years, OSI-Baltimore has served as a social justice laboratory. With the strong support of a local board, a leadership council, and diverse funders,⁷ it has served as an interesting model on how to build local credibility and connect city to statewide policy change, as discussed in more detail below. Drawing on this experience but as also informed by other philanthropic and public-sector-led efforts, U.S. Programs has launched a new undertaking called the Open Places Initiative which will provide three to five cities or regions up to \$1 million a year for three to ten years to develop sophisticated local capacity to pursue open society issues. In April 2013, U.S. Programs awarded eight places \$100,000 each in planning funds to develop proposals for the final selection.

Finally, in recognition of the long-standing interest in being able to move nimbly in response to unanticipated opportunities, U.S. Programs adopted a new mechanism: the Reserve Fund. Accounting for 20% of our 2013 budget, the Reserve Fund can be accessed quickly, and is intended to allow board or staff to raise issues that were not anticipated during the budget process. Already, it has permitted us to respond aggressively to potentially adverse voting rights consequences of several cases before the United States Supreme Court as well as engage deeply in immigration reform (as discussed in III.A.2). Its utility has been expanded by a newly developed means for U.S. Programs to work more closely with OSI-D.C. and the Open Society Policy Center on efforts that involve legislative elements.

C. OPERATIONAL APPROACHES

C1. TOOLS

Given the relative strength of civil society in the United States we pursue our work largely through our grantee partners. We have also integrated the use of other tools and plan to do so more frequently in future. We already

⁶ We are also examining whether this approach may be helpful to inform how we engage with other institutions in a given field which we view as critical but that do not have the multi-faceted capacity and track record of our anchor partners.

⁷ While U.S. Programs remains its largest source of support, OSI-Baltimore has increasingly been raising funds from local and in some instances national funders for both core and project support. More than one-third of its funds come from other donors, some of which make multi-year pledges. Special events designed to cultivate prospective donors – to raise \$2.2 million annually – aid in advancing the office’s mission and goals

make robust use of fellowships to individuals, because we value the flexibility such grants offer in pursuing new ideas, tapping the entrepreneurial spirit in communities of concern to us, and supporting the development of new and emerging leaders through which we help build and sustain fields of work. Our active fellowship programs are:

- The Soros Justice Fellowships, which seek to support innovative projects, promote new ideas and approaches, and seed and sustain leadership in the criminal justice field;
- The Baltimore Community Fellowships, which identify new talent to become change agents across a range of social justice issues and sustain a network of individuals committed to using their collective tools and resources to catalyze change in Baltimore's underserved communities; and
- The Black Male Achievement Fellowships, which target social entrepreneurs who launch new and innovative organizations in the field.

While we have chosen not to pursue litigation in our own name given the strong base of non-profit legal organizations in the U.S., we support court-based advocacy through grant-making in virtually all of our priority areas. Our grantees lead litigation on some of the most important open society issues in the U.S. today, such as the NAACP Legal Defense Fund's defense of the Voting Rights Act, the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund and Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights' challenge to National Voter Registration Act and the Center on Constitutional Rights' focus on racial profiling, and national security.

Further, we have explored multi-faceted place-based approaches in the OSI-Baltimore initiative. It is a geographically focused, multi-faceted effort to reform policies that are perpetuating discrimination and preventing residents from participating fully in the civic, economic and social life of the region. In addition to administering its Community Fellowships Program to bring new ideas and energy to Baltimore's underserved communities, OSI-Baltimore currently focuses on three inter-related areas: Education/Youth Development; Drug Addiction Treatment; and Criminal/Juvenile Justice. The four programs work closely together, sharing information and expertise. While a significant portion of the work relates to state policy, the office looks to the Baltimore community to identify needs, demonstrate effective approaches and measure impact, given the city's demographics and importance to the state. As a typical big city with high poverty and inequity, successful approaches in Baltimore are noted in other cities.

The office has a steady presence and an activist, inclusive approach. Only half of staff time is spent on grant-making. From the outset, the office has worked closely with key public agencies in order to bring promising initiatives to scale and to reform key policies and practices. In addition to technical assistance to government in the fields of education and drug addiction treatment, (including to its staff serving on various public committees), OSI-Baltimore conducts advocacy (including through multi-platform communications, office-based forums, a public Talking About Race series, and a Leadership Council), awards grants (including demonstration projects to refine practice and show cost-effective impact as well as advocacy, litigation, research, and mobilization), and makes Program-Related Investments.

We have also made strategic use of program-related investments in our Baltimore field office, which is currently conducting due diligence for a proposed loan guarantee for clinics that would allow low and moderate-income individuals to secure health insurance, taking advantage of the Affordable Care Act. We are examining how we might expand the use of program related investments in some other areas.

In what is U.S. Programs' single largest grant, the Campaign for Black Male Achievement made a \$30 million direct grant to New York City for, *inter alia*, an initiative to reform public education in 40 city schools focused on overcoming the lack of college readiness for low-income black and Latino males.

In addition, we have begun to intentionally explore and expand the ways we've invested in advocacy. We are specifically engaging more directly with government leaders, at the national level in partnership with OSI-D.C.

C2. PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIONS

In pursuing our goals and objectives, U.S. Programs engages in a number of partnerships and collaborations, both with funders and with other external allies. Given our role as one of the largest foundations working domestically in the United States, and one which actively advances our own strategies, we frequently take the lead on an issue, including recruiting and organizing donor partners. We have a number of significant philanthropic partners with which we collaborate, such as Atlantic Philanthropies, the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. We partner closely with them on priority areas such as immigration reform, improvement of the criminal justice system, and elections systems reform.

Beyond work with other foundations, we engage in strategic partnerships with an array of other players. For example, OSI-Baltimore works with governmental entities such as the Maryland health and public safety departments to advance its access to addiction treatment and criminal justice reform work, respectively; the Equality Fund works with national unions SEIU and the AFL-CIO to advance the immigration reform agenda; and the Campaign for Black Male Achievement engages with the White House Fatherhood Initiative around its shared goal of promoting activities to strengthen families. Given the assets of our founder, we also have access to organized donors through the Democracy Alliance and Committee on States, whose partners from business, politics, and philanthropy collectively provide millions of dollars in support of causes consistent with our goals.

While we have engaged in collaborations across the OSF network, we're beginning to take a more intentional approach to it. Our work with OSI-D.C. is growing, and today embraces shared priorities that notably include criminal justice, immigration, voting and national security. We've had long-time connections with the Foundation's international work in some areas such as harm reduction and information policy, but are beginning to now also leverage other links. They include more closely connecting our National Security & Human Rights work on transparency, accountability, the rule of law, and human rights issues, with the **Justice Initiative's** Counterterrorism & Human Rights and Freedom of Information & Expression projects, as well as with the **Regional Policy Initiative for Afghanistan & Pakistan**. We are also examining links between our National Security & Human Rights work on civil rights and equality and the work of the **Fund to Counter Xenophobia, At Home in Europe Program** and the **Human Rights Initiative**.

C3. SHARED FRAMEWORKS

U.S. Programs sees great value in working more effectively with colleagues from other thematic and geographic programs to pursue shared goals, address common hurdles, or to confront challenges not contained within the increasingly porous borders within which USP works. We are currently discussing the development of several Shared Frameworks, including but not limited to the following:

Corporate secrecy: Given U.S. Programs' work on transparency and on the role of private interests, we are jointly exploring the idea of a potential shared framework around a campaign to end tax havens by 2017, or an alternate, narrower framework on the globalization of U.S. mandatory extractive revenue policy.

Public Discourse in the Era of Big Data: U.S. Programs and the Information Program recognize that: 1) digital platforms, services and devices mediate human relationships of all kinds including the relationship between citizens and government, and that they are shaped, owned and operated by private companies; and 2) the rise of "big data" means that civic discourse can be invisibly manipulated through the massive harvesting of digital public data and increasingly sophisticated algorithmic tools. We are working to develop a cross-cutting strategy that addresses the open society consequences of these developments.

International dimensions of U.S. policy on targeted killings: Given our work on U.S. targeted killings policy, we are actively engaged in discussions with the Regional Policy Initiative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, OSI-DC, and the Justice Initiative to explore the idea of a shared framework to address targeted killings and/or the use of drones, with an eye toward achieving international agreement about standards and policy.

Elections: Given our work on voting rights, elections systems reforms, and the undue influence of money in politics, we participated in discussion of the Foundation’s elections-related activities and contributed to a memo documenting these activities and recommending next steps in the area. Some in the group are interested in emulating the “Situation Room” model pioneered in Africa; U.S. Programs is sharing with this subgroup its experience supporting Election Protection, a multi-faceted structure to monitor U.S. elections.

Drug Policy: U.S. Programs’ history of supporting drug policy reform and related work with OSF’s Global Drug Policy, International Harm Reduction Development and Latin America programs, and past co-funding with the Youth Initiative, provide a strong foundation for deeper collaboration. Specifically, U.S. programs could play an important role in marshaling and resourcing efforts to remove international barriers to reform, such as constraining multilateral treaties, which are now being used in efforts to suppress American marijuana law reform and similar reforms in other countries.

IV. New Capacities to Enhance Our Impact & Outstanding Organizational Issues

As noted above (in Section IIIB), U.S. Programs used our strategy review to refine our approach in several ways: (1) creating a new unit focused on what we call “anchor” grantees, and enhancing our capacity to engage in short-term campaigns, (2) expanding our local work through the newly launched Open Places Initiative, and (3) promoting opportunistic activities with a significant Reserve Fund. Collectively, these represent a commitment to maximize the impact of our work and our ability to flexibly respond to opportunities.

In conjunction with these efforts, we are also implementing a set of steps to promote more effective idea generation for both board and staff, and generally focus on more systematically promoting learning and innovation by our staff. Under the umbrella of the **Open Society Ideas and Learning** initiative, we are beginning with three components:

- Identifying and investigating important ideas or concepts that do not necessarily fall within our main program areas but which raise fundamental open society concerns and which may offer value to not only us but to our grantees and other partners. The first such effort, “the Project on Work,” was identified by the U.S. Programs Board-Staff Working Group on Economic Equity in 2012. Even in “good times,” many of the most marginalized communities in the U.S. live in a recession-style economy with too few accessible and living-wage-paying jobs for all who seek them. Futurists tell us that continued technological change will fundamentally reshape the labor market, with significant impacts for marginalized communities, the role of government, and the nature of commerce. Over the next 18 months, the project will explore the nature of employment 20 or 25 years from now. A joint board-staff team will engage a set of experts from various fields to help shape research, discussion, deliberation and dialogues about what lies ahead and what potential open society responses could look like.
- Initiating a program to bring in for short durations outside experts to challenge and develop our internal thinking, especially contrarians who may be approaching open society issues from a different perspective;
- A dedicated approach to improving grant-making skills and focusing upon shared learning within U.S. Programs and in conjunction with the OSF-wide efforts in this regard. U.S. Programs’ Grantmaking Operations Unit has been leading this effort to expand our focus on how to not only improve our work but ensure lessons are learned and transmitted.

Beyond this initiative, we also plan to revisit the interim structure that we adopted in January 2013, particularly with regard to the so-called “campaigns” that reside within U.S. Programs. At this time, there are three such efforts: the Campaign for a New Drug Policy, the Campaign for Black Male Achievement, and the National Security and Human Rights Campaign. Each continues important work beyond the time-limited set of activities envisioned when they were created, leading to the question of how to reflect this work within broader U.S. Programs efforts. In determining what to do, we’re considering: (1) how the campaigns relate more or less to

the three U.S. Programs core funds (Democracy, Equality and Justice); (2) their substantial differences in in size and scope; and (3) their respective stages of development.

V. Appendix

In the charts that follow, we detail for each of our substantive focus areas the fields we will support, the foundation-led concepts we will pursue and the shared frameworks we are considering to further our aims and objectives. We provide descriptions of activities for our new initiatives as well.

We have noted in these charts representative key grantees whom we trust within the various fields we support, as well as other key partners with whom we collaborate, including other funders and, where appropriate, other entities within the foundation network. In our identification of foundation-led concepts, we have sought to describe activities in which we have played or will play a significant role in defining what is important and identifying a capacity, strategy or orientation that is new or at least does not exist in the form we think it should.

We are often doing this in partnership with other funders, and with significant involvement of key grantees, and have noted that where appropriate. Last, it is our view that some investments in which we have been involved over time may have begun as foundation-led concepts but have evolved into field investments as well. We have sought to indicate in our charts those objectives we are pursuing through the use of both support of fields and foundation-led concepts.

We are in preliminary discussions with colleagues within the foundation network about a number of promising possibilities for shared frameworks. The charts reflect some of those ideas, which are in various stages of development.

We have provided charts for:

Democracy Fund.....17

National Security and Human Rights Campaign.....19

Justice Fund.....20

Campaign for a New Drug Policy.....21

Equality Fund.....22

Campaign for Black Male Achievement.....23

Special Initiatives and Partnerships Unit.....24

OSI-Baltimore.....26

Open Places Initiative.....29

The Democracy Fund: Reflecting refinements of long-standing U.S. Program commitments to furthering vibrant democratic practice in the United States, the Democracy Fund has refocused its attention on certain threats to contemporary American democracy: the manner in which technology both enhances and potentially compromises access to public information and has transformed media and civic information; the rising influence of money in politics; the threats to voting rights amid other challenges to effective and equitable election systems; and the growing ideological divide that has engulfed the courts as well as the other branches of government. The Democracy Fund engages in grant-making both with our anchor partners and in distinct sub-fields, and also works directly to influence policy at the federal and local level with OSI-DC and in other forms. The Democracy Fund houses USP's national security and human rights work, which similarly promotes transparency, the rule of law, and the effective and accountable application of governmental power.

	A. Informed and Engaged Public	B. Responsive and Effective Government	C. Political Equality
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieve universal access to an open Internet. Governance of digital environment advances free expression, privacy, shared economic opportunity, and civic participation. Advance innovation and new models in journalism and broader media to provide accessible, sustainable news and civic information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve federal and local transparency policy and practice, including through engaged and informed communities. Restore role of courts in promoting rule of law and defending constitutional rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the power of money to distort democratic debate and participation Ensure impartial and diverse state courts Ensure full and equitable participation in public decision making, including the electoral process.
Faith to Fields/Places	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support and expand field of organizations working on range of media, information, and technology policy issues, including better engagement of civil society groups with equity orientation and support for nascent work on affirmative privacy norms and protections for the digital environment, with more emphasis on coordination with NSHR in light of recent revelations about NSA surveillance. Also In light of NSA surveillance, we are exploring enhanced work on whistleblower protections and protection of journalist sources and the practice of journalism, especially national security reporting. Key Partners: Ford Foundation, Media Democracy Fund. Key Grantees: Free Press, New America Foundation's Open Technology Institute, Public Knowledge, Ctr for Media Justice; Knight Foundation and Committee to Protect Journalists Expand, scale and protect public broadband development as alternative internet access mechanism with broad public participation potential in light of growing municipal interest and as means to curb excesses of private influence over Internet access exercised by handful of companies with enormous political and economic power. Key Partners: Omidyar Network, Ford Foundation <i>Identify sustainable, scalable models for investigative reporting, and to measure social and economic impact of investigative journalism.</i> Key Grantees: NPR, Ctr for Investigative Reporting, Investigative News Network, MIT Ctr for Civic Media. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure strength and coordination of federal and local transparency field by increasing strategic communications capacity and enhancing advocacy on national security-related transparency while winding down our support for municipal transparency work in New Orleans. Key Partners: Bauman Foundation; Open Gov. Partnership. Key Grantees: Project on Gov. Oversight, Center for Effective Gov., Gov. Accountability Project, New Orleans Coalition on Open Governance Develop sustainable state-level capacity of civil society groups to advocate for state judicial reforms and judicial diversity in coordination with national organizations. Key Grantees: Justice at Stake, Lambda Legal; Key partners: Piper Fund, Wellspring Advisors 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Foster greater collaboration of national and state groups; ensure field's response to Shelby is strategic and coordinated; and facilitate field's use of streamlined strategic communications to keep narrative robust; focus field on affirmative voting reforms. Key Partners: Ford, Carnegie, Omidyar Network, Hewlett Foundation. Key Grantees: Brennan Center, Advancement Project, Demos, Lawyers' Committee, NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund Through idea generation, communications and advocacy, augment support for federal courts that enforce rights and defend democratic processes; effectively link national organizations working on this with state and local-level networks funded by OSF. Key Grantees: American Constitution Society, Constitutional Accountability Center; Center for American Progress, Infinity Project. <i>Key partner: HJW Foundation</i>

	A. Informed and Engaged Public	B. Responsive and Effective Government	C. Political Equality
Foundation-Led Concepts			<p>3. Given how Supreme Court doctrine has constrained the ability to limit the influence of money in politics, develop a multi-year campaign through collective enterprise of leading legal and political entities to build alternative approach that allows for limits on unfettered private money, supports publicly financed elections requires meaningful transparency and accountability in electoral systems.</p> <p>Key Partners: <i>Fund for the Republic</i> Key Grantees: <i>Brennan Center, Campaign Legal Center, Demos.</i></p>
Shared Frameworks	<p>3. “Big Data” and the Future of Open Society: USP is working with the Information Program and others to explore the potential value of a shared framework that stems from the common recognition that: 1) digital platforms, services and devices mediate human relationships including that of citizens to government, and that they are shaped, owned and operated by private companies; and 2) the rise of “big data” means that civic discourse can be invisibly manipulated through the massive harvesting of digital public data and increasingly sophisticated algorithmic tools.</p>		<p>4. Elections: We are exploring with an OSF-wide cohort the potential value of a multi-country undertaking to set forth and attempt to influence core principles in sound election practice, including influence of national and international norms.</p>
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telecoms have the technical means and the financial incentives to interfere with information flow, and are a formidable and aggressive lobbying force. Nineteen states have passed laws restricting municipalities from creating publicly funded broadband networks; additional legislation is in the pipeline. Limited local funding for watchdog journalism; low-income communities risk becoming news deserts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of constituency nationally for government transparency. Resistance to openness on national security-related matters. Capacity gaps of organizations tackling transparency at municipal level and persistent racial tensions. Difficulty of conveying significance of the role courts play to issue-based organizations and to the broader public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing excessive money in politics is a multi-front, long-term effort with well-financed elements resistant to change Failure to win state judicial selection battles could stall or reverse momentum Development of nationwide, coordinated, multi-front strategy, and identification of adequate resources, to respond to Shelby decision; partisan battles to limit voting continue, with 82 restrictive bills already introduced in 31 states in 2013 (and 9 have passed in 8 states), spurred in part because of widespread but unsupported belief in voter fraud.

National Security and Human Rights Campaign: OSF launched this effort in advance of 2008 presidential elections that presented an opening to disrupt the prior years' dramatic shift away from the rule of law and respect for human rights in the name of U.S. national security. Conceived in partnership with Atlantic Philanthropies, the Campaign supported a field newly coming together at the intersection of work in national security, human rights and civil liberties, international law, digital privacy, and transparency and accountability. The 2014-17 strategy takes advantage of a new political moment with heightened opportunities. Our mission is to promote respect for human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law in U.S. counterterrorism efforts. Our principal tool is grantmaking, but we also commission research, foster policy and strategy development through convenings, and work closely with OSI-DC and other parts of the Foundations to achieve our goals.

	A. Promote Rule of Law and Human Rights	B. Strengthen Civil Rights and Equality
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attain official acknowledgment of past rights violations in connection with counterterrorism measures and prevent repetition through reforms Improve adherence to international (and constitutional) legal standards with respect to counterterrorism policies Ensure counterterrorism policies and standards for their application are transparent and subject to effective oversight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce unjust profiling of Muslims, Arabs, Middle Easterners, and South Asians by law enforcement and decrease national-security driven xenophobia against these communities Protect civil liberties against overbroad surveillance, massive collection and use of data
Faith to Fields/Places	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support human rights, accountability, and civil liberties organizations' specialized capacity on national security and counterterrorism litigation, advocacy, research, dialogue, and policy development. Support the national security/counterterrorism field and related messaging to incorporate human rights and rule of law analysis, inform advocacy, and promote smart national security policy Support efforts to organize nationally and at the grassroots to reject torture, overcome a war framework, and promote rule of law in U.S. counterterrorism efforts Key Partners: OSI-DC, Justice Initiative, Atlantic Philanthropies (to 2015), Oak Foundation, academics, and former government officials Key Grantees: American Civil Liberties Union and Brennan Center for Justice (USP anchor grantees); National Security Archive and Human Rights First (USP core grantees); Center for Constitutional Rights, Center for Victims of Torture, The Constitution Project, Center for National Security Studies, National Security Network, National Religious Campaign Against Torture; Human Rights Watch (grantee of Human Rights Initiative); 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen defense of civil liberties, communications, and the proactive capacity of Arab, Middle Eastern, Muslim, and South Asian American organizations; strengthen connections to longstanding civil rights organizations Support the capacity of religious sector allies to confront anti-Muslim bias Rein in overbroad surveillance through advocacy, litigation, and technical assistance, with support for policy development, PATRIOT Act and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act reforms, and global efforts to limit collection and use of data without a basis in suspicion. Key Partners: Equality Fund, Atlantic Philanthropies, Oak Foundation Key Grantees: Brennan Center for Justice and ACLU (anchors); Proteus Fund, AAJC/Asian Law Caucus, National Network of Arab American Communities, Sikh Coalition, Muslim Advocates, Rights Working Group, Electronic Frontier Foundation, Center for Democracy and Technology, The Constitution Project
Foundation-Led Concepts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a shared framework on drones to regulate lethal attacks by the U.S. and other countries. Key Partners: Human Rights First, American Civil Liberties Union, Center for National Security Studies, former government officials and academics, OSI-DC, Justice Initiative, others to be developed Potential Key Grantees: to be developed but could include Columbia Human Rights Institute; 	
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner Atlantic Philanthropies exits this field in 2015, leaving OSF as the primary U.S. funder in this area Public support on these issues is limited, so advocates have had difficulty expanding their constituency Complexity of law and facts divides advocates; political polarization on the issues and fore-closed litigation limit solutions largely to the Executive branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner Atlantic Philanthropies exits in 2015 Ramped up border enforcement is likely to have a disproportionate impact on Arab, Middle Eastern, Muslim, and South Asian individuals in or entering the U.S. Relatively young sub-field with strong grassroots constituencies but still somewhat disconnected from longstanding civil rights groups

*Note that for budgeting purposes, work on shared framework projects still in development is represented here as foundation-led concepts.

The Justice Fund: For more than 15 years, U.S. Programs has sought to address the excesses of America's criminal justice system: its overuse of incarceration, its extensive use of extreme punishment and the racial and class disparities found throughout the criminal justice continuum. In large part through our support, the criminal justice reform field now encompasses a diverse array of players, working nationally, at the state level, and locally to foster systemic reform through research and policy analysis, grassroots and grass tops advocacy, and direct legal assistance and impact litigation. In addition to support for these organizations, the Justice Fund strengthens the field through the strategic use of fellowships to implement innovative projects, seed and sustain leadership, and pursue new ideas and approaches. The Campaign for a New Drug Policy, housed within the Fund, seeks to promote a health-based approach to drug use and drug markets to reduce the use of punitive practices that contribute to excessive justice system involvement.

	A. Reduce Mass Incarceration	B. Challenge Extreme Punishment	C. Promote Justice System Accountability
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Prison and Jail Populations (by 50% in 10 years) Eliminate collateral consequences of convictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abolish the death penalty. End harsh treatment of youth in the justice system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote effective police accountability practices. Improve public defense services (portfolio under review).
Faith to Fields/Places	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support field of national organizations working on range of criminal justice reform issues, identify gaps in capacity and strategic relationships, better integrate resources of Anchor grantees. Key Grantees: <i>Sentencing Project, Council of State Governments, American Civil Liberties Union, Brennan Center, Texas Criminal Justice Coalition, National Employment Law Project</i> Build on current limited capacity of state-based organizations in target jurisdictions to engage in multifaceted policy advocacy and reform activities Key Partners: <i>Ford Foundation, Public Welfare Foundation, OSI-DC</i> Key Grantees: <i>Texas Criminal Justice Coalition; Justice Strategies</i> With field leaders and the Ford Foundation, develop, support and launch coordinated national campaign to reduce incarceration (under exploration). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sustain litigation, research and advocacy capacity of key death penalty organization working nationally and in high use states to reduce use of capital punishment and support repeal efforts Key Partners: <i>Atlantic Philanthropies, Proteus Fund</i> Key Grantees: <i>Southern Center for Human Rights, Equal Justice Initiative of Alabama, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty Equal Justice USA</i> Support capacity of national organizations to provide technical assistance to field, and strengthen communications and organizing capacity of state and local grassroots advocates challenging prosecution and sentencing of children as adults Key Partners: <i>Ford Foundation, Public Welfare Foundation</i> Key Grantees: <i>Campaign for Youth Justice, Juvenile Law Center, Equal Justice Initiative</i> Strengthen communication between and coordination disparate state based litigation and policy advocacy efforts challenging sexual offender registration of children. Key Grantees: <i>American Civil Liberties Union, Juvenile Law Center</i> Engage experts in developing alternative systems of accountability for youth in conflict with the law (in development). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Explore development of new strategic approaches within the public defense field to promote system improvement (in development). Key Partners: <i>Ford Foundation</i> Key Grantees: <i>National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, American Civil Liberties Union, National Legal Aid and Defender Association, Brennan Center, Southern Center for Human Rights</i> Expand field support for police accountability work (in development).
Foundation-Led Concepts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain support for campaign to reduce incarceration in California launched by OSF in 2012 with funder partners to take advantage of opportunity presented by fiscal and political opportunity and to fill an identified gap in the advocacy field Key Partners: <i>Ford Foundation, Rosenberg Foundation, California Endowment, California Probation Officers Assn., San Francisco DA</i> Key Grantees: <i>Californians for Safety and Justice</i> Use ACA implementation to expand Medicaid coverage for the incarcerated by promoting enrollment of jail and prison populations so that they will have access healthcare services upon release Key Partners: <i>Public Welfare Foundation, California Endowment, U.S. DOJ</i> 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Continued support of New York City campaign to end discriminatory policing launched by OSF in partnership with Atlantic Philanthropies to coordinate previously fragmented reform activities and support stronger engagement of community-based advocacy groups Key Partners: <i>The Atlantic Philanthropies, NY City Council Progressive Caucus, National Action Network, Justice Initiative</i> Key Grantees: <i>Communities United for Police Reform; Center for Constitutional Rights, NYCLU, Make the Road NY</i>
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing resistance to prison population reduction efforts as growth of correctional costs is contained Continued public support for excessive sentences for serious and violent crimes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of lead death penalty funder with the closing of Atlantic Philanthropies in 2016, growing tension among field leaders Harsh legislative response in a number of states to court rulings invalidating life without parole sentences imposed on children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong resistance from and public support of NYPD; implementation challenges related to recent Federal Court ruling and City Council legislation State cutbacks to funding for public defense

The Campaign for a New Drug Policy (CNDP) is a continuation of OSF's two-decade commitment to ending punitive drug policies and collateral harms that disproportionately affect racial minorities and poor people. CNDP was initiated by U.S. Programs in November of 2010 to advanced drug policy that is evidenced-based and effective, prioritizes individual and community health, preserves civil rights and addresses human and community needs. In addition to strategically focused grantmaking, CNDP applies its on-staff legal, medical, public health and drug policy advocacy expertise to engage directly as issue experts and advocates for reform. An ongoing challenge for CNDP will be the effort to promote a stable and effective field with adequate diversity of viewpoint and strategic vision, while fulfilling its role as the conduit for major OSF funding to the Drug Policy Alliance.

Transforming the Dominant Paradigm of American Drug Policy	
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Campaign for a New Drug Policy supports efforts to end America's "War on Drugs" and to establish a new approach that (a) directly addresses the causes of drug related harm, (b) promotes health and social stability, and (c) ensures public safety and equal justice. The Campaign strives to fill gaps in advocacy to eliminate persistent barriers to reform and promote the work of the most necessary and effective actors in the drug policy reform and drug user health communities.
Faithful to Fields/Places	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support Leadership in the Field: Support effective advocacy that advances public understanding of the costs of current drug policies and strengthens the field through the inclusion of leaders representing directly affected and involved communities, including racial minorities, law enforcement, active drug users and those in recovery, young people and other key stakeholders. Key Partners: Riverstyx and Libra foundations, individual funders, OSF programs. Key Grantees: Drug Policy Alliance (DPA), Law Enforcement Against Prohibition (LEAP), Harm Reduction Coalition (HRC), Students for Sensible Drug Policy (SSDP), and others. Support Non punitive Responses to Drug Related Harm – Support development and proliferation of programs – initially at the local community level – that effectively respond to public concerns about the safety, order and health risks posed by drug use and drug markets. This work will establish, normalize and create a constituency for non punitive policy alternatives to the War on Drugs by developing “products” that meet public demand and provide relevant and appropriate solutions that are accountable to the communities in which they are adopted. Key Partners: Ford, Riverstyx and Libra foundations; local law enforcement; treatment and harm reduction providers; business community; national drug policy reform advocacy groups. Key Grantees: Racial Disparity Project, Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities, Community Renewal Society, and other locally based organizations.
Foundation-Led Concepts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of National Health Care Reform to Establish a New Drug Policy – Advance the development of an integrated and comprehensive infrastructure for a health centered drug policy through focused implementation of the Affordable Care Act and exploitation of emerging trends in health care to address both the needs of individual drug users and of affected communities. Key Partners: Public Welfare Foundation, private insurers, government, community foundations, medical professional associations, federally qualified health centers. Key Grantees: Key state level advocates, Community Catalyst, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Legal Action Center, Faces and Voices of Recovery, National Advocates for Pregnant Women (NAPW) and others.
Shared Frameworks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary exploration of shared frameworks with thematic and geographic programs involving (a) American NGO's active engagement in international drug policymaking forums (e.g., 2016 United Nations General Assembly Special Session); (b) prevention of U.S. invention in foreign drug policymaking; (c) support nations considering non punitive and health-centered alternatives; and (d) OSF cross-program cooperation regarding American domestic reform to limit U.S. promotion of global drug war.
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate charitable funding and escalation of counterproductive competition among potential grantees for limited foundation resources. Federal modification and/or state-level rejection of key provisions of the Affordable Care Act and lack of broadly accepted health-based definition of quality comprehensive care for people who use substances. Opposition by influential interests benefited by the status quo (e.g., the private prison industry and organized law enforcement).

Equality Fund: The Equality Fund addresses a range of barriers to access and opportunity faced by marginalized people in the U.S. Its work is motivated by three main factors: the persistent effects of the United States' history of racial inequality; the direct challenges to inclusion and economic opportunity in light of demographic shifts; and growing economic inequality, the brunt of which is borne by people of color. To confront and remedy these factors, the Fund supports policy interventions, strategic initiatives, and programs to expand political and social inclusion and promote economic and educational opportunity for marginalized groups. The Equality Fund includes the Campaign for Black Male Achievement (CBMA), which seeks to counter the economic, political and social exclusion of black men and boys from the American mainstream, and there is funding for a complimentary focus on fiscal equity housed in the Special Initiatives and Partnerships unit.

	A. Expand Political and Social Inclusion	B. Promote Economic and Educational Opportunity
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further the inclusion of new and undocumented immigrants into U.S. society and attack efforts at exclusion. Strengthen existing or secure new federal, state and local bans on racial profiling. Support the development of a 21st century narrative that affirms the continuing need to remedy racial inequality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote fair and equal access to affordable housing and responsible financial services. Ensure marginalized youth have an equal opportunity to learn and reduce disparities in school discipline policies.
Fidelity to Fields/Places	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Build on lessons learned from past efforts to secure comprehensive immigration reform, support and expand the capacity of national and state immigration advocacy organizations to implement and sustain sophisticated campaign advocacy to secure broad reform, challenge harsh immigration enforcement policies, and mobilize funders and advocates to begin planning for implementation of legalization policies. Key Partners: <i>Atlantic, Ford, Carnegie, Unbound Philanthropy, Four Freedoms Fund.</i> Key Grantees: <i>ACLU, America's Voice, Campaign for an Accountable, Moral and Balanced Immigration Overhaul, Center for Community Change (CCC), CLINIC, Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees, Immigrant Legal Resource Center, Migration Policy Institute, National Immigration Forum, National Immigration Law Center (NILC), PICO, United We DREAM, Detention Watch Network.</i> Promote development of linkages across multiple fields and constituencies engaged in anti-profiling advocacy (i.e., racial justice, criminal justice, immigrant rights and national security) to facilitate exchange of best practices and foster collaboration. Key Partner: <i>Ford.</i> Key Grantees: <i>ACLU, Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity, Leadership Conference, NAACP, NAACP LDF, Opportunity Agenda, Proteus Fund Security & Rights Collaborative, National Network of Arab American Communities, Rights Working Group.</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that federal housing programs create pathways to opportunity for residents of high-poverty, racially segregated communities, and that these communities are engaged in critical decisions about how federal housing and urban development funds are used. Key Partners: <i>Open Places Initiative, HUD, Treasury, Ford, Neighborhood Funders Group, NYU</i> Key Grantees: <i>Opportunity Agenda, PolicyLink, Poverty & Race Research Action Council</i> Rebuild the housing finance system in a manner that ensures access to affordable credit for underserved borrowers and promotes fair and responsible lending practices. Key Partners: <i>Consumer Finance Protection Bureau, HUD, Ford, Casey.</i> Key Grantees: <i>Center for American Progress, Center for Responsible Lending, National Consumer Law Center, National Council of La Raza, Urban Institute</i>
Foundation-Led Concepts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In light of shifting demographics and growing economic inequality, reconsider prevailing racial narrative and identify policy areas that are ripe to test new strategies for communicating about race. Possible Grantees: <i>Applied Research Center, Center for Social Inclusion, Opportunity Agenda.</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure strength and coordination of field of educational reform, juvenile justice, and civil rights advocacy groups devoted to reforming school discipline policies by creating exemplars of positive discipline reform and disparity reduction; increasing awareness of effective alternatives among key stakeholders; building pressure for local and state-level policy reform through smart and effective advocacy from parents, students and civil rights organizations; strengthen federal policy to increase monitoring of disciplinary practices. Key Partners: <i>OSI-Baltimore, OSI-DC, Campaign for Black Male Achievement, Atlantic, Just and Fair Schools Fund, The California Endowment.</i> Key Grantees: <i>Advancement Project, NAACP LDF, Juvenile Law Center.</i>
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2013 immigration legislative battle fails or delivers tepid reforms. "Enforcement first" policies continue to sway debate. If immigration reform passes, how the law is implemented will determine how many immigrants will succeed in jumping all the hurdles on the pathway to legal status. If the new law includes any triggers around border security, employment verification, and/or visa backlogs, as expected, advocates will need to remain vigilant about whether and when the federal government meets its obligations under these triggers so immigrants in provisional status can attain permanent resident status. If CIR fails to pass, there will be more pressure and momentum for the President to grant immediate relief to the 11 million without status – either through a "DACA-plus" program or expansive implementation of prosecutorial discretion. Impact of narrative work is hard to measure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sequestration has already dramatically reduced support for housing mobility programs and threatens hundreds of thousands of public housing units. Supreme Court may eviscerate the disparate impact standard under the Fair Housing Act. Increased federal enforcement of fair housing and lending laws likely to face significant backlash from conservative media, lending industry and local governments. Current proposals to reform housing finance system require massive retreat of government from mortgage markets, and would likely cut off access to affordable homeownership for underserved populations. High-profile shootings fuel support for more police in schools. Atlantic scheduled to exit school discipline field in late 2014/early 2015. Congressional funding will likely be inadequate to ensure schools' compliance with federal data collection and civil rights standards.

The Campaign for Black Male Achievement (CBMA) was launched in 2008 to address the economic, political, and social exclusion of black men and boys from the American mainstream. CBMA seeks to craft an assets-based narrative about black men and boys that emphasizes the need for systemic policy changes to lift the barriers that prevent them from realizing their full potential. It supports both direct services and policy advocacy, and is housed within the Equality Fund.

Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure black boys have the opportunity to excel academically, to prepare for college, and to learn skills essential to earning a living wage. • Strengthen low-income families through responsible fatherhood initiatives. • Strengthen the nascent black male achievement field by investing in leadership development, donor organizing, and communications strategies that shift public perceptions of black males.
Foundation-Led Concepts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Campaign for Black Male Achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because many of the policies that perpetuate black male exclusion are state and local policies, CBMA will strengthen the capacity of local actors in its target cities of New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia and Oakland to address the range of barriers black males face as boys and men, with a focus on CBMA's core concerns related to educational equity and responsible fatherhood. Key Partners: OSI-Baltimore, Bloomberg Philanthropies, Heinz Endowments, White House Office of Faith-based and Community Partnerships, US Office of Child Support. Key Grantees: NYC Young Men's Initiative/Expanded Success Initiative, Center for Urban Families, Oakland unified School District, Philadelphia Student Union, Higher Achievement. • Recognizing the failure of past philanthropic efforts to provide enduring support for the field of black male achievement, CBMA has exercised leadership in mobilizing donors and field partners to establish new anchor institutions and resource hubs to ensure that the black male achievement field is sustained beyond OSF's investment. Key Partners: Robert Wood Johnson, Knight, The California Endowment, Heinz Endowment, Casey Family Programs, Carnegie Corporation, Mitchell Kapor. Key Grantees: Leadership & Sustainability Institute, Black Male Achievement Fellowships, BMAFunders.org, Echoing Green, PolicyLink, Root Cause, Foundation Center, Association of Black Foundation Executives. • Because negative perceptions of black males lead to flawed policy development in multiple contexts, including criminal justice, education, and fatherhood, CBMA has placed a priority on reshaping public perceptions of black males by investing in communications and other strategies that seek to mainstream the idea that black males' success is critical to the success of all Americans. Key Partners: Knight Foundation, Heinz Endowment. Key Grantees: American Values Institute, Opportunity Agenda, Color of Change. 2. School Discipline Reform <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rate at which black males are being pushed out or are dropping out of school is unacceptably high. To redirect the educational trajectory for black boys in the U.S., CBMA will support and expand the field of organizations dedicated to seeding new models for educating black boys, keeping them in school, and improving their educational outcomes. Key Partners: Atlantic, Bloomberg Philanthropies, The California Endowment, OSI-DC. Key Grantees: NYC Young Men's Initiative, Coalition of Schools Educating Boys of Color, Schott Foundation, Just and Fair Schools Fund, Campaign for Grade Level Reading, Oakland Unified School District, Eagle Academy Foundation, Mentoring USA.
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black males have been particularly hard-hit by economic downturn. Prospective donors have also seen reserves decline during the recession and have less money to devote to work that may be perceived as narrowly focused on a particular constituency. • 2014 departure of Atlantic Philanthropies as a funding partner. • In recent years, many schools have succeeded in reducing reliance on suspensions and expulsions to address student behavior, but race and gender disparities persist.

Special Initiatives and Partnerships: Following a strategic review and structural reorganization, U.S. Programs established its new Special Initiatives and Partnerships unit to: (1) manage “anchor partner” grantmaking to deepen USP’s strategic partnerships with its largest and often highest impact multi-issue grantees; (2) manage USP “civic core” grantmaking for a small cohort of multi-issue grantees that expand public participation from “new American majority” constituencies, including communities of color and young people; (3) develop and manage special initiatives related to emerging opportunities or challenges that may not fit within existing programmatic siloes. In 2014, this will include the continuing federal and state fiscal challenges as well as initial research into 2020 strategies, including redistricting; and (4) staffing the Project on the Future of Work, the board and staff learning exploration on future employment projections, potential impacts on the nation and, in particular, the most marginalized constituencies, and the intersections of economics, sociology, and culture as they relate to employment in America.

	A. Anchor Partnerships: Key multi-issue institutions that advance our mission	B. Special Initiatives: Emerging advocacy opportunities or challenges	C. Project on the Future of Work : Long-term idea generation	D. Civic Core: Building the power of America's new majority
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the likelihood of strengthening open society in the U.S. by deepening USP's partnership and exchange of ideas with its largest, longest tenured, and typically most programmatically aligned multi-issue grantees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead work on cross-cutting and rapid response emerging priorities, including gun violence prevention (2013) and federal and state fiscal challenges (2013-14). Scout and build strategic partnerships with influential strategic allies, e.g. business, faith, or labor leaders. Identify and develop for exploration future areas of work on critical open society issues. In 2014, this could include initial research into the development of a coordinated USP approach to 2020 strategies, including redistricting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technological changes are fundamentally reshaping the labor market, likely to leave too few quality jobs for too many workers over the next quarter century. This has particularly dire consequences for the most marginalized communities. Following initial mapping of relevant efforts being conducted by others, through 2014 USP will conduct a future-oriented research collaboration with leading thinkers and key grantees to explore potential scenarios and implications for open society in the decades to come. This is intended as a model for conscious efforts to use the OSF platform to develop and shape new ideas and learning. Key Partners: <i>Institute for New Economic Thinking, Roosevelt Institute, Center for American Progress, National Domestic Workers Alliance, Rockefeller Foundation, AFL-CIO.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take advantage of demographic shifts and create new political openings via enhanced leadership development, grassroots, and advocacy capacity within communities of color and youth constituencies.
Fealty to Fields/Places	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expand knowledge of anchor partner organizational capacity and impact. Provide general operating and targeted capacity building support to enable greater engagement of anchor partners on open society priorities. Key Partners: <i>Democracy Alliance, OSF-DC, Ford and Sandler foundations.</i> Key Grantees: <i>ACLU, Advancement Project, American Constitution Society, Brennan Center for Justice, Center for American Progress, Center for Community Change, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Drug Policy Alliance, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, NAACP.</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide targeted support to fiscal equity advocates in order to raise revenue and confront austerity policies that adversely impact low-income Americans. Includes policy analysis, strategic communications and narrative work, and field advocacy, including connecting national policy experts with state and local advocates. Begin initial planning and field and funder mapping of efforts related to 2020, including redistricting. Key Partners: <i>Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Economic Policy Institute, Bauman and Ford foundation.</i> Key Grantees: <i>Americans for Tax Fairness, Center for American Progress, Center on Budget, Main Street Alliance, PICO.</i> 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Make targeted general support and project investments in a small cohort of institutions that build large scale civic capacity within communities of color and youth constituencies. Key partners: <i>Democracy Alliance, Latino Civic Engagement Fund, Black Civic Engagement Initiative, Youth Engagement Fund</i> Key grantees: <i>Ballot Initiative Strategy Center, Color of Change, Economic Policy Initiative, Faith in Public Life, League of Young Voters, National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, PICO Interfaith Network, State Voices, and Young Elected Leaders Network</i>

	Anchor Partnerships: Key multi-issue institutions that advance our mission	Special Initiatives: Emerging advocacy opportunities or challenges	Project on the Future of Work : Long-term idea generation	Civic Core: Building the power of America's new majority
Foundation- led Concepts				
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria: Need to identify clear criteria for anchor partner selection in the future: is it a temporal, cyclical, or long-term designation? • Evaluation: Must develop a fair & informative means to evaluate anchors. • Capacity: What else can OSF provide to encourage more anchor partner engagement on our highest priority issues where there has been more limited commitment, including confronting over-incarceration? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization: Need to clarify USP processes to elevate emerging issues for prioritization without spreading our resources too thinly. • Re: Fiscal equity advocacy: (1) Organizations taking on fiscal equity advocacy have generally strong “inside the Beltway” policy analysis capacity but limited field capacity in key regions or within important constituencies; and (2) Congressional leadership from both parties is more entrenched than ever on fiscal policies, leading to limited optimism for increased revenue. Best case scenario may be protecting the most marginalized as budget cuts persist at federal and state levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role clarity: It will be important to clearly distinguish OSF's internal learning process from other, complementary academic, advocacy, business, labor, and philanthropic efforts. • Calling the question: Following extensive board and staff learning throughout 2014, how will OSF determine if there is a need for our continued engagement, whether through ongoing learning, external partnerships, or new grant-making strategies? • Open Places: How can we best integrate places chosen and local and/or state perspectives into this exploration? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria: Need to identify clear criteria for civic core selection in the future: what are our highest priority constituencies, what are the most essential strategies to complement existing USP grantmaking, and which organizations are most effective? • Evaluation: Must develop a fair & informative means to evaluate civic cores.

Open Society Institute-Baltimore as a field office of US Programs, is a geographically focused, multi-faceted effort to reform policies that are perpetuating discrimination and preventing residents from participating fully in the civic, economic and social life of the region. In addition to administering the Community Fellowships Program to bring new ideas and energy to Baltimore’s underserved communities, it currently focuses on three inter-related areas: Education/Youth Development; Drug Addiction Treatment; and Criminal/Juvenile Justice. The four programs work closely together, sharing information and expertise. While a significant portion of the work relates to state policy, the office looks to the Baltimore community to identify needs, demonstrate effective approaches and measure impact, given the city’s demographics and importance to the state. As a typical big city with high poverty and inequity, successful approaches in Baltimore are noted by other cities. The state is positioned as a progressive leader nationally, despite a conservative undercurrent, and relates to the office more as a partner than adversary. Working as a social justice laboratory, the office (staff and a highly engaged advisory board) have a steady presence and an activist, inclusive approach. Only half of staff time is spent on grantmaking. From the outset, the office has worked closely with key public agencies in order to bring promising initiatives to scale and to reform key policies and practices. In addition to technical assistance to government (including serving on various public committees), it conducts advocacy (including through multi-platform communications, office-based for a, a public Talking About Race series, and a Leadership Council), awards grants (including demonstration projects to refine practice and show cost-effective impact as well as advocacy, litigation, research, and mobilization), and makes Program Related Investments. Special events designed to cultivate prospective donors—to raise at least \$2.2 million annually—aid in advancing the office’s mission and goals.

<p><u>Education and Youth Development</u></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. End inequitable policies and practices that marginalize and keep too many Baltimore and Maryland children out of school. 2. Ensure that Baltimore’s public schools and youth programs engage and prepare students for success in adulthood. <p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reform attendance & discipline policies/practices that keep students out of school and cause disparate education outcomes (OSF-initiated). • Increase the quality and number of learning opportunities outside of school to ensure all City students are prepared for adulthood. • Create new high schools models that give City students the flexibility and support needed for employment and further education (OSF-initiated). <p>Benchmarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baltimore’s suspension rate falls to 7% and racial disparities by 50%. • Maryland adopts new regulations holding local districts accountable for high and disparate discipline outcomes and at least three Maryland school districts adopt new discipline codes that result in significant reductions in suspensions and disparities. • City funding for out-of-school time programs doubles to \$10 million. • Baltimore opens two new “high-value” high schools. <p>Risks and Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cuts in public funding. • Leadership change at City Schools and other agencies and partners. <p>Representative Grantees: Advancement Project, Baltimore Education Research</p>	<p><u>OSI-Baltimore Community Fellowships</u></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify new talent to become dynamic, resourceful and committed social entrepreneurs to become Baltimore Community Fellows. 2. Build a network of individuals skilled at and committed to using tools and resources to catalyze change in Baltimore’s underserved communities. <p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake an extensive outreach campaign and thoughtful selection process to recruit 10 – 12 individuals to receive a fellowship. • Support cross-program collaboration with all OSI-Baltimore programs, field experts & alumni fellows. • Support current and alumni fellows with technical assistance resources. <p>Benchmarks (Over three years):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 80% of fellows will continue the work beyond the 18 months. • Fellows will establish boards to help guide their work. • Fellows will develop essential resources to support the work beyond the 18 months. • Risks and Challenges: • Individual entrepreneurs may have difficulty converting to an organizational structure. • 18 months may not be long enough to achieve results, reducing the ability to raise other funds. • Demands of individual projects may undercut Fellow’s ability to benefit fully from peer support and other resources. <p>Strategic Allies: OSI-Baltimore Community Fellowship Alumni, community</p>
---	---

<p>Consortium, Family League, Fund for Educational Excellence, Community Conferencing, Safe and Sound, ACLU, GLSEN, and Baltimore Urban Debate League</p> <p>Strategic Allies: Baltimore City Public Schools, Departments of Health and Social Services, Maryland State Department of Education, Johns Hopkins University, and Morgan State University</p> <p>Funding Partners: Atlantic and Bloomberg Philanthropies; Annie E. Casey Foundation, Abell Foundation, and most other Baltimore education funders</p> <p>OSF Partnerships: OSI-Baltimore Juvenile Justice, Community Fellowships, and Communications; CBMA; and Equity Program</p>	<p>associations, NGOs in Fellows' fields of interest, and public agencies such as the Department of Social Services and the Baltimore City Public School System</p> <p>Funding Partners: The Clayton Baker Trust and The Lois and Irving Blum Foundations. Alumni Fellows receive funding from the Baltimore Community Foundation, The Abell Foundation, the Weinberg Foundation, Parks & People Foundation, and host organizations (if available)</p> <p>OSF Partnerships: OSI-Baltimore Programs, Campaign for Black Male Achievement, Individual Grants Working Group, and Soros Justice Fellowships</p>
<p><u>Criminal and Juvenile Justice</u></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce Baltimore City's pre-trial detention population and Maryland's prison population. 2. Advance sound policies and practices, including adequate public funding, for the successful re-entry of people with criminal and juvenile records. <p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reform pre-trial, parole and probation practices that are unfair, discriminatory or excessively punitive (OSF-initiated). • Reduce youth arrests by promoting fair school discipline policies and programs and improving youth/police relations. • End the automatic prosecution of youth as adults and their detention in adult jails (OSF-initiated). • Advocate for policies that offer equal access to employment, housing and other services to people with criminal and juvenile records. • Support demonstration projects that provide re-entry/reintegration services to adults and youth. <p>Benchmarks (Over three years):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 15% reduction in the daily population at the Baltimore City adult jail and juvenile detention center and a 15% reduction in the prison population. • A 10% decrease in, or elimination of, racial disparities in pre-trial detention, parole and /or probation practices. • A 70% reduction in the number of youth who are charged as adults and held pre-trial at the Baltimore City Detention Center. • Policy reforms that expand reentry program slots and provide equal access to jobs to people with criminal and juvenile records. <p>Risks and Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustaining policy reform successes during administration transitions. • Limited funding sources for criminal justice advocacy work. <p>Representative Grantees: Advocates for Children and Youth; JFA Institute; Maryland</p>	<p><u>Drug Addiction Treatment</u></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Close the addiction treatment gap for low-income patients by taking advantage of the opportunities of health care reform. 2. Support the availability of addiction services not covered by health care reform. 3. Decrease the harms of drug use, lower the threshold to treatment, and reduce stigma. <p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the sound implementation of Medicaid expansion, the essential health benefits, and parity legislation. • Advocate for the successful implementation of the State Health Insurance Exchange to meet the needs of patients with addictions. • Advocate for the preservation of block grant funds. • Increase the number, diversity and impact of advocates. • Advocate for programs to discontinue the practice of discharging patients (OSF-initiated). • Advocate for the expanded availability of buprenorphine (OSF-initiated). <p>Benchmarks (over three years):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the number of patients with Medicaid who are admitted into treatment for addiction by 50%. • Increase in the average length of stay in addiction treatment by 300%. • Increase the number of naloxone doses dispensed by 100%. <p>Risks and Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible block grant dollars could be decreased to pay for the expansion of addiction services for patients with Medicaid. • Programs will resist changes to the current practice of discharging patients. <p>Representative Grantees: Maryland Addictions Directors Council, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependency-Maryland Chapter</p> <p>Strategic Allies: Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration, Baltimore Substance Abuse Services, and Maryland Poison Control Center</p>

<p>Restorative Justice; Ingoma Foundation; Justice Policy Institute; Job Opportunities Task Force; Community Law in Action; and Public Justice Center</p> <p>Strategic Allies: Baltimore City Public Schools; Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services; Baltimore Police Department; Department of Juvenile Services; and Office of the Public Defender</p> <p>Funding Partners: Abell, Annie E. Casey, and Public Welfare foundations.</p> <p>OSF Partnerships: OSI-Baltimore programs; USP Justice and Equity programs and CBMA, and Open Society Policy Center</p>	<p>Funding Partners: Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration, Abell Foundation, and Baltimore Substance Abuse Services</p> <p>OSF Partnerships: OSI-Baltimore Programs, International Harm Reduction Development Program, and Campaign for a New Drug Policy</p>
---	--

The Open Places Initiative: recognizes, and seeks to maximize, the role of local decision-making, policy and practice in advancing significant systemic change. The Open Society Foundations was motivated by several intersecting and fundamental shifts now occurring at the local level that will increasingly affect how low-income and minority communities are able to access equity, justice and democratic practice. These trends include: the dramatic shifts in federal and state funding that will intensify the responsibilities placed on local governments to make hard choices with fewer resources; large-scale demographic changes that are upending traditional political dynamics and offering opportunities for new alliances; the expansion of innovation in program delivery and policy setting by local governments that frequently turns on the presence or absence of effective community engagement and capacity; and the increased challenges faced by the non-profit sector as it experiences decreased funding and increased demand. Eight sites have received a planning grant; in late 2013, USP will award implementation grants of up to \$1million/year for three years to 3-5 sites, which it may extend for an additional seven years.

	A. Advance Equity, Justice and Democratic Practice	B. Increase Sustainable Civic Capacity	C. Inform & Strengthen Place-Based Partnerships and Strategies
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable diverse local sites to advance open society values through priority issues, strategies and structures that they identify. Equip site teams with the resources to engage in long-term, multi-issue advocacy efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have site teams grow beyond existing capacity ceilings to expand reach and efficacy, strengthening the local social justice ecosystem Develop an institutional home in each site that is flexible, sustainable, and impactful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen the capacity of OSF and other funders to maximize impact through better understanding of place-based philanthropy and strategic, aligned funding Enhanced coordination and sharing of best practices internally and between national and local players, including public and private funders
Faith to Fields/Places			
Foundation-Led Concepts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support a collaborative of local advocacy NGOs working in specific geographic boundaries on a range of issues to advance open society Identify goals & strategies and enhance partnerships & capacity to influence social change locally, with the potential to scale <p>Key Partners: Local, state & regional funders, govt & and collaboratives, Ford Foundation, Annie E. Casey, Kellogg Foundation, Neighborhood Funders' Group</p> <p>Representative Grantees: local/state advocacy groups, national NGOs with a local presence (State Voices, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, CCC)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide TA to build sites' sustained capacity and growth to address multiple issues over the long-term, including organizational capacity Establish social justice laboratories to determine best practices in devolution and changing local conditions and needs Develop relationships so local and national funders become strategically aligned supporters <p>Key Partners: State & local leaders, funders, NGOs, government officials, labor, business & academia</p> <p>Representative Grantees: Local site team partners representing a variety of issues and constituencies</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Create place-centered investments to seed local change/innovation, scale efforts for maximum impact Support development of local grassroots efforts, leadership cultivation for multi-sector, multi-issue work Provide resources (funding, TA, partnerships) to increase capacity for advocacy on issues critical to sites Disseminate learning OSF- and philanthropy-wide Alternative responses to devolution, call for innovation <p>Key Partners: The California Endowment, Ford, Annie E. Casey, Kellogg, Neighborhood Funders' Group</p> <p>Representative Grantees: National grantees that have or could benefit from local partnerships and local grantees</p>
Risks/Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site teams may lack the co-operation and sophistication to carry out planned goals Resistance to policy change from conservatives and decision-makers Goals/agendas among organizational may conflict and derail Initiative goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites will not be able to sustain themselves beyond OSF's investment Tensions within sites could distract from goals Leadership could stagnate, lacking in innovation Orgs inadequately develop multi-sector partnerships (no change to the ecosystem) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites may not make sufficient measureable progress to attract others to place-based approaches to philanthropy Peer funder objectives may not align (limited resources) Local/regional and national non-profits may not place priority on improved coordination among themselves Inability to adequately measure and capture success