

# THE HYAMS FOUNDATION, INC.

Dear Colleague:

We are very pleased to share with you a copy of *Joining Forces: Community Organizations and Labor Unions Form New Collaborations*. The Hyams Foundation commissioned this report because a number of our community organizing and public policy grantees had developed partnerships with organized labor and we were interested in learning more about the nature of these relationships and their impact on our grantees' work.

Based on extensive interviews with community and union leaders, as well as with other funders, the report documents these collaborations and their impact. It also explores the many challenges that community groups and unions face as they seek to build mutually supportive relationships that advance the interests of low-income and working class individuals. While the report illuminates the experiences of particular Foundation grantees and their union partners, we believe there are some interesting and provocative lessons that may be helpful to other funders, community organizations and unions interested in exploring similar partnerships.

We have learned from our grantees that this is not easy work, even when there is good will and a clear vision for the potential benefits from such collaboration. There are a number of challenges that must be faced honestly, history that must be acknowledged, and tensions that will not disappear simply because of larger shared values. Nevertheless, we are convinced of what the report makes clear: there are compelling reasons why community groups and unions should welcome the opportunity to resolve these challenges and find common ground.

We want to gratefully acknowledge the support and cooperation of the many community and union leaders who made this report possible. They were open and forthright in discussing their own experiences. We also want to thank the report's researcher and author, Lisa Ranghelli, for her excellent work and strong commitment to this project and Patricia Brady for her final editing of the report.

We hope you find this report interesting. Please do not hesitate to contact Henry Allen at (617) 426-5600, ext. 309 or [hallen@hyamsfoundation.org](mailto:hallen@hyamsfoundation.org) if you have any questions about the report, or if there are other ways we can be supportive of your own work in this area. The Foundation plans to convene one or more discussions of the report. Please let Henry know if you would be interested in attending such a session.

Sincerely,



Elizabeth B. Smith  
Executive Director

**Joining Forces**

**Community Organizations and  
Labor Unions  
Form New Collaborations**

A Report Commissioned by  
The Hyams Foundation  
March 2005

*Researched and Written by:*  
*Final Editing:*

Lisa Ranghelli  
Patricia Brady

# CONTENTS

<b>Preface</b>	3
<b>Introduction</b>	4
<b>When Everything Lines Up: Models of Successful Collaboration</b>	6
1. The Essex County Community Organization (ECCO)	
2. The Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO)	
3. ACORN	
4. Neighbor to Neighbor (N2N)	
How did they do that?	10
<b>Building New Partnerships: The Challenges</b>	12
1. The Brazilian Immigrant Center (BIC) and the Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA)	
2. Mass. Coalition for Occupational Safety and Health (MassCOSH)	
3. Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO)	
4. Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance (MAHA)	
Apples and Oranges	17
<b>New Collaborations and Old Traditions: Redefining ‘Us’ and ‘Them’</b>	18
1. Boston Tenants Coalition	
2. The Paraprofessional Healthcare Institute	
3. The Boston Workforce Development Initiative	
<b>Some Advice</b>	22
<b>Recommendations: The Role of the Hyams Foundation in Fostering Collaboration</b>	24
<b>Appendix I: Interviewees</b>	27
<b>Appendix II: Grantees and Their Labor Allies in Boston</b>	28

## **PREFACE**

The mission of the Hyams Foundation is to increase social and economic justice and power within low-income communities in Boston and Chelsea, Massachusetts. As part of this mission, the Foundation has a long-standing commitment to support comprehensive community organizing efforts as well as statewide public policy advocacy.

In recent years a number of community organizations funded by the Foundation have begun to work with organized labor on issues ranging from affordable housing to workforce development, public school reform, immigrant rights and the living wage. As part of the Neighborhood Funders Group (NFG), Hyams has played a leading role in fostering such collaborations nationally as well as locally.

This report is the result of a research project Hyams sponsored to learn more about the collaborative work of community organizations and unions in Boston. Involving interviews with fourteen grantees and eighteen labor representatives as well as several program officers at foundations supporting these new collaborations, the report explores the value of these relationships for both grantees and labor unions, the challenges of bringing together such disparate groups, the implications for others interested in working together, and the potential role of the Foundation in furthering these new collaborations.

The research reveals that grantees and labor organizations must come together across a significant historical and institutional divide, and that bridging their differences requires time, effort, and understanding. The process for many has involved unsuspected pitfalls. Nevertheless, the majority of grantees and unions taking part in these efforts have come to regard collaborating as not only valuable but essential to the work they do. While they are struggling, with varying degrees of success, to make working together a reality, the partnerships described in this report represent a powerful force for change.

## INTRODUCTION

Working together in recent years, community organizations and labor unions in Greater Boston have helped win passage of a Boston living wage ordinance, a \$6 million state job training program for 1,500 workers, an increase in the minimum wage in Massachusetts, an earned income tax credit on state income taxes, improvements in union contracts and in workplace conditions, and a number of progressive state tax policies, including a new tax on capital gains.

These remarkable achievements are echoed in efforts throughout the country, as community organizations form alliances with organized labor to tackle problems affecting the lives of low-wage workers, a constituency they share. The living wage movement, an example of this nexus of interests, has brought labor and community groups together in cities, counties and states, with an impressive record of success. To many, the need for labor and community groups to join forces in order to achieve long-term goals of economic and social justice is increasingly evident.

Recent developments in both labor and community organizing have created a more auspicious environment for collaboration than has existed in many decades. Faced with a decline in the unionized workforce from 38% in the 1950s to 14% today (only 9% in the private sector), unions are reaching out to potential allies, including faith-based and community organizations that work extensively with immigrants. In a major policy shift, the AFL-CIO in February, 2000 announced its support of amnesty for undocumented immigrants and played a major role in organizing, planning and supporting the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride of 2003, a nationwide effort to raise the visibility of immigrant worker issues.

Changes in the national economy over the last few decades also have played a part in re-focusing union organizing efforts. As the economy has shifted from higher-paying manufacturing jobs to lower-paying jobs in the services sector, the plight of the working poor has come to the fore. Today, unions that organize low-wage workers, including the Service Employees International Union--renowned for its successful Justice for Janitors campaigns--and the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union, are among the fastest growing and most vibrant labor organizations in the country.

At the same time, the labor movement is broadening its public policy efforts to promote the welfare of working families in general. Under new leadership since 1995, the national AFL-CIO has devoted increased resources to advocating policies such as raising the federal minimum wage and universal health care coverage intended to benefit all working Americans, not just those who are union members.

As the labor movement focuses increasing attention on the working poor, community organizations that have long served this constituency are changing too, becoming larger and more sophisticated. Networks such as the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), and the Pacific Institute for Community Organizing (PICO) are themselves national in scope. Immigrant organizing has grown tremendously and is now able to turn out large-scale support for campaigns, as exhibited by rallies around the country attended by tens of thousands in support of amnesty for undocumented workers.

While the time seems right to many for the development of closer ties between labor and community organizations, even groups that have worked together successfully acknowledge the existence of substantial challenges stemming from the starkly contrasting history, culture, structure and resources of these organizations. Bringing together these complex organizations and finding common ground is no small task. The perspectives of foundation officers from around the country make it clear that successful collaborations everywhere rely more on developing mutual awareness of differences than on any other single factor. Michele Prichard, of Liberty Hill Foundation in Los Angeles, observes that “community leaders who have reached out to labor in L.A. have invested a great deal of time in understanding how labor unions work and what is important to them. They engage in very open and extensive communication about the complementary roles that each can play.” Regina McGraw, at the Wieboldt Foundation in Chicago, echoes this sentiment. She believes that unions are most successful at collaboration when they have taken the time to learn the organizational culture of community groups.

Greater Boston today is seeing an increase in the number and kinds of collaborations between unions and community organizations. Why? Because, as one union leader put it, “When everything lines up, the results have been impressive.” In fact, many union and community group leaders now see working together as fundamental to achieving social justice for low-wage workers in the United States. This report describes in detail the nature and the impact of the collaborations between several Hyams Foundation grantees and labor unions. It analyzes both the benefits and the challenges, and it suggests ways in which these partnerships can be more productive. The report concludes with recommendations to the Foundation regarding its future work in this area.

## **When Everything Lines Up: Models of Successful Collaboration**

### **1. The Essex County Community Organization (ECCO)**

When it was looking for ways to create much-needed living-wage jobs in the region, the Essex County Community Organization of Lynn, a former Hyams grantee, saw an opportunity in the local shortage of trained machinists. Since there were no training programs in place to prepare workers, ECCO approached the International Union of Electrical Workers/Communication Workers of America (IUE/CWA) Local 201. The union was interested in providing training for its members, as well as in securing allies for support on other issues.

The leaders of ECCO and Local 201 spent many months conversing individually. Their members attended each other's meetings and supported one another at major actions for an extended period before either group felt ready to undertake a joint campaign. This phase of the relationship proved key in developing trust and overcoming misperceptions. For example, the union was uncertain that a faith-based organization like ECCO, which is comprised of church congregations, would take on tough labor issues. These concerns were dispelled by an incident recounted by Jeff Crosby, president of Local 201 and head of the North Shore Labor Council.

“During contract negotiations in 1996-97,” he says, “when we had 4,000 workers marching through downtown Lynn, St Stephen’s Church put up a banner on the steeple to show solidarity. The was a very powerful gesture that sent a signal to the union that the church’s support was real.”

*“You need to have the interest, creativity, and political thoughtfulness among leaders and organizers on each side—it needs to be intentional and mutual.” – Lew Finfer, Organizing and Leadership Training Center*

Working together, ECCO and Local 201 secured state funding for a machinist-training program. Today, the community organization and the union continue to play a role in the operation of the program, and both participate on a jobs committee that is exploring other working issues.

### **2. The Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO)**

The Greater Boston Interfaith Organization, like ECCO, is a member of the Organizing and Leadership Training Center, and a Hyams grantee. From its inception GBIO, representing some eighty different congregations and community-based organizations, recognized the importance of working with organized labor. When GBIO was founded, its leaders secured three Service Employees International Union (SEIU) locals as dues-paying members of the organization. Even this institutional tie did not guarantee effective collaboration, however, and much groundwork needed to be laid. In developing its relationship with SEIU Local 2020, for example, GBIO staff met with Local 2020 staff on a monthly basis for almost a year, slowly

building trust and discovering common ground. Along the way, the union demonstrated its commitment to GBIO by actively engaging in GBIO affordable housing campaigns, turning out at actions, writing letters, making phone calls, and leveraging its relationships. Meanwhile, GBIO determined that two of its goals would be of interest to Local 2020, which represents 11,000 health care workers statewide, including nursing home workers. GBIO wanted to strengthen relations with its Haitian congregations and to take on worker issues. Since Haitian workers predominantly staff the Boston area nursing home industry, GBIO and Local 2020 have a common constituency. Local 2020 wants to increase unionization among nursing home workers, upgrade working conditions, and improve the quality of care.

As a result of their lengthy relationship building, GBIO and SEIU 2020 have entered an unusual partnership, in which the union pays the salary of a Haitian organizer who is on GBIO's staff. The organizer is building Haitian worker leadership from within the Haitian congregations, and these leaders in turn are educating the other GBIO congregations about their working conditions and the need to improve nursing home care. By bringing teams of nursing home workers to all of GBIO's institutions—some of which have nursing home owners as members—GBIO hopes that its members will realize the political implications of getting involved. Since only 5% of the nursing home sector is currently unionized, GBIO and Local 2020 see the potential for a significant increase in unionization. When contracts come up for negotiation in the spring, the congregations will be sensitized to the issues and likely to offer public support for Local 2020's campaign.

Mike Fadel, an SEIU 2020 organizer, described how this relationship departs from the usual union-community group alliance. "Typically, unions do last minute outreach to community-based organizations in the heat of an organizing or contract campaign and ask the organization to make a call or speak at a rally. What has been very different from our past experience, and from GBIO's as well, is that we really built a relationship. We are trying to make social justice and community change work happen, and together are making it a focus of the union, of GBIO, and of its member organizations." Celia Wcislo, Local 2020's president, highlighted the importance of learning about each other's culture and making connections. "GBIO staff took me around to ministers and priests and I talked about why there are unions. Many had never met a union person before and didn't understand how our organization worked. One Lutheran minister told me how he was changing his approach from serving his congregants to teaching them to advocate for themselves. I said that was very similar to what we were trying to do with our union members. Neither of us realized we had so much in common."

Both ECCO and GBIO found union leaders who were willing to look beyond their immediate self-interest and take risks to achieve broader goals. In Jeff Crosby's words, "There are very basic reasons why labor and faith-based groups are inclined to work together—it's ideological. There are not that many social forces that have the institutional intention to counter the neo-liberal, dog-eat-dog consensus. The churches say 'I am my brother's keeper' and the unions say 'An injury to one is an injury to all.' Combined, these values are insurrectionary."

### 3. ACORN

In addition to faith-based organizations such as ECCO and GBIO, other community organizations are forging powerful ties with labor as well. Among Hyams grantees, the local chapter of the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) is probably the most deeply engaged with organized labor in the city and state. Counting 175,000 member families in 850 neighborhood chapters in 70 cities across the country, ACORN is the nation's largest community organization of low- and moderate-income families.

In 1996, when Boston ACORN decided to pursue a living wage ordinance, the organization knew it could not win without the support of organized labor. At that point, however, ACORN had no ties to labor groups, and according to lead organizer Lisa Clauson, it was persistence alone that changed this situation. Remembering the initial efforts to contact labor organizations, she says, "I often had to call many times before a union got tired of getting my messages and agreed to set up a meeting with me and an ACORN leader. When we then sat down to talk about campaigning for a living wage, and it became clear to them that it was a labor issue, I would also ask about their own interest in the issue in order to get even greater buy-in." ACORN initially reached out to the Greater Boston Central Labor Council and the state AFL-CIO, and then to individual union locals.

Clauson also knew that ACORN would have to prove itself to the unions. "There are a number of nonprofits in Boston that can't mobilize people and aren't about mobilizing people," she says. "In order to get labor's interest we had to convince them that we could mobilize people so that it was clear this would not be a one-sided relationship, with us looking for them to produce in this area, but that we would pull our own weight. We knew this was a campaign that would need mass mobilizations in order to win and that turn-out would be very important." Because the street campaign was so critical, ACORN made the ability to turn out twenty or more people at campaign events a requirement of steering committee membership. The combined ability of labor and the community groups to mobilize their membership base as well as to lobby proved to be a winning formula, and the Boston City Council passed the Living Wage Ordinance into law.

In 1998, ACORN and the state labor federation joined forces, and with other key organizations went on to win increases in the statewide minimum wage and to establish a state earned income tax credit. In 2001, they came together again in a successful effort to raise the city's living wage.

ACORN's relationship with labor has not centered solely on campaigns it has initiated itself. The organization has been conscientious about networking within the labor community and supporting various union campaigns. ACORN is consistently represented at union events, at Jobs with Justice meetings, and (when invited) at Central Labor Council meetings. Kathy Casavant, Secretary-Treasurer of the state AFL-CIO, comments, "A feeling of trust has developed between the labor movement in Boston and ACORN. ACORN is there on issues that don't necessarily pertain to its organization, such as attending labor rallies. With ACORN we are there for each other, even on issues that are not our core concerns."

*“With ACORN and some other groups, there is synergy because we are working on similar issues, issues of income and issues of economic justice -- or the lack of it.”*  
*--Robert Haynes, President, Massachusetts AFL-CIO*

As a leader in the Boston Parent Organizing Network, ACORN also has been building ties with the Boston Teachers Union over the last five years. Although the BTU and ACORN have not yet engaged in substantive joint campaigns, ACORN earned the union’s trust by providing a neutral venue for BTU and the Superintendent of Schools to air their points of view with the community prior to an impending strike. ACORN and the union stress the fact that, although they may not agree on every issue, they will work together on common concerns. Currently, ACORN is helping the union learn about a teacher-mentoring program that has been successful in Toledo and could be a model for training new teachers in the Boston public schools. BTU President Richard Stutman points out that “what ACORN believes in—economic justice and a society that provides for its members in a better fashion that it currently does—we support as well. We all want what’s best for the kids.”

#### **4. Neighbor to Neighbor (N2N)**

Neighbor to Neighbor is another statewide community organization with low-income membership that has built successful alliances with organized labor. N2N has created a powerful coalition of community organizations (including many Hyams grantees) and labor groups to fight state cuts to services and to advance a progressive tax agenda. The “Stop the Cuts” campaign scored a major victory in 2002 when the state legislature passed a revenue package with a new tax on capital gains.

N2N also has brought labor and community groups together to create a “Working Families” agenda. As described by one state AFL-CIO representative, “Everyone has a say in voting on the agenda and then we carry it through the year. This way we are not competing for limited resources and taking from one pot to fill another.” Many see the kind of cohesion N2N is fostering as critical to achieving progress, noting that conservatives have gotten the attention of legislators by being well organized and disciplined. N2N has developed a sophisticated electoral strategy, and devotes significant resources to voter registration, education and turnout. “We are always trying to get our members to register and vote,” says Massachusetts AFL-CIO President Robert Haynes. “Neighbor to Neighbor has had a great impact on getting people in low-wage districts and in public housing to vote.”

While N2N partners with and receives donations from a number of unions, including the building trades, public sector unions, and the state AFL-CIO, it enjoys a particularly close relationship with the Association of Federal, County, State, and Municipal Employees (AFCSME). This relationship has been mutually beneficial, as Andi Mullin, of AFCSME, observes: “Organized labor could not have won the tax campaign without Neighbor to Neighbor, and Neighbor to Neighbor could not have won without organized labor.” A state

labor representative echoes this appreciation: “Neighbor to Neighbor has genuinely helped make me more of an organizer. That group has raised the bar for us, because it has been so successful in membership engagement.” For AFSCME, there was much to be gained from the relationship. Increasing state revenues and fighting budget cuts were directly relevant to its members, whose public sector jobs depend on consistent state funding.

***"I can't speak highly enough of Neighbor to Neighbor. They have really demonstrated the effectiveness of engaging membership at the grassroots level. For AFSCME and other unions, this has reinforced the importance of giving priority to that strategy."***  
**--Andi Mullin, AFSCME**

The larger significance of their alliance is clear to both N2N and AFSCME. As N2N’s Director, Harris Gruman, says, “The missing piece in most political power analyses is the people in the bottom 25% income range—the poor. The bulk of union members are in the 25-to-50% income range. The poor need to join with them in order to constitute a majoritarian coalition that can win power nationally.” Andi Mullin framed the challenge another way, “The right wing created a wedge that has been extremely successful in dividing people who receive services (the poor) from those who provide them (our union members). As a result, union members may be inclined to vote against public services and those who receive them, not quite realizing that their fates are tied.” By engaging their grassroots memberships and bringing them together around a common agenda, N2N and AFSCME are gradually overcoming class differences and winning progressive policies at the same time.

### **How Did They Do That?**

What accounts for the success of community organizations such as ECCO, GBIO, Boston ACORN, and N2N in forming effective partnerships with labor unions? This research suggests that certain underlying factors are relevant, including:

*First, infrastructure support.* ECCO and GBIO (both members of the Organizing and Leadership Training Center) and the local branches of ACORN and N2N all benefit from being part of larger networks. This infrastructure provides a set of relationships and resources that independent local organizations often lack. In addition to supplying local chapters with information and advice from the experience of member groups, these networks represent a base of stability that allows the community groups to approach labor as an equal. This feeling of equality has been harder to achieve for independent immigrant organizing groups attempting to form partnerships with labor.

*Second, organizational structure.* A community group works well with organized labor when its membership structure parallels that of a union. This is particularly true in the case of ACORN, as Enid Eckstein, of SEIU Local 509, sums it up: “ACORN organizes low-wage workers, it is a membership organization [ACORN members pay dues, just as union members do], it focuses on accountability, it has a chapter structure, and it tries to mobilize its base.” With so much in common, ACORN meshes well with its union partners.

*Third, the capacity to organize and deliver members.* Community organizations that work successfully with unions organize low-income people and community leaders directly, build individual leadership, and engage their membership in a very direct way in campaigns by turning out members to events, showing up at legislators’ offices, and otherwise using people-power to create change. Organizations like ACORN and N2N have acquired reputations in the labor community for being able to deliver in this way.

While these factors play an important part in effective partnerships, patience and perseverance in relationship building, as described in the examples in this section, may be equally critical. Community organizations that succeed in forming partnerships with labor organizations make significant investments in time to select appropriate partners, to ascertain the degree to which concerns are shared, and to develop knowledge and trust. They hold numerous exploratory meetings among officials. They create institutional links through board membership or sharing staff people. They form personal ties on several levels within the organizations. They provide support for issues not directly related to their own agenda. They choose their initial joint campaign, when the time is right, with great care. Overall, they do what it takes to prove themselves reliable partners, capable of looking beyond their own self-interest, and willing to work together over the long haul, for the common good.

## **Building New Partnerships: The Challenges**

While neighborhood groups differ among themselves in numerous ways and unions are similarly diverse, the larger and more general differences between these two kinds of organizations can make working together truly challenging. Of all the distinctions made by individuals interviewed for this report, the most commonly repeated was the “process” orientation of community groups as opposed to the “action” orientation of unions. It is a difference that reflects very basic ideas about how to effect social change, ideas that crop up in every campaign an organization undertakes. Is the primary goal of the campaign to win a particular concession or agreement through the collective power of people working for a common purpose? Or is the goal of a campaign to empower individuals within the group to develop their own capacity to organize for change?

A second important distinction made by interviewees dealt with the structures of community groups and unions. How democratic is the structure of each? Who makes decisions and how are they made? What is the relationship between the directors, say at the state level, and the ‘rank and file’ of the local organization? What about the fact that union leaders are elected, while community organization leaders are generally appointed?

Perhaps the fact that communities are likely to have both kinds of organizations suggests that the form and purpose of each are important to the common good. But when community groups and unions come together, these differences can puzzle the participants and fray their nerves. Even community groups and labor unions that have developed an awareness of these fundamental differences have problems working through their implications.

### **1. The Brazilian Immigrant Center (BIC) and the Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA)**

The surge of immigration in Boston over the last two decades—and the plight of the low-wage immigrant worker—have made the city’s newcomers an important focus of union-community group collaboration. Several Boston unions now actively support the legalization of undocumented immigrants, as well as driver’s license reforms, which would allow immigrants to apply for one without a Social Security card, and paying in-state tuition rates at public colleges for the undocumented. These unions include Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 615, Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees (HERE) Local 26, the Teamsters, and the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades (IBPAT) District Council 35. Interviews with staff at the Brazilian Immigrant Center (BIC) and the Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA) suggest that much has been accomplished through partnerships with these unions, even in the early stages of collaboration with them, but there are still challenges to overcome.

Both BIC and MIRA have labor representatives on their boards, union leaders who can help them connect to the broader labor community. BIC also has a relationship with the carpenter and painter unions which allows the unions to conduct workshops for the Brazilian community about

why and how to join a union and what apprenticeship opportunities are available. Fausto DaRocha, who directs the Center, estimates that about 200 of the Center's constituents have joined a union since these collaborations began. According to Jim Snow at the Painters Union, their relationship with the Center has helped the union "get closer to the people we represent, and get them information about their rights. The Center also lends us credibility because there is a lot of suspicion among the workers because they are mostly undocumented."

Despite these benefits, some immigrant rights organizers express frustration that the partnership is not more equal, more two-way. Says one, "Most of the advantages go to the unions, who gain members, which is clearly essential to the union's purpose and to the benefit of these new members. But once they join, Brazilians are dispersed and we don't have access to them to organize them. We want unions to develop Brazilian leadership inside the union, or let us do it. That's the partnership we want to develop. I don't know if the union leaders will accept that. Their priority is to get new members, not organize the existing ones." On the other hand, some activists see promise in the fact that several unions now have bilingual organizers on staff. Also, HERE has approached BIC about a possible joint effort to organize Brazilian workers in non-union hotels. One advocate comments, "HERE supported us with the [Immigrant Workers] Freedom Ride campaign before coming to ask us for anything, which is good, and makes me feel more comfortable about a partnership."

The Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride was an important opportunity for labor unions and community groups in Boston to work together. BIC's DaRocha feels that the Freedom Ride was an overwhelmingly positive experience, but MIRA has expressed reservations. Sonia Pinto-Torres, MIRA's legalization campaign coordinator, observes, "The Freedom Ride was an indication of both the stresses and benefits of working with unions. Unions have a top-down model in many ways. HERE and others made decisions from the top. Their approach to the media and legislators meant that people were told exactly what to say and how to behave. It left a bad taste in the mouth when our democratic process—our leadership development process—was hard to maintain." Yet Pinto-Torres believes that the AFL-CIO's and HERE's support for amnesty have been instrumental in pressuring national leaders to pass some kind of legalization legislation. Also, the Freedom Ride allowed each side to see that the other could mobilize its constituent base. This increased mutual respect.

These tensions emanate from the contrasting cultures of unions and community organizations and the general tendency community groups to be concerned with leadership development and therefore to be process-oriented, while unions are action-oriented and hierarchical. Luz Rodriguez, co-founder of the Center to Support Immigrant Organizing (CSIO), has worked for both community groups and organized labor. "Community groups and unions are trying to organize the same people," she points out, "but they are using different methods. Community groups want to help workers, find out what their issues are, and build trust and develop relationships before organizing them. Unions already have an agenda, and they want to involve people in those campaigns." Rodriguez believes that it is especially difficult for new immigrants to understand the union methods, which differ from those in their countries of origin. "Immigrants need time to understand how the system works in this country, to learn their rights and how to exercise them. If you tell them 'you need a union, and here is how to do it,' you send a confusing message." MIRA's Pinto-Torres observes, "Unions are much more likely to get

engaged if there is an immediate, specific objective. It is harder to engage them in the process of meeting and building a coalition. But this can be a good thing. We should be focused on achieving things and not so focused on process.”

## **2. Massachusetts Coalition for Occupational Safety and Health (MassCOSH)**

MassCOSH brings together unions, community groups and others in eastern and central Massachusetts to strengthen worker rights, increase health and safety protections, and build worker leadership. It too struggles with the action/process tensions. Director Marcy Goldstein-Gelb observes, "A union organizing drive can feel like a tornado—things have to be done quickly in order to win the election. But engaging workers in the process of organizing for health and safety can take time to document the dangerous conditions and identify possible solutions. So we're constantly working on how we can most effectively support organizing while building the capacity of workers concerned about their health and safety."

Libby Devlin at SEIU Local 615 thinks the perception that unions don't engage members enough is based on the different information that community groups and unions bring to the table about their constituents' availability. "Community groups tend to have more access to the people they work with. The time constraints of workers are dramatic," she says. "Unions have clear information about their members' constraints and we work to create a balance that fosters worker control within this time constraint. With MassCOSH we developed a very good partnership in which we achieved that balance." MassCOSH helped Local 615 develop a campaign to document the potential health and safety risks of a proposed increase in the workloads of janitors. Once the campaign got underway, the employer dropped the proposal. MassCOSH also trained an SEIU organizer who helps the union develop campaigns around health and safety issues in the various buildings janitors clean.

Another union leader highlighted the benefits of MassCOSH's process-oriented, long-term focus on leadership development. Fernando Lemus, of the United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW), which represents thousands of supermarket and warehouse workers in the Boston area, credits MassCOSH with tenacity in supporting and assisting workers even when an organizing drive fails. This enables workers to continue to fight for better workplace conditions when the union is not able to stay beyond a defeat. "So many [undocumented] workers are unprotected and afraid to come forward," Lemus says. "But MassCOSH is there, working on the ground, creating allies with nonprofits, and pushing workers to participate. They will work with [worker] groups whether there is a union there or not. They don't just drop the ball." MassCOSH also has worked with various parts of organized labor on a number of state legislative campaigns, including one on toxic substances and one on reforming the State's child labor laws.

## **3. Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO)**

Despite GBIO's successful collaborations with organized labor, its focus on process can be problematic from a union perspective. More than one union representative commented on how IAF and OLTC community groups have an established process—including accountability

sessions with public officials--that gets repetitive to participate in year after year. In addition, because of their membership structure, these community organizations are sometimes less able to respond to sudden requests for help. One labor leader said of GBIO, "They have their method and they do fabulous, deep work, but they have their process. If you want to fight quickly, they can't. Sometimes you need to move quickly. They don't have that capacity if it's not on their agenda."

Community groups and unions have found that building a relationship for the long term is a more effective way of coming together than working on a particular campaign or action. GBIO and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 615 learned this from their experience with the Justice for Janitors campaign. Local 615 has 15,000 members statewide, of whom 80% are immigrants; it represents janitors as well as some of the skilled trades in public higher education institutions. According to GBIO staff, SEIU 615 joined the organization when the union was getting ready to strike, but the two groups did not have a natural connection. For GBIO, supporting the strike was an opportunity to move beyond housing to other issues, and to tap into a new Latino constituency, but tensions arose when the union wanted GBIO leaders to pursue strike tactics, such as civil disobedience, with which the ministers of GBIO were not comfortable. The experience proved internally divisive for GBIO, yet the strike support also gave the organization a shot in the arm: leaders were trained in public action, the group got visibility, and GBIO became identified with issues beyond housing.

Staff at SEIU 615 learned from the experience as well. Rocio Saenz expressed appreciation for GBIO's role in the strike. "They took this as their issue and mobilized their religious leaders through the whole six months of the campaign. They helped us raise our issues in a different way morally. In the end, though, GBIO members' comfort level with the tactics needed to win the strike didn't match that of our members. Since ultimately we had to call the shots, this difference created some tensions." The union, however, is continuing discussions with GBIO about how to find common interests and make the relationship more integral to its ongoing work.

More broadly, SEIU 615 is now eager to represent a more progressive face of organized labor to community groups. This is a welcome turn-around for a union that had been unresponsive to its own members and their communities before being put into trusteeship. Weezy Waldstein, of the union's nonprofit arm, Voice and Future Fund, explained, "We have worked pretty hard to get to know groups with overlapping constituencies, and to figure out shared agendas. The path will be different with each organization. We can't emphasize enough how different this union is in feeling integrated into the community, and it's a powerful combination in both directions. We want to be a gateway to labor, to create a new culture within labor and continue to move away from the traditional labor mode."

#### **4. Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance (MAHA)**

In 2001, the Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance (MAHA) attempted to engage labor in its campaign for the Boston Community Preservation Act, a ballot initiative that would have leveraged up to \$28 million in state and local money for the development of affordable housing. The campaign, while ultimately unsuccessful, showed MAHA's ability to mobilize a very large

constituency: the campaign secured the endorsement of 60 nonprofit groups, gathered 43,000 signatures to get the initiative on the ballot, and garnered majority support in twelve of the city's twenty-two wards. Given labor's clout and its experience with electoral campaigns, MAHA decided early on, with encouragement and support from Hyams, that unions would need to be key allies in the fight.

MAHA was able to draw on its institutional relationship with the carpenters union, which has had a seat on MAHA's board since the alliance was established in 1985. To go beyond the carpenters, MAHA secured an introduction to Robert Haynes at the state AFL-CIO and Joe Nigro at the Greater Boston Building Trades Council through MAHA's campaign advisor, John Sasso. Haynes and Nigro both endorsed the campaign, but communication broke down in the effort to mobilize rank and file union members. MAHA Director Tom Callahan recalls, "We had good meetings with Bobby Haynes and Joe Nigro, but when we would talk to lead organizers about implementing the plan, they were not always aware of those meetings. The promises hadn't descended through the internal organization. When we got to people at the next tier down in the hierarchy, we were in trouble. They weren't being dishonest, they just had marching orders on a variety of other things."

In contrast, the carpenters union followed through on its commitment to do poll coverage, make signs, and otherwise help out. In fact, union staff member Vic Carrara and his family were featured in television ads and campaign literature. For him, the experience was very positive. "A union may want to come in and run things, but I was happy to do my part. Since our union's restructuring we have a large organizing staff, so we were able to do a lot of poll coverage. I brought my senior organizer to the meetings. At the coordinating meetings, my job was outreach, and the people around the table acknowledged the role of the carpenters in doing poll coverage. They really appreciated what we did and we really appreciated the credit they gave us."

MAHA learned that having an institutional relationship with a union made the difference. Also, the organization discovered—belatedly—that union politics could be tricky: locals don't necessarily march to the beat of the Building Trades Council or the state labor federation. Reflects Callahan, "We should have had a two-pronged strategy of reaching out to union leaders and of developing networks with rank and file union members to get them to talk it up among their peers and bring it up to their leadership. We didn't appreciate the tensions that sometimes exist between the locals and the state leadership."

MAHA anticipates working with labor on a future Community Preservation Act campaign, but is cautious about reaching out on other issues. Muses Callahan, "You could make the case that working together on smaller campaigns would make the relationship stronger, but you could also annoy each other with issues that are not core to either's self-interest. I am more concerned about the latter. We have to be strategic about when we reach out and what we ask for. We ought to think about more ways to institutionalize relationships, maybe with more unions on our board or in other ways. We would like to learn from others about how they do this."

## **Apples and Oranges**

In other parts of the country labor and community groups are grappling with issues and tensions similar to those that Boston is experiencing. Sue Chinn, formerly Executive Director at the Discount Foundation and now at the Center for Community Change, underscores a common complaint that emerges from the fundamental differences between the two types of organizations: “Community groups express frustration that labor didn’t swing its weight behind a particular position. But unions are often more democratic than community groups. They have regular elections and an elected leadership that needs to respond to its constituency or is booted out of office. Community groups don’t appreciate the fact that unions can’t turn on a dime.” Adds Janet Shenk, of the national AFL-CIO, “Labor leaders can’t spend fifty hours a week on an issue that isn’t directly related to their members. There needs to be acknowledgement that this is a positive reflection of accountability on their part.”

As these comments suggest, community organizations and unions represent very different ways of attempting to change social conditions, and when these groups come together, friction is likely. The time-consuming “process” employed by community organizations to build leadership, the seeming unwillingness of the labor union to deviate from its agenda, or the reluctance of the community group to engage in aggressive campaign tactics are among the many differences that can discourage earnest attempts at collaboration and leave both sides baffled.

Working together, as this research project indicates, requires a genuine effort on the part of both unions and community groups to understand how the other works and to develop an appreciation for the differences. Successful groups in Boston and around the country attest that the outcome is well worth the effort.

## **New Collaborations and Old Traditions: Redefining ‘Us’ and ‘Them’**

In Los Angeles, affordable housing advocates worked successfully with unions in a campaign to create a \$100 million housing trust fund. In fact, the campaign was co-chaired by the president of the labor federation. In other cities including Boston and Chicago, however, housing groups have had a hard time engaging labor in their campaigns, at least in part because the partnerships attempt to bring people together across traditional fault lines, challenging longstanding distinctions between owners and renters, landlords and tenants, management and labor, employers and employees. In efforts to address systemic issues, the importance of such dividing lines become especially salient.

### **1. Boston Tenants Coalition**

Like the Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance, the Boston Tenants Coalition (BTC) has made concerted efforts to engage organized labor in its affordable housing work. BTC is a coalition of tenant, housing, homeless, and community groups organized to protect tenants’ rights and to expand the supply of affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households in Boston. BTC has pursued labor support of its rent stabilization ordinance as well as its 10,000 Affordable Homes campaign. Its greatest success has been collaborating with SEIU 615, which, according to BTC director Kathy Brown, “has everything to do with who is in the union—low-income workers, immigrants, and renters, who are all affected by the housing crisis.” BTC participated in strike support activities and sat on the community representative board formed during the janitors’ strike. SEIU 615 has been very active in the rent regulation campaign, sending representatives to testify at hearings, speaking at press conferences, and helping strategize the campaign’s next direction. The Greater Boston Central Labor Council and AFSCME Local 1489 also endorsed the rent regulation campaign.

However, BTC faces challenges in garnering the support of other unions. Kathy Brown points to complexities generated by class issues. Adds BTC staffer Roxan McKinnon, “It boils down to economics, whether we are talking about low-income versus middle-income people who are affected. Also, there are the internal politics of unions, and differences in sensibilities—there is more progressive versus more conservative labor.” For example, BTC failed to get the support of SEIU 2020 for rent regulation, which may not be surprising given that the union has landlords in its membership. Brown believes that within the union’s leadership there were conflicting opinions about whether to endorse, but those who were opposed won out. In the case of HERE, BTC reached out but got no response, even though the union represents low-wage workers. Brown believes that with more time in the campaign, which was very brief, BTC could have won over additional labor allies.

As a result of the powerful opposition from the landlord lobby and real estate industry in the last campaign, and of collaboration with groups like ACORN that work with low-income homeowners, as well as its experiences with the unions, BTC has revised its rent stabilization proposal. Now called "Community Stabilization," the plan provides more exemptions for small property owners, and it bundles the bill with predatory lending provisions and other protections

against foreclosure that would protect small property owners, who do not stand to benefit from rent regulation alone. “The new proposal gets rid of a boundary line that people have a hard time crossing. We talk about the issues in terms of income and cost, rather than a dividing line between owners and renters,” explains Brown. The organization is also trying to find broader links between unions and renters, by reframing the labor concept of the ‘right to organize,’ to focus it both at work *and* at home. In BTC’s reasoning, just as people should have the right to organize in their workplace, they should have the right to organize in the building where they live.

Like MAHA, BTC is optimistic about increasing its collaboration with labor, despite the difficulties. Brown comments, “One problem is that BTC is focused on a single issue. I think labor collaborations are easier if you have a worker focus as part of your mission or have a broader mission altogether.” Brown notes that BTC is fortunate in having members that are multi-issue organizations like City Life/Vida Urbana (a grassroots, bilingual organization that works on affordable housing and other social justice issues) and the Chinese Progressive Association, which both have strong labor roots and relationships that can help BTC forge new relationships with labor.

## **2. The Paraprofessional Healthcare Institute**

Several recent and current Hyams grantees have entered into formal partnerships with organized labor in order to address systemic problems in a comprehensive way. The Direct Care Workers Initiative (DCWI) of the Paraprofessional Healthcare Institute (PHI) is perhaps unique among Hyams grantees in its effort to forge alliances between workers, consumers, *and* employers. The Initiative would upgrade the quality of jobs and care in the nursing home industry where workers suffer from low pay, expensive and inadequate health coverage for themselves, and limited upward mobility. Supported by a strong economy and tight labor market, PHI’s alliance initially held together and achieved some landmark gains at the state level: \$84 million to increase wages for nursing home workers, \$5 million for advanced training and career ladders, and a plan to provide health care coverage for direct care workers. PHI’s Barbara Frank recalls, “When everyone was still involved, it was amazing. We packed the State House with 500 people, there was a sea of purple SEIU shirts, provider groups were represented en masse, and consumers were out in great numbers. We had a joint statement from employers, unions and consumers, which really got legislators to listen. The victories we won have set the bar for other states.”

As the state’s fiscal situation changed and the health care system resources dried up, however, it became difficult to maintain the coalition in the face of union-employer friction. An anti-union stance by one prominent nursing home, which made it clear that it did not value a union presence among its workforce, caused the union participants to leave the initiative in all but name. Since then, Frank has begun working directly with workers, both union and non-union, but she continues to look for opportunities to rebuild trust with the union partners and re-engage them in a meaningful way. “SEIU 2020 is cautious but open,” Frank reports. “For example, they recently spoke in common cause with employers at the State House about the need for health insurance. It has taken years to get back to this level of cooperation.”

The Direct Care Workers Initiative is a cautionary tale of the challenges inherent in a collaboration that requires cooperation between entities whose interests often compete. Bringing employers and unions together yielded powerful results at the State Legislature; but such an unusual alliance is clearly very fragile. Unions continue to organize the health care workforce and demand better wages and working conditions, while employers continue to seek a better bottom line. One state labor representative observes, “There have always been some challenges in working with community groups because we do represent a different constituency and ultimately a different agenda. Our institutional needs may not jive with those of a community campaign. This was definitely the case with the PHI initiative. We are both working to strengthen the role of the worker and improve wages, but they are more open to assuaging the employer. That wasn’t something we wanted or needed to do.”

Frank cautions that attempting this kind of collaboration without ensuring careful facilitation is risky. Yet she believes that the benefit of helping different stakeholders see each other’s perspective is vital. “In the best of worlds people learn from each other. You are constantly helping people hear each other. There is a lot of truth in the room, but there is no one truth. If you deal only with a narrow version of the truth, you are going to produce only a narrow solution.”

### **3. Skillworks**

Another collaboration involving community groups, organized labor, and employers is underway in the workforce development arena. Skillworks is a multimillion dollar public-private collaborative that seeks to benefit both workers and employers by generating family-supporting jobs and career ladders for low-income workers, higher skills in the workforce, greater resources for education and training, increased capacity for workforce development practitioners, and improved workforce development public policies. Two Hyams grantees, the Organizing and Leadership Training Center (OLTC) and the Women’s Educational and Industrial Union (The Women’s Union), are partnering with the state AFL-CIO and the Massachusetts Workforce Board Association on the public policy component of the initiative.

The BDWI policy partnership has already yielded some success. In 2003, the State Legislature approved (and overrode the Governor’s veto to preserve) \$6.5 million earmarked for a variety of industry-, union- and community-based programs to provide an estimated 1,500 workers with training needed for better paying jobs. Based on their experience to date, the community groups and their labor partners express optimism about the initiative, tempered by pragmatism. Mary Lassen, executive director of The Women’s Union, observes, “We have had some very clear, ‘put things on the table’ discussions so that we know exactly where everyone stands and can begin figuring out where we can build unity. There has to be some give and take on both sides. If that isn’t recognized, then things won’t go very far.” For Lassen, the success of working with labor comes down to two fundamental things, good personal relationships based on trust and respect, and the ability to deliver people, resources and capacity. “It is not about being nice but about being able to deliver. That is how unions see the world, but it goes both ways. A good idea won’t go very far without people and resources.”

The state AFL-CIO seems prepared to deal with the inherent challenges. Observes one state labor representative, “We also represent the public employees who are in the workforce development system, so while we may all want to advocate to change the system, we don’t want to throw the baby out with the bath water. We have a more delicate road to walk.” From this perspective, potentially divergent self-interests may require that at certain points in the process, the state labor federation will have to approach the advocacy effort more cautiously. Yet the labor representative is unequivocal about the importance of labor-community group collaboration: “We are all one step away from each other—the unemployed—the low-wage worker—the unionized worker. We are different institutions on a very short continuum. Our campaigns have a better chance of succeeding, and people have more possibility for transforming themselves, through developing working relationships with people who are not like ourselves.”

## Some Advice

Hyams grantees and labor organizations interviewed for this report offered a number of pointers, along with a great deal of encouragement, to community groups and labor unions interested in working together:

- **Do thorough research first.**

Community groups should begin by mapping the union landscape, ideally with the help of a knowledgeable ally. The state AFL-CIO is willing to be an entry point to labor for groups seeking guidance, and SEIU 615 also sees itself as a gateway to organized labor. By becoming familiar with the various union locals, as well as the Central Labor Council (CLC) and the state federation, a group can target the unions most likely to be receptive to its concerns.

One union staffer advises groups to look for union leaders who are “counter-cultural,” have vision, and want to shift the balance of power in society. The considerable crossover in staff between unions and community groups means that there are people who have worked in both worlds who can help build bridges.

OLTC’s Lew Finfer cautions against “assuming that certain unions (say, the service sector unions) are always progressive, and that others (the building trades) are always conservative.”

It also helps to understand clearly how the local unions relate to the Central Labor Council and state AFL-CIO. Not all locals are members of the state federation or of the CLC. Even if a local is a member, the state and local councils cannot compel a union to work on a particular issue. It helps to know which issues are likely to be a priority for labor, and not to approach labor on every single issue a group works on.

- **Be patient and persistent.**

It takes time to make the right connections and build relationships. Lisa Clauson at ACORN advises others to be persistent with labor: keep calling until you finally get someone to talk with you. Weezy Waldstein advises staying in regular, ongoing contact so you can readily find points of mutual interest. Others say it is necessary to understand the other side’s self-interest, and clearly articulate your own, and avoid hidden agendas. Realize that you may not agree on every issue or be on the same side of every campaign. Going to union or community events, meetings and activities routinely will help a community group or union better understand and become familiar with the people and issues on the other side. If your community group is reaching out to a union, look for members of that union within your own membership or constituency. Demonstrate to the union that your people are union people and that all are part of the same community.

- **Focus on building and maintaining the relationship.**

Lew Finfer asserts that a combination of interest, creativity, political thoughtfulness, and some risk-taking on both sides are prerequisites for building a relationship. It helps to have dedicated and diverse staff that may be better able to relate to diverse leadership within a union or community group.

Institutionalizing the relationship, for example with formal board representation or membership dues, can help build the connections but does not guarantee a strong collaboration in and of itself. Community group and union leaders all stress that you have to prove yourself to earn mutual respect. Follow through on commitments and show support for other labor or community causes.

- **Engage in joint campaign work with clear expectations.**

Experience shows that a union should not expect help from a community group, or vice versa, once a campaign is in full swing. It is far better to bring allies into the planning and strategizing early so that they understand and are committed to the campaign effort.

For community groups, it is important to develop relationships at all different levels of organized labor. A group cannot expect labor to deliver if rank and file is not engaged; nor should it rely on the state federation leadership or even a union local's leadership to carry the water (even though they may be gatekeepers).

Some argue that a joint campaign is the best way to build a relationship. Monica Halas at Greater Boston Legal Services, and a vice president of the State AFL-CIO, says, "What has been the most effective is very concrete projects that people can converge around," like the living wage and minimum wage campaigns. On the other hand, it is clear that doing joint campaign work alone may not in and of itself deepen the relationship. Says Jeff Crosby at IUE Local 201, "Build a strategic relationship, not a momentary convergence of interests."

## **Recommendations: The Role of the Hyams Foundation in Fostering Collaboration**

Everyone interviewed for this report agreed that the Hyams Foundation plays a critical role in supporting collaboration between community groups and organized labor. Individuals offered the following suggestions to the Foundation:

- **Continue encouraging these collaborations.**

Many grantees expressed their appreciation for the role that Hyams, and Henry Allen in particular, plays not only in supporting but also challenging grantees to think about where labor fits into their goals and strategies. Organized labor also values the role Hyams plays, noting that some union locals have an uneven history and the Foundation can be a legitimizing voice in Boston for organized labor when it is clearly committed to working collaboratively with community-based organizations. Hyams can reassure grantees (and others) that it is appropriate and valuable to work with labor, and can help grantees see what the union connection to their issue might be.

- **Provide additional resources to support community-labor collaboration.**

Both community groups and unions talked about how challenging it is to build and maintain relationships in an under-resourced environment. Several people urged Hyams to provide funding in addition to current grants to help unions and community groups (at least those with a track record of producing) to staff these relationships. Kathy Casavant comments, “Unless those [staff] people are in place and there is a consistent relationship and discussion, the collaboration won’t happen.”

- **Proceed with caution in funding unions.**

Several grantees and unions asked Hyams to consider funding labor (501)(c)(3)'s directly, as well as community groups. However, given the concern a few grantees (particularly immigrant groups) expressed about competition for philanthropic resources, this idea should be explored cautiously. Says one immigrant rights organizer, “The only thing I still worry about is when unions build worker centers and take foundation money. Unions say they will not compete for the same resources, but it’s inevitable.”

- **Help grantees map the union landscape.**

Clearly some community groups have done a better job than others of figuring out who in labor is receptive to collaboration, who can open doors, and who can deliver victories. Hyams can facilitate the sharing of this kind of knowledge and connect groups to those in labor who have offered to help, such as Kathy Casavant and Sandy Felder (national representative of the AFL-CIO in Massachusetts). It can also share “best practices” for

working together. One community organizer said, “Strategic leveraging of Hyams’ relationships with labor would be helpful in encouraging a union person to sit down with me.” Hyams also can help unions better understand and navigate the world of community-based organizations.

- **Help grantees and unions resolve difficulties.**

Several grantees suggested that Hyams engage in diplomatic work or create the venue to help resolve specific tensions such as those between housing groups and the building trades, or between private child-care providers and teachers. Roxanne McKinnon at BTC suggests, “Issue mapping would be really interesting -- to clarify where issues overlap and where there is antagonism, and to see where there is potential for compromise, collaboration, and coordination of political strategies.” One union person urged Hyams to “fund efforts that move a common agenda, rather than ones that put people in conflict with each other, such as affordable housing development issues.”

- **Don’t force collaboration by dangling money.**

Some grantees said that using resources to bring people to the table may not result in building meaningful relationships, and that organic efforts to collaborate should be supported instead. On the other hand, some labor people believe there is value in using formal partnerships to bring the two constituencies together.

- **Convene grantees and labor partners.**

Several grantees as well as labor representatives expressed a desire to share experiences and learn from each other’s collaborative efforts, including what makes for an effective collaboration. A few offered to assist Hyams in pulling such a meeting together. There were some exceptions, with grantees who felt that such meetings are not as useful as making the individual connections with union people.

- **Explore new opportunities for collaboration.**

Several union people spoke about the potential to create a research and policy arm for community groups and labor unions similar to the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE) and the San Jose-based Working Partnerships USA. As this concept is in the formative stage, Hyams can play a valuable role by ensuring community group involvement from the outset.

Other interviewees suggested that Hyams facilitate some practical discussions about how community groups and unions can combine resources to address unmet needs in communities where their geography overlaps. For example, union computer training

centers might be used for after-school homework clinics. Joint citizenship classes were another suggestion.

- **Continue educating other funders.**

Many grantees urged the Foundation to continue educating funders about the changing role of organized labor and the power of unions to support the work of community groups. One grantee suggested Hyams share this report with other funders and host a forum for funders to highlight the value of these relationships.

Grantees agreed that the Hyams Foundation has a great deal to show for its investment in community and labor collaboration. However, the experiences described in this report indicate great potential not only for more collaboration but also for more *effective* collaboration, with help from Hyams. To cite just one example, with regard to immigrant worker issues there is tremendous momentum coming from several directions, creating the potential not only to improve workplace conditions and wages but also to enact public policies that level the playing field for undocumented workers.

In addition, given the lack of affordable housing in Boston for low-income families, alliances between housing groups and labor unions clearly warrant further exploration.

Meanwhile, in the current economic and political climate, basic economic issues common to community groups and unions need more support than ever.

Finally, Hyams should consider ways to expand its leadership role in the larger philanthropic community. There is a widespread need to educate funders about the positive role that the labor movement can play in supporting economic and social justice goals shared by community-based organizations.

## **Appendix I: Interviewees**

### **Background**

Susan Chinn, Discount Foundation  
Regina McGraw, Wieboldt Foundation  
Michele Prichard, Liberty Hill Foundation  
Janet Shenk, National AFL-CIO

### **Grantees**

Kathy Brown and Roxan McKinnon, Boston Tenants Coalition (BTC)  
Lisa Clauson, Massachusetts ACORN  
Cheri Andes, Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO)  
Lew Finfer, Organizing and Leadership Training Center (OLTC)  
Marcy Goldstein-Gelb, Massachusetts Coalition for Occupational Safety and Health (MassCOSH)  
Harris Gruman, Neighbor to Neighbor (N2N)  
Tom Callahan, Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance (MAHA)  
Fausto DaRocha, Brazilian Immigrant Center (BIC)  
Ali Noorani and Sonia Pinto-Torres, Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA)  
Mary Lassen, The Women's Union  
Barbara Frank, Paraprofessional Healthcare Institute (PHI)  
Weezy Waldstein, Director, Voice and Future Fund (affiliated with SEIU 615)  
Monica Halas, Greater Boston Legal Services (GBLS)  
Luz Rodriguez, Center to Support Immigrant Organizing

### **Labor**

Sandy Felder, national AFL-CIO  
Kathy Casavant, Secretary/Treasurer, Massachusetts AFL-CIO  
Robert Haynes, President, Massachusetts AFL-CIO  
FayeRuth Fisher, former Legislative Coordinator, Massachusetts AFL-CIO  
Harneen Chernow, Director of Education and Training, Massachusetts AFL-CIO  
Rich Rogers, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Greater Boston Central Labor Council  
Andi Mullin, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Council 93  
Richard Stutman, President, Boston Teachers Union  
Enid Eckstein, Organizing Director, Service Employees International Union (SEIU) 509  
Rocio Saenz, President, SEIU Local 615  
Libby Devlin, SEIU Local 615  
Frank Santafe, Carpenters Union  
Vic Carrara, Carpenters Union  
Jim Snow, Director of Organizing, International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades (IBPAT) District Council 35  
Celia Wcislo, Director, SEIU Local 2020  
Mike Fadel, Organizing Director, SEIU Local 2020  
Jeff Crosby, President, International Union of Electrical Workers/Communication Workers of America (IUE/CWA) Local 201 (Lynn)  
Fernando Lemus, Business Agent, United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW) Local 1445

## Appendix II: Grantees and Their Labor Allies in Boston

*Note: This list is intended as illustrative, not exhaustive. Grantees may have relationships with other labor organizations as well.*

ACORN	Mass. AFL-CIO, Greater Boston Labor Council, Boston Teachers Union, SEIU Local 925, SEIU Local 3
Boston Tenants Coalition (BTC)	SEIU 615, Greater Boston Labor Council, AFSCME Local 1489, SEIU 2020
Brazilian Immigrant Center (BIC)	International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades (IBPAT) District Council 35, SEIU 615, UNITE, Teamsters Local 25, UFCW Local 1445, HERE Local 26, Carpenters Union
Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO)	SEIU Local 509, SEIU Local 615, SEIU Local 2020, Mass. AFL-CIO
Massachusetts Coalition for Occupational Safety and Health (MassCOSH)	SEIU 615, UFCW Local 1445, SEIU 2020, Bus Drivers Local 8761, Mass. AFL-CIO, Greater Boston Labor Council
Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance (MAHA)	Mass. AFL-CIO, Boston Building Trades Council, SEIU 2020, Carpenters Union
Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA)	Mass. AFL-CIO, SEIU 615, Teamsters Local 25, HERE Local 26, International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades (IBPAT) District Council 35
Neighbor to Neighbor (N2N)	AFSCME Council 93, Mass. AFL – CIO, MTA, SEIU 2020, SEIU 509, Boston Building Trades Council, Mass. Federation of Teachers
Organizing and Leadership Training Center and Essex County Community Organization in Lynn. (GBIO is also a member of OLTC)	Mass. AFL-CIO, International Union of Electrical Workers Local 201 and North Shore Labor Council (Lynn)
PHI Direct Care Workers Initiative	SEIU Local 2020
Women’s Educational and Industrial Union	SEIU Local 2020, Mass. AFL-CIO
Greater Boston Legal Services	Mass. AFL-CIO; Greater Boston Central Labor Council
Center to Support Immigrant Organizing	Mass. AFL-CIO; SEIU Local 615