

YOUTH MANDATE

THE SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS TOOLKIT

FOR 501(C)(3) ORGANIZATIONS

HOW YOUNG PEOPLE CAN BUILD POWER THROUGH SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS





ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This toolkit was written by Kate Hamaji (CPD), Kate Terenzi (CPD), and Lynn Zhong (former CPD intern) – with research support from Abby Ang (CPD) and Eli Vitulli (CPD). Many thanks to Cendi Trujillo Tena (Leaders Igniting Transformation) and Sandra Hernández-Lomelí (Latinos Unidos Siempre) for their contributions to the case studies and tools featured in this toolkit.



The Youth Mandate for Education and Liberation: A Mandate to Guide Us From Crisis to Liberation, written by youth led groups in the Center For Popular Democracy's network, and endorsed by nearly 200 organizations and thousands of individuals, demands that officials at all levels of government fund education, not incarceration, restore and strengthen young people's civil rights in education, uplift public education and end the private takeover of schools.



The Center for Popular Democracy is a nonprofit organization that promotes equity, opportunity, and a dynamic democracy in partnership with innovative base-building organizations, organizing networks and alliances, and progressive unions across the country. www.populardemocracy.org



Race Forward is a national non-profit organization that works towards building a just, multiracial, democratic society, free from oppression and exploitation, in which all people, including people of color, thrive with power and purpose.

INTRODUCTION

In the era of COVID-19 and following the 2020 wave of nationwide uprisings contesting white supremacy, United States politics have grown increasingly polarized at every level of government.¹ Communities across the country are waging battles along partisan and ideological lines, from debates over public health measures, such as mask-wearing and vaccines, to whether to teach young people the truth about this country's legacy of enduring systemic racism or "critical race theory" and the need for police free schools. While there are limited opportunities for engagement on these issues at the national level, many community members have sought opportunities to engage in local politics. As a result, school boards – the most local and easily accessible form of government – have become sites of intense political and cultural debate.²

Indeed, the country has seen a recent flurry of engagement in school board races and increased scrutiny over election outcomes. A recent analysis by Ballotpedia identified at least 84 attempted school board recalls against 215 board members in 2021 – a significant increase from any other year since at least 2009.³ However, while school board activity has intensified since 2020, local activism in school board politics is not a new phenomenon. Since the 1950s, school board politics have proven meaningful to Black and Brown communities as they organize to dismantle white supremacy and fight for education justice in their communities.

At this moment, with heightened levels of community engagement in school boards across the country, there are viable opportunities for young people, parents, and community members to participate in this critical site of local power and uplift their issues through the electoral process. The communities already building their participation in school board advocacy are demanding that school board members address how Black and Brown young people face harm in schools (including the racist and punitive school discipline policies and the presence of police and security in schools). They are calling on school board members to align with their bold vision for a liberatory education system based on inclusion, equity, and racial justice principles.



ABOUT THIS TOOLKIT



This toolkit provides a historical snapshot of how communities have engaged in school board elections, current context on the forces at play in school board elections, and case studies of school board election campaigns run by grassroots organizations.

Finally, this toolkit provides community organizers with resources to successfully participate in school board races and uplift the issues that matter the most to them – including:

YOUTH PLATFORM FOR EDUCATION AND LIBERATION

CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

CANDIDATE DEBATES OR FORUM AGENDAS AND MATERIALS

CAMPAIGN PLANNING TOOLS AND MORE

BACKGROUND

School boards: a historical locus of Black and Brown organizing

While the country has seen a wave of renewed activity in school board politics in recent years, school boards have been central to Black and Brown-led organizing efforts for racial justice in education since at least the 1950s.

White school boards and resistance to racial desegregation

In 1954, the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision deemed racial segregation in schools unconstitutional,⁴ spurring a wave of racist backlash.⁵ White school board officials in many districts across the country used every available tactic to prevent desegregation and maintain control of schools. A primary strategy many school boards employed to maintain racial segregation was instituting “freedom of choice” plans—used in about 90 percent of southern districts—in which students were automatically re-enrolled in their segregated schools unless they opted to change enrollment.⁶ “Freedom of choice” effectively maintained the status quo of racial segregation by putting the onus on individual Black families to enter all-white schools, risking discrimination, harassment, and violence.⁷ In addition, white school boards, superintendents, and state elected officials pushed hundreds of Black teachers and administrators out of their jobs in the first decade following the *Brown* decision.⁸

Black educators commonly learned that school boards did not renew their teaching contracts— or they were demoted, pushed into positions outside of their discipline or training, and eventually fired—without merit.⁹ Their positions were then filled by white teachers.¹⁰ In addition, when schools integrated, it was primarily Black schools that closed, pushing Black teachers and school principals out of their jobs en masse.¹¹

Another tactic that white school boards employed was to construct new Black schools as part of an effort to thwart calls for integration by disputing claims that Black schools were underfunded. When the federal courts forced school districts to develop new desegregation plans, white school boards closed these Black schools, creating massive job loss for Black educators and administrators.¹²

It was not until the 1968 Supreme Court decision, *Green v. New Kent County*, that the federal government required districts to develop more effective desegregation plans.¹³ “Freedom of choice” plans and other desegregation efforts which effectively maintained the status quo would no longer suffice.¹⁴

Ultimately, the *Brown* decision led to a wave of racist backlash by local school boards.

In response, organizing among Black and Brown communities for local control of schools and school boards skyrocketed.

BLACK AND BROWN ORGANIZING FOR LOCAL CONTROL

In response to such systemically racist efforts to fight desegregation, Black communities began organizing for local control of school boards. In the 1960s, Kwame Ture (then known as Stokely Carmichael) popularized the call for Black Power and the movement for self-determination,¹⁵ calling for full participation in decision-making processes affecting Black people.¹⁶ **This fight for self-determination included a fight for control at the school district level.**¹⁷

Beginning in the 1950s and 60s, enrollment in several large city school systems became majority Black. Black voters exercised their political power, winning school board victories over white leaders and political groups. By the 1970s, many of these school districts also had majority Black school boards and superintendents.¹⁸ During this time, public schools were some of the first institutions in which Black people held formal leadership roles, such as principal and superintendent, before moving into political roles, such as mayor. They also served as major centers of Black employment and sites for organizing around social and political issues impacting Black communities.¹⁹

Fighting for representation on Arkansas school boards

To take control of school boards, Black communities required political power, which necessitated the mobilization of voters and the defense of voting rights. In the early 1960s, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) organizers gathered in Arkansas to fight for racial desegregation and to build Black voting power.²⁰ By 1964, mainly due to SNCC's organizing, the percentage of Black citizens registered to vote increased from 34 to 49, despite fervent white intimidation and violence.²¹

Faced with continued resistance to desegregation in districts across Arkansas—including continued segregation via “freedom of choice plans” and violent backlash against those that sought to integrate²²--SNCC fought to gain more control of the educational process. **In 1965, the same summer that the Voting Rights Act became law, SNCC organizers vied for political power through their support of school board candidates.** They encouraged local women to join the Women Voter's League to prepare for upcoming school elections and supported the campaigns of **30 Black community candidates** running for school board elections.²³

As a result of harassment and intimidation, 29 out of the 30 Black candidates lost in the 1965 Arkansas elections.²⁴ Nevertheless, these efforts raised political consciousness and laid a foundation for organizing in years to come.²⁵

FIGHTING FOR LOCAL CONTROL OF SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK CITY



Black and Brown communities also fought for meaningful desegregation by directly taking control of schools. In the fall of 1966, Black and Puerto Rican parents in Harlem, New York, boycotted Intermediate School 201 (I.S. 201), demanding that the school be racially integrated or have control handed over to them. This action inspired school boycotts across the city and quickly popularized the idea of community control of schools.²⁶

In December 1966, an Ocean Hill-Brownsville school board hearing at the Board of Education's headquarters turned into a sit-in, during which occupiers formed the "People's Board of Education" and began taking testimony on school conditions. The occupation culminated in the passage of a resolution calling for community control of education in New York.²⁷

Facing increasing public pressure, in 1967, the NYC Board of Education agreed to experiment with three sites of "demonstration districts," which allowed for greater community control of schools.²⁸ Three communities in East Harlem, Ocean Hill-Brownsville (Brooklyn), and Two Bridges (near Chinatown and the Lower East Side) won greater power to determine school policy, design curriculum, and choose administrators themselves.²⁹

In 1969, following intense backlash to community control that utilized white fear from those who wished to maintain the status quo, New York State passed a new "decentralization" bill, giving the city 30 elected school boards with limited control over their schools.³⁰ While "decentralization" sounds like it would promote community control, the bill effectively ended community control established in the experimental "demonstration" districts.³¹

After the end of community control, school board membership showed dramatically less representation among public school parents and people of color.³²



The NYC demonstration districts exemplified the profound potential of community-controlled schools.

In a few years, NYC schools under community control saw increases in Black and Brown supervisor personnel, empowering environments that created innovative programs, better connections between parents and schools, and increased academic success for students.³³

The popularity of community control grew and evolved outside of New York, in cities such as Detroit, Los Angeles, and Washington D.C., among others.³⁴



RIGHTWING TAKEOVER OF SCHOOL BOARDS

While Black and Brown communities have sought control of school boards as a way to fight for racial justice in the education system, so too have right-wing religious, corporate, and law enforcement actors to advance their agendas.

In the 1990s, the religious far-right began battling out “culture war” issues (such as sex education, prayer, creationism, and LGBTQ policies) with unprecedented intensity at the school board level.³⁵ Conservative Christian parents and political groups began aligning to take control of school boards—fights that were local in geography but reflective of national ideological battles.³⁶ In 1990, for example, 58 religion-right candidates won school board and municipal elections throughout San Diego county. Meanwhile, in 1992 New York City, the 450,000-member Christian Coalition, in partnership with the Catholic diocese, successfully organized to put dozens of their candidates in school board seats.³⁷

In the early 2000s, national networks led by wealthy, conservative billionaires began more systematically influencing school board elections to advance neoliberal causes, such as the privatization of public education.³⁸ In conjunction with cash-flush political advocacy groups and political action committees,³⁹ billionaires like Michael Bloomberg⁴⁰ and the Koch brothers⁴¹ have poured money into school board elections to undermine public education

in favor of privatization.⁴² Charter enrollment increased significantly, from 1.2 million students in 2006–07 to about 3.1 million in 2016–17.⁴³ Notably, 99.6% of students in New Orleans attend a charter school⁴⁴—a byproduct of decisions made by charter-funded Orleans Public School Board members after Hurricane Katrina.⁴⁵

More recently, far-right organizations have identified school boards as essential to winning ideological battles over Critical Race Theory (CRT) and, thus, how race is understood and discussed in this country. In his podcast in May of 2022, former Trump advisor Steve Bannon blatantly stated, “The path to save the nation is very simple—it’s going to go through the school boards.”⁴⁶ Indeed, NBC News has documented at least 165 organizations around the country that are mobilizing parents and communities to protest the teaching of CRT⁴⁷--even though CRT is a method of examination taught in higher education and not at the K–12 level.⁴⁸ Moreover, legislation banning CRT is often passed at the state level, not at the local level.⁴⁹ Many of these organizations are part of the far-right and are formed and funded by corporate or political sponsors.⁵⁰ For instance, right-wing Citizens Renewing America (a national organization led by former Trump administrator Russ Vought) published a toolkit that became a playbook for many of these groups and includes guidance on how to “win back” school boards.⁵¹

In the winter of 2021, far-right organizations like the Heritage Foundation and the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) held webinars denouncing CRT in schools.⁵² Turning Point USA, founded by radical right-wing activist Charlie Kirk, developed a “School Board Watchlist” that “exposes” school board leadership that supports, among other things, CRT and encourages supporters to get involved in local school board races.⁵³

Across the country in 2021, there were candidates in 76 school districts who highlighted race in education or CRT,⁵⁴ alongside attempted recalls of many more candidates.⁵⁵ Candidates who ran against CRT performed well in their school board races, and many won. For example, about three-fourths of the 58 candidates endorsed by the 1776 Project PAC, which focuses on banning the teaching of CRT, won local school board races.⁵⁶

Besides individual wins, the impacts of CRT debates are significant and widespread.⁵⁷ School board seats are often a launching pad for individuals with higher political aspirations,⁵⁸ and thus school board races are essential to contest political power in the country. In addition, many predict a “chilling effect” on school board members who may shy away from addressing racism in their schools for fear of being labeled divisive. The issue of race in education will likely continue to be a significant issue in 2022 school board races and beyond.⁵⁹



LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY IN SCHOOL BOARD RACES

For decades, communities across the country have demanded that their cities reallocate funding from police to community needs and remove police from schools. These campaigns gained significant national attention in 2020. In many places, police groups have reacted by backing and donating to pro-police candidates – continuing law enforcement’s consistent history of involvement in state and local races to advance a pro-policing agenda. Between 2015 and 2020, law enforcement PACs donated nearly \$15 million to state and local elected officials—both Democrats and Republicans.⁶⁰

A recent example of police influence in school board elections was the 2021 La Crosse (Wisconsin) School Board race. Assistant Police Chief Robert Abraham won a seat on the school board after 30 years in the La Crosse Police Department.⁶¹ Abraham received significant campaign donations from two Republican organizations—in a nonpartisan race⁶²—at a moment when the school district and board were debating whether or not to keep police stationed in La Crosse schools.⁶³ Abraham had previously come out against ending the \$250,000 contract to have police in schools.⁶⁴

In other recent races around the country, police officer associations have backed and donated to pro-police candidates following the 2020 uprisings. For example, in 2021, some candidates backed by the Nassau and Suffolk County (New York) police unions were elected to the Smithtown school board, following calls from a thousand Smithtown school district students and residents demanding more racial diversity in the district’s curriculum.⁶⁵ In another 2021 Socorro Independent School District race in El Paso, Texas, a former police officer received campaign contributions from the El Paso Municipal Police Officers Association and the El Paso Sheriff’s Officers Association. The police officers union also donated to a candidate who was formerly a Border Patrol agent.⁶⁶

THE PRESENT: LOCAL COMMUNITIES FIGHT BACK

As public school segregation and disinvestment have continued and worsened in some areas since the post-*Brown* era,⁶⁷ local communities are even more committed to engaging in these critical local elections. Youth-led community organizations are calling on school boards to remove police from schools and reinvest in the comprehensive support systems and services students need to be healthy and safe.⁶⁸

These victories are possible with increased voter engagement and mobilization around school board elections. Historically, school board elections have seen strikingly-low turnout rates. For example, in 2012, in approximately 240 school board elections in Arkansas, *less than one percent* of eligible voters turned out to vote.⁶⁹ In 2015, “more than half of over 1,528 open school board seats in New Jersey had either one or no candidates on the ballot.”⁷⁰ In 2020, the National School Boards Association reported that turnout for school board elections often falls in the five-to-ten percent range.⁷¹

Voter turnout for school board elections is often lower than for top-of-the-ticket races, such as Presidential elections. In 2020, turnout was only 33% in the school board elections for Clarke County, Nevada, compared to 74% for top-of-the-ticket races. That same year in Orange County, Florida, turnout for school board seats was only 34%, compared to 75% for top-of-the-ticket races. Some of the races in Nevada and Florida were decided by slim margins. For example, the 2020 District C election in Clark County, Nevada, was decided by a six percent margin of victory (or about 4,500 votes). The 2020 District 5 election in Orange County, Florida, was decided by a 6.6% margin of victory (or about 4,000 votes). In these cases, especially, modest increases in voter turnout would change the dynamics of the race.⁷²

Voter turnout in local elections is also typically skewed in favor of voters who are white, older, and more affluent than the full voting-age population.⁷³ In a recent study of voters and students in four states, researchers found that school board voters are whiter and more affluent than the public school student body.⁷⁴ As a result, school board members are often wealthier and whiter than the districts they represent.⁷⁵ **In two-thirds of the sample, primarily white voters determined the school board election outcomes of school districts populated predominantly by students of color.**⁷⁶ The study also found that school districts facing the most considerable differences in academic outcomes between white students and students of color are those where voters look least like the public school student body.⁷⁷

Increasing voter turnout and closing the voting participation gap between older voters and younger voters – who tend to be less white and affluent than older voters⁷⁸ – would result in school boards that are more representative and responsive to the needs of young people.

WHEN STRATEGIZING ABOUT HOW TO INCREASE VOTER PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS, YOUNG PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES HAVE CONSIDERED THE FOLLOWING:

Base Building:

Growing a base of voters that support the issues that matter the most to young people for their schools, then returning to those voters closer to the election to remind them to vote.

Understanding your turnout goals:

Consider the organization's capacity and how to use that capacity to increase voter turnout most effectively. Setting weekly and monthly goals can help the organization plan and create events or strategies to mobilize the most people to the polls.

Coalition Building:

Forge partnerships, including (where possible) with teachers' unions and other groups with impactful reach on education justice issues or throughout the school community. Parents, youth, educators, and other school employees may be motivated to participate in school board elections that directly impact their lives.

Turnout Strategy:

Make a plan to increase turnout among underrepresented constituencies such as young people and people of color.

EXAMPLE: STUDENTS IN OAKLAND WINNING VOTING RIGHTS IN SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS

In 2020, Oakland students organized to hold their representatives accountable after years of budget cuts that were destroying student programs and services -- particularly those that supported vulnerable students (restorative justice programs, foster care case managers, and a support program for Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) youth).⁷⁹ Although young people had continuously shown up at school board meetings and mobilized to make their demands known, school board members routinely ignored them. It became clear that students needed another lever of power to influence school board members: the power to vote.⁸⁰

A coalition of Oakland students, Oakland Kids First (OKF), and partner organizations testified, wrote letters, drafted legislation, and secured 300 endorsements before garnering enough support from City Council for a resolution to put the youth vote on the ballot.⁸¹ They then won the passage of Measure QQ, a ballot measure granting 16- and 17-year-olds the right to vote in school board elections.⁸²



CASE STUDY: LEADERS IGNITING TRANSFORMATION ACTION FUND (LIT AF) IN MILWAUKEE AND LA CROSSE, WISCONSIN

Leaders Igniting Transformation Action Fund (LIT AF) is a Black and Brown-led organization that organizes young people in Wisconsin to build independent political power for social, racial, and economic justice. In 2019, a year after it was founded, LIT AF decided to become involved in school board organizing -- based on their assessment of school board members as much more accessible than state and federal elected officials. Additionally, given conservative state politics in Wisconsin, greater wins have been possible at the school board level than at the state level. School board members also directly impact the district budget and policies in schools and possess a significant amount of power that can translate to tangible impacts for LIT AF's communities. Since becoming involved in school board organizing, LIT AF has not endorsed any particular school board candidate because they believe that, regardless of who is in office, all electeds will need to be held accountable.

Typically, LIT AF's election work ramps up in the late fall when candidates announce their intention to run. LIT AF then begins to map out a timeline for when it will hold candidate interviews, identify other organizations that align with their values to partner with, and work with students to develop questionnaires for candidates. Depending on the year and if they deem particular referendums or initiatives as organizational priorities, LIT AF may hire a canvass team to do community outreach. LIT AF also uses creative digital advocacy to reach young people and keep them informed. One year LIT AF created "Tinder" profiles for candidates and asked young people to either swipe right or left on them based on their commitment to young people's issues.

LIT AF first began organizing school board members during the 2019 Milwaukee school board election. That year, LIT AF held public forums and conducted interviews with candidates. Through the Youth Power Agenda, they described the changes LIT AF's members envisioned in Milwaukee Public Schools. Nine candidates expressed their alignment with LIT AF's **agenda**, but only one candidate publicly endorsed the platform when asked. LIT AF then **birddogged** the candidates at a subsequent forum and effectively pressured *all* nine candidates to endorse their platform. However, during the next budget season, LIT AF suffered a disappointment when none of the newly-elected school board members agreed to decrease the school police budget -- despite this being a core principle of the Youth Power Agenda they had endorsed. LIT AF responded by taking **direct action** at a subsequent board hearing. Afterward, one of the board members introduced an amendment to reduce the policing budget by \$600,000 and reinvest those resources into mental health resources for students.

After this success, LIT AF received significant backlash from the then-board president, who prohibited their organizers from entering Milwaukee Public Schools in the fall when school began. However, LIT AF leveraged relationships developed with other board members through organizing (including the board's vice president, who was close to the board president) to influence non-supportive board members. Due mainly to LIT AF's relationship with the vice president – cultivated through several meetings, attending school board hearings, and advocacy on a range of important issues – the board president went from blacklisting LIT AF to becoming a strong LIT AF supporter by the end of his term. This relationship-building would not have been possible without LIT AF's early and consistent organizing of school board members before they had even won their seats on the board.

2020 proved itself as another significant year for LIT AF's school board organizing -- as voters approved a referendum to infuse \$87 million into Milwaukee Public Schools. LIT AF strongly supported this referendum and hired a canvass team to encourage voters to turn out to vote in its favor.

That same year, the school board passed a resolution to end their contract with the Milwaukee Police Department.

Additionally, the resolution directed the superintendent to end all contracts to buy new or maintain old metal detectors, facial recognition software, and social media monitoring software.⁸³ In the meetings leading up to the resolution's passage, two school board members attempted to weaken provisions around metal detectors. However, the resolution's authors stood their ground, undoubtedly feeling public pressure due to the nearly 900 people that LIT AF helped organize to testify on the topic. Additionally, some members referenced the stories that LIT AF members shared during previous board meetings, and a report LIT AF published detailing the harms of the school-to-prison-and-deportation pipeline. The very language in the resolution was thanks to LIT AF's organizing and partnership with CPD, as each provision originated from the National **Youth Mandate** and LIT AF's Youth Power Agenda demands, which became a **model resolution** for other cities to use as well.

In 2021, LIT AF continued to organize school board races in Milwaukee and La Crosse. In La Crosse, LIT AF held a successful candidate forum where five out of six candidates attended, canvassed before the day of the election, and made calls to voters – resulting in the election of three progressive school board candidates. In 2022, LIT AF will focus energy on La Crosse, where school board races are now garnering attention. In 2022, LIT AF held its first statewide action in La Crosse and led local get-out-the-vote (GOTV) efforts in the days leading up to the election.

LIT AF's successes have been numerous in just a few years since they started organizing school board elections. Their material wins have directed money away from policing and to critical resources that young people need to stay safe, ended a school policing contract, and curtailed metal detectors and surveillance in schools. Just as importantly, LIT AF has built relationships with school board members such that they can influence school board decisions and outcomes directly. **School board members in Milwaukee and La Crosse now recognize that LIT AF is not just present for the election season but will be present before, during, and after to unfailingly pressure whoever is in office to be accountable to the young people in their district.**



CASE STUDY: LATINOS UNIDOS SIEMPRE (LUS) IN SALEM, OREGON

Latinos Unidos Siempre (LUS) is a Salem-based organization that works towards educational, cultural, and political development for young people. LUS empowers youth through leadership development and grassroots organizing while fighting against institutional oppression.⁸⁴

LUS's school board organizing dates back to 1996, the organization's founding year. In those early years, LUS targeted school board members who were blatantly ignoring students' experiences with the school-to-prison pipeline. School board members often shut down and ignored students, and young people had no allies to support them on the issues impacting them at school. After over a decade of working in the community, LUS began to shift its school board organizing strategy. At this point, young people were fed up and traumatized by repeatedly having to share their harrowing experiences and seeing no results, so they began to more explicitly target and call out individual school board members for their inaction. Many of these members were not only dismissive of young people but had expressed racist views in their personal time and during school board meetings. One particularly egregious example occurred in 2020 when a school board member wore blackface during a school board meeting.

LUS has worked in recent years to shift the public narrative and bring new attention to the racist activities of the school board, where previously very few people were paying attention. To do so, LUS has employed a combination of mobilizing the community in protest, marches, and direct action to target both the school board and school administration. They have used social media to reach community members and bring awareness to their issues, and they have consistently shown up at school board meetings to provide public comments. LUS's strategy is to build long-term community power (regardless of the electoral politics of the moment) and to combat anti-democracy policies that affect people of color, so that community members have the right to vote for people who truly represent them.

In the last few years, LUS has performed substantial work to educate the public about school board activities – shifting the public narrative and winning concrete material gains for students in the district:

- In 2018, the district proposed an office for law enforcement inside Salem-Keizer School District, but LUS successfully mobilized to prevent the proposal from being approved.

- In 2019, LUS uncovered connections between school board members and white supremacist groups and began exposing these connections to the public, shifting the public narrative about the board. That year, Measure 105 would have taken away the sanctuary status of Oregon, making immigrant communities more vulnerable to ICE and police collaboration. The school board refused to endorse no on the measure, which LUS discovered was due to the presence of a white supremacist school board member who affiliated with the white supremacist “3 percenter” group. This news prompted a wave of mobilization in the community, and as a result, two candidates who had expressed racist views ultimately decided not to run for reelection.
- Although as a 501(c)(3) LUS does not make candidate endorsements, much of their organizing, educational, and narrative shifting work has raised awareness in Salem about the importance of school board elections. During the 2021 school board election, LUS educated the community about the significant issues that School Board members decide by hosting a candidate forum. In addition, they ran a massive Get Out the Vote (GOTV) effort. In part due to LUS’s efforts, the 2021 school board election had a record-high turnout. In 2021, two progressive candidates ran after being selected by a coalition of community groups—including young people—who ensured that their selected candidates had a track record of direct work in the community and then worked to hold them accountable once in office. This coalition had strong student representation, ensuring that young people would continue to share decision-making power beyond the election cycle. Before these wins, the board was a majority conservative board – but is currently a majority progressive board with its first three Latinx members in the school board’s history. This change is particularly significant as school board members in Salem-Keizer Public Schools are elected “at large,”⁸⁵ and the majority of BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, people of color) voters live in northeast Salem.
- Significantly, in 2021, LUS also won an end to the Student Resource Officer (SRO) contract in Salem-Keizer Public Schools. While this win was necessary, it did not end all school policing in the district. Now that LUS has won the termination of the SRO contract, it is turning its attention to fights concerning funding, as the district has decided to continue funding other forms of policing. From the one million dollars freed from the SRO contract, \$600,000 is now appropriated to fund new security specialists – essentially police by a different name.

LUS’s school board organizing continues regardless of election cycles to ensure that people in power are effectively working on their behalf. In the months and years to come, LUS will relentlessly press school board members to represent the interests of young people in their community.

CONCLUSION

Heightened activity and attention directed at school board races creates an abundance of opportunities for community members to make their demands known, and hold elected school board members accountable to the young people in their communities. In particular, they demand that school board members end the school-to-deportation-and-prison pipeline by eradicating racist and punitive school discipline policies and removing police and security from schools. They want elected board members to advance their bold vision for liberatory education rooted in inclusion, equity, and racial justice.

The following tools are designed to help young people, families, and community members educate the public about the impact of school board elections in their communities, uplift the issues that matter the most to them, and get out the vote.



TOOLKIT

This toolkit provides a set of tools and resources for communities to participate in school board races and uplift the issues that matter the most to them – including:

- * *Youth platform for education and liberation*
- * *Candidate questionnaire*
- * *Candidate debates or forum agendas and materials*
- * *Campaign planning tools*

In addition, each tool includes some guidelines for using them as a 501(c)(3) organization plus some tips from community organizers on how to use them most effectively. **Check out this document for all of the resources listed below and more! We will continue to add to these tools as people continue building power through school board elections.**

PLATFORMS

Some guidelines

Platforms can be valuable tools to share your organization’s stance on different issues with the public. 501(c)(3) organizations can “educate all of the candidates on public interest issues within the purview of the organization” and can “work with all political parties to get its positions included on the party’s platform”.⁸⁶ However, 501(c)(3) organizations **cannot** ask candidates to pledge to support the organization’s platform. For additional information, **check out this guide** by Bolder Advocacy, a Program of Alliance for Justice.

National Example:

National Platform for federal, state, and local officials (pages 6 & 7)

Local Example: Leaders Igniting Transformation's Platform

Tips for using platforms:

- ***Publish your platform** to educate the public on your issues
- ***Turn your platform into a sign-on for the public.** This can help you base-build, reaching members of the public aligned with you and showing broad support for the issues your organization advocates.
- ***Use this petition** as an opportunity to build relationships with voters based on issue agreement.
- ***Get thousands of people to sign the petition** in support of your policies. This can help you build relationships with community members on the issues that matter to them. These more durable relationships can last far beyond election day.
- ***Include specific core demands** you have for the school board so you can hold them to it once they are elected.



CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE AND VOTER GUIDES

Some guidelines

501(c)(3) organizations can distribute and publish the answers to candidate questionnaires for the sole purpose of “educat[ing] the voters impartially on a nonpartisan basis.”⁸⁷ There are several guidelines 501(c)(3) organizations should be aware of when using questionnaires.

See a guide from Bolder Advocacy, a Program of Alliance for Justice here.

Tips for using questionnaires

***Ask candidates their position** on investing in the supports and resources young people are demanding in their schools and creating police-free schools. It is an excellent organizing tool to uplift the issue through the election.

***Publish their answers to the questionnaire** and tell candidates in advance that you are doing so. In all cases, assess the political conditions to ensure that publishing the answers will help support your issue advocacy rather than encourage blowback.



***Publish the full answers from candidates** so that the public can be well informed about the different candidates running for office. (It is important for 501(c)(3)s to not paraphrase or summarize answers.)

*Your organization can turn your questionnaire into a **voter guide** with the full answers published - although 501(c)(3) organizations must follow the guidelines of how to do this appropriately.



Examples:

- **Sample Candidate questionnaire**
- **LIT AF Candidate Questionnaire (La Crosse)**

CANDIDATE DEBATES OR FORUMS

Some guidelines

501(c)(3) organizations can host candidate debates or forums, provided they follow specific guidelines. **Here is a useful guide** from Bolder Advocacy, a Program of Alliance for Justice, on the dos and don'ts of candidate debates. Candidate forums can also be used to educate the public.

Tips for hosting debates and/or forums

*Distribute the invitations well in advance. Election season is hectic for candidates! Getting out invitations well in advance will help ensure that those candidates who genuinely want to attend are able to, and reduce the excuses to miss the event for candidates who do not want to participate.

*Once you have a few RSVPs, start publishing who will attend. Publicizing RSVPs will help lock in the folks who said they would be there and pressure other candidates to join.

*Work with members to plan and lead the debate! Members can develop the questions for candidates, prioritize among questions submitted, and take on roles throughout the event. These events can be powerful leadership development opportunities.




*Increase engagement with your base and community by crowdsourcing questions folks want candidates to answer at the debate. A text bank to your list, asking on the doors during canvassing, or requesting ideas through emails and social media are all good ways to get engagement from the community.

*Keep it short! No one wants to be at a three-hour debate. You can lose your audience and dilute the information folks retain from the event if it goes too long. Think of the most important questions to ask those, and keep candidates to a time limit.

*Partner with other organizations to cover a range of topics (especially if you are a 501(c)(3)). Collaboration can also increase turnout and awareness of your event.

*Make watching it fun! Host a watch party. **Here is a toolkit and sample agenda** for hosting a watch party! **Here is a sample agenda** for hosting a candidate forum.



PLAN YOUR CAMPAIGN

Some guidelines

At the beginning of the campaign, spend time creating a strategic campaign plan. The campaign plan should map the organization's long term, intermediate, and short term goals, the capacities and needs of the organization, ways to build the organization's base and identify potential members, allies and opponents, and finally set some tactics the organization will use.

Tips for creating strategic campaigns:

*Start with the vision. Having a clear vision of success is motivating, and can help focus the energy and capacity of the organization and members. **Here is a worksheet** from Race Forward and Metro Center to help create a campaign vision and timeline. For even more campaign tools, **check out their full toolkit here.**

Don't forget the tips shared in this report. Here's a refresher.

***Base building:** Growing a base of voters that support the issues that matter the most to young people for their schools, then returning to those voters closer to the election to remind them to vote.



*Understanding your turnout goal:

Consider the organization's capacity and how to use that capacity to increase voter turnout most effectively. Setting weekly and monthly goals can help the organization plan and create events or strategies to mobilize the most people to the polls.

***Coalition building:** Forge partnerships, including (where possible) with teachers' unions and other groups with impactful reach on education justice issues or throughout the school community. Parents, youth, educators, and other school employees may be motivated to participate in school board elections that directly impact their lives.

***Turnout strategy:** Make a plan to increase turnout among underrepresented constituencies such as young people and people of color.



END NOTES

1. Sebastian Jungkunz, "Political Polarization During the COVID-19 Pandemic," *Frontiers in Political Science*, March 4, 2021, <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpos.2021.622512/full>.
2. Stephen Sawchuk, "Why School Boards Are Now Hot Spots for Nasty Politics," *EducationWeek*, July 29, 2021, <https://www.edweek.org/leadership/why-school-boards-are-now-hot-spots-for-nasty-politics/2021/07>.
3. Currently, 23 states allow for the recall of school board elections. See: "States that Allow School Board Recalls," *Ballotpedia*, accessed May 2, 2022, https://ballotpedia.org/States_that_allow_school_board_recalls. Abbey Smith, "School Board Recalls in 2021," *Ballotpedia*, November 8, 2021, <https://news.ballotpedia.org/2021/11/08/school-board-recalls-in-2021>.
4. *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
5. "Massive Resistance," Equal Justice initiative, accessed April 20, 2022, <https://segregationinamerica.eji.org/report/massive-resistance.html>.
6. Will Stancil, "The Radical Supreme Court Decision That America Forgot," *The Atlantic*, May 29, 2018, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/05/the-radical-supreme-court-decision-on-that-america-forgot/561410/>.
7. "Massive Resistance," Equal Justice initiative; Will Stancil, "The Radical Supreme Court Decision That America Forgot."
8. Michael Fultz, "The Displacement of Black Educators Post-Brown: An Overview and Analysis," *Cambridge University Press*, February 25 (2017), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3218109>, 14, 20.
9. Michael Fultz, "The Displacement of Black Educators Post-Brown: An Overview and Analysis," 23, 25.
10. Michael Fultz, "The Displacement of Black Educators Post-Brown: An Overview and Analysis," 26.
11. Michael Fultz, "The Displacement of Black Educators Post-Brown: An Overview and Analysis," 19-24; "Massive Resistance," Equal Justice initiative.
12. Sonya Ramsey, "The Troubled History of American Education after the Brown Decision," *Organization of American Historians*, accessed April 20, 2022,

END NOTES

<https://www.oah.org/tah/issues/2017/february/the-troubled-history-of-american-education-after-the-brown-decision/#fr6>.

13. Sonya Ramsey, "The Troubled History of American Education after the Brown Decision."

14. Will Stancil, "The Radical Supreme Court Decision That America Forgot."

15. Karen Gribsy Bates, "Stokely Carmichael, A Philosopher Behind The Black Power Movement," NPR, March 10, 2014,

<https://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2014/03/10/287320160/stokely-carmichael-a-philosopher-behind-the-black-power-movement>.

16. Maurice R., Berube & Marilyn Gittell, "Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville: the New York School Strikes of 1968," Frederick A. Praeger (1969), 9, accessed at <https://archive.org/details/confrontationato0000beru>.

17. Maurice R., Berube & Marilyn Gittell, "Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville: the New York School Strikes of 1968," 9.

18. Jeffrey R Henig, Rebecca Jacobsen, and Sarah Reckhow, *Outside Money in School Board Elections: The Nationalization of Education Politics* (Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2019), 32.

19. Sally A. Nuamah and Thomas Ogorzalek, "Close to Home: Place-Based Mobilization in Racialized Contexts," *American Political Science Review* (2021), doi:10.1017/S0003055421000307, 3.

20. Randy Finley, "Crossing the White Line: SNCC in Three Delta Towns, 1963-1967," *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 65, no. 2 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.2307/40038293>, 121.

21. Randy Finley, "Crossing the White Line: SNCC in Three Delta Towns, 1963-1967," 127.

22. Randy Finley, "Crossing the White Line: SNCC in Three Delta Towns, 1963-1967," 129.

23. "Freedom Summer in Arkansas," SNCC Digital Gateway, accessed April 20, 2022, <https://snccdigital.org/events/freedom-summer-arkansas/>; Randy Finley, "Crossing the White Line: SNCC in Three Delta Towns, 1963-1967," 131.

24. Randy Finley, "Crossing the White Line: SNCC in Three Delta Towns, 1963-1967," 131.

END NOTES

25. Randy Finley, "Crossing the White Line: SNCC in Three Delta Towns, 1963–1967," 131.
26. Maurice R., Berube & Marilyn Gittell, "Confrontation at Ocean Hill–Brownsville: the New York School Strikes of 1968," 13; Mike Stivers, "Ocean Hill–Brownsville, Fifty Years Later," *Jacobin*, September 12, 2018, <https://jacobinmag.com/2018/09/ocean-hill-brownsville-strikes-1968-united-federation-teachers>.
27. Jerald E. Podair, "The Strike That Changed New York," Yale University Press (2002), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1npzqf>, 71–72.
28. Jerald E. Podair, "The Strike That Changed New York," 75–77; Marilyn Gittell, "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education," *Public Administration Review* 32, (1972), <https://doi.org/10.2307/975232>, 673, 675–676.
29. Mike Stivers, "Ocean Hill–Brownsville, Fifty Years Later."
30. Jerald E. Podair, "The Strike That Changed New York," 145–147; Mike Stivers, "Ocean Hill–Brownsville, Fifty Years Later."
31. Jerald E. Podair, "The Strike That Changed New York," 145–147; Mike Stivers, "Ocean Hill–Brownsville, Fifty Years Later;" Marilyn Gittell, "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education," 678.
32. Marilyn Gittell, "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education," 678.
33. Marilyn Gittell, "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education," 680.
34. George R. LaNoue and Bruce L.R. Smith, "The Political Evolution of School Decentralization," *The American Behavioral Scientist* 15, no. 1, September 1971, 80–87.
35. Elizabeth Shogren and Douglas Frantz, "School Boards Become the Religious Right's New Pulpit," *Los Angeles Times*, December 10, 1993, <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1993-12-10-mn-255-story.html>.
36. Elizabeth Shogren and Douglas Frantz, "School Boards Become the Religious Right's New Pulpit."
37. Elizabeth Shogren and Douglas Frantz, "School Boards Become the Religious Right's New Pulpit."
38. Sarah Reckhow et al., "Outsiders with Deep Pockets: The Nationalization of Local School Board Elections," *Urban Affairs Review* 53, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087416663004>, 784, 805; Sean Cavanagh and Stephen Sawchuk, "Outside Advocacy Groups Target Local School

<https://www.edweek.org/policy-politics/outside-advocacy-groups-target-local-school-board-elections/2012/05>.

39. Darwin Bond Graham, “How a Handful of Pro-Charter Billionaires Flooded Oakland’s School Board Elections With Cash,” East Bay Express, October 25, 2016, <https://eastbayexpress.com/how-a-handful-of-pro-charter-billionaires-flooded-oaklands-school-board-elections-with-cash-2-1/>.

40. Howard Blume, “N.Y. Mayor Gives \$1 Million to Back L.A. School Board Slate,” Los Angeles Times, February 12, 2013, <https://www.latimes.com/local/la-xpm-2013-feb-12-la-me-bloomberg-lausd-20130213-story.html>; Alana Semuels, “Why Some People Think Michael Bloomberg’s Donations Have Undercut Democracy in Local Races,” Time, February 28, 2020, <https://time.com/5792383/michael-bloomberg-charter-schools-donations/>.

41. Stephanie Simon, “Kochs vs. unions in school race,” Politico, November 2, 2013, <https://www.politico.com/story/2013/11/koch-group-unions-battle-over-colorado-schools-race-099252>; Trymaine Lee, “The Koch Brothers And The Battle Over Integration In Wake County’s Schools,” HuffPost, October 14, 2011, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/the-battle-for-wake-count_n_926799.

42. “Hijacked by Billionaires: How the Super Rich Buy Elections to Undermine Public Schools,” The Network for Public Education Action, September 2018, <https://npeactionorg.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Hijacked-by-Billionaires.pdf>; Howard Blume and Ben Poston, “How L.A.’s school board election became the most expensive in U.S. history,” Los Angeles Times, May 21, 2017, <https://www.latimes.com/local/la-me-edu-school-election-money-20170521-htmllstory.html>.

43. Joanne Barkan, “Death by a Thousand Cuts: Privatizing Public Education in the USA,” The State, Business, and Education: Public-Private Partnerships Revisited, October 26, 2018, <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Death-by-a-thousand-cuts%3A-privatizing-public-in-the-Barkan/78a39fb12a2ada38bb624bd6391b9aa2180b20db>, 157.

44. “City Enrollment Share,” National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, accessed April 20, 2022, <https://data.publiccharters.org/digest/tables-and-figures/city-enrollment-share/>.

45. Zoe Sullivan, “The Battle for New Orleans Public Schools,” Next City, January 24, 2019, <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/the-battle-for-new-orleans-public-schools>.

END NOTES

46. Eric Griffey, "Conservative groups are training activists to swarm school board meetings," Spectrum News 1, July 22, 2021,

<https://spectrumlocalnews.com/tx/south-texas-el-paso/politics/2021/07/21/conservative-groups-are-training-activists-to-swarm-school-board-meetings->.

47. Tyler Kinkade, Brandy Zadozny and Ben Collins, "Critical race theory battle invades school boards with help from conservative groups" NBC News, June 15, 2021,

<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/critical-race-theory-invades-school-boards-help-conservative-groups-n1270794>.

48. Caitlin O'Kane, "Head of teachers union says critical race theory isn't taught in schools, defend 'honest history,'" CBS News, July 8, 2021,

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/critical-race-theory-teachers-union-honest-history/>.

49. Rashawn Ray and Alexandra Gibbons, "Why are states banning critical race theory?" Brookings, November 2021,

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2021/07/02/why-are-states-banning-critical-race-theory/>.

50. Christine Palm and Frank Hanley Santoro, "Opinion: Dark money behind school board conflicts," October 4, 2021, CT Insider,

<https://www.ctinsider.com/opinion/article/Opinion-Dark-money-behind-school-board-conflicts-16507237.php>.

51. Eric Griffey, "Conservative groups are training activists to swarm school board meetings."

52. Tyler Kinkade, Brandy Zadozny and Ben Collins, "Critical race theory battle invades school boards with help from conservative groups."

53. Mark Wingfield, "Who's behind the nationwide attacks on local school boards over Critical Race Theory?"

54. Chelsey Cox, "Critical race theory: The Narrative winning local elections for conservatives," USA Today, February 12, 2022,

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2022/02/12/critical-race-theory-local-elections/6519348001/?gnt-cfr=1>.

55. Lauren Meckler and Timothy Bella, "Conservative school board wins may deliver chilling effect on racial equity efforts," The Washington Post, November 8, 2021,

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2021/11/08/conservative-school-board-wins/>.

END NOTES

56. Gwen Aviles, “Conservatives used critical race theory to influence voters and win elections. Critics warn the propaganda is working,” Insider, November 15, 2021,

<https://www.insider.com/conservatives-won-elections-with-critical-race-theory-propaganda-2021-11>; Erik Ortiz, “School board candidates who opposed critical race theory, mask mandates win,” NBC News, November 3, 2021, <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/education/school-board-candidates-opposed-critical-race-theory-mask-mandates-win-rcna4420>.

57. Lauren Meckler and Timothy Bella, “Conservative school board wins may deliver chilling effect on racial equity efforts.”

58. See, for example: Maryann Jones Thompson, “The SF School Board’s Long History as a Political Springboard,” The San Francisco Standard, February 24, 2022, <https://sfstandard.com/politics/the-sf-school-boards-long-history-as-a-political-springboard/>.

59. Lauren Meckler and Timothy Bella, “Conservative school board wins may deliver chilling effect on racial equity efforts.”

60. David Moore, “Law Enforcement PACs Give millions to the Politicians Who Set Their Budgets,” Sludge, June 4, 2020, <https://readsludge.com/2020/06/24/law-enforcement-pacs-give-millions-to-the-politicians-who-set-their-budgets/>.

61. Mike Tighe, “Annie Baumann handily tops LA Crosse School Board vote, with Quarberg and Abraham winning other two seats,” News 8000.com, April 7, 2021, <https://www.news8000.com/annie-baumann-handily-tops-la-crosse-school-board-vote-with-quarberg-and-abraham-winning-other-two-seats/>; “La Crosse Assistant Police chief Rob Abraham announces retirement, WXOX, June 17, 2021, https://www.wxow.com/news/la-crosse-assistant-police-chief-rob-abraham-announces-retirement/article_1b56e3db-8edb-5c4b-9939-4ab1ee27c5e3.html.

62. Mike Tighe, “Annie Baumann handily tops LA Crosse School Board vote, with Quarberg and Abraham winning other two seats.”

63. Elizabeth Beyer, “A pipeline to higher office: Nonpartisan school board races getting more political, Madison.com, February 6, 2022, https://madison.com/news/local/education/local_schools/a-pipeline-to-higher-office-non-partisan-school-board-races-getting-more-political/article_26bcd4e6-01e9-54de-bfba-924311b0d514.html.

64. “Asst. Police Chief Hits Back at Plan to Remove Officers From Schools,” La Crosse Independent, June 19, 2020,

END NOTES

<https://lacrosseindependent.com/2020/06/19/asst-police-chief-hits-back-at-plan-to-remove-officers-from-schools..>

65. Charles Lane, "Police-Backed School Board Wins In Smithtown Following Backlash Against Diversity Curriculum, WSHU, May 19, 2021, <https://www.wshu.org/news/2021-05-19/police-backed-school-board-wins-in-smithtown-following-backlash-against-diversity-curriculum>.

66. Molly Smith, "El Paso school board races funded by pro-charter PAC, unions and police groups," El Paso Matters, April 6, 2021, <https://elpasomatters.org/2021/04/06/el-paso-school-board-races-funded-by-pro-charter-pac-unions-and-police-groups/>.

67. Erica Frankenberg, "What School Segregation Looks Like in the US Today," Truthout, July 20, 2019, <https://truthout.org/articles/what-school-segregation-looks-like-in-the-us-today>.

68. Rachel M. Cohen, "School Board Elections are Confronting the School-to-Prison Pipeline," The Appeal October 23, 2020, <https://theappeal.org/politicalreport/school-board-elections-school-to-prison-pipeline>; "Arrested Learning: A survey of youth experiences of police and security at school," The Center for Popular Democracy, April 2021, <https://www.populardemocracy.org/news/publications/arrested-learning-survey-youth-experiences-police-and-security-school>.

69. Henig et al, 35.

70. Henig et al, 35.

71. Jon Valant, "It's time to start voting in your local school board elections," Brookings, November 1, 2021, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2021/11/01/its-time-to-start-voting-in-your-local-school-board-elections/>.

72. Analysis of Clark County, Nevada, Department of Elections data, accessed May 18, 2022, https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/elections/past_elections.php; analysis of Orange County Supervisor of Elections Office data, accessed May 18, 2022, <https://www.ocfelections.com/election-results-and-turnout>.

END NOTES

73. Mike Maciag, "Millennials Let Their Grandparents Decide Local Elections," *Governing*, December 13, 2016,

<https://www.governing.com/archive/gov-voter-turnout-generations-millennials.html>; Jan Brennan, "Increasing Voter Turnout in Local Elections," *National Civic Review* 109, no. 1 (Spring 2020).

74. Matt Barnum, "As public schools grow more diverse, school board elections are largely determined by white voters," *Chalkbeat*, January 29, 2020, <https://www.chalkbeat.org/2020/1/29/21121108/as-public-schools-grow-more-diverse-school-board-elections-are-largely-determined-by-white-voters>.

75. Vladimir Kogan, Stéphane Lavertu, Zachary Peskowitz, "The Democratic Deficit in U.S. Education Governance," *EdWorkingPaper*, January 1, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.26300/2dqg-w009>, 3.

76. Kogan et al, 3.

77. Kogan et al, 3.

78. Kim Parker and Ruth Igielnik, "On the Cusp of Adulthood and Facing an Uncertain Future: What We Know About Gen Z So Far," *Pew Research Center*, May 14, 2020, <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2020/05/14/on-the-cusp-of-adulthood-and-facing-an-uncertain-future-what-we-know-about-gen-z-so-far-2/>.

79. Sonja Kaleva and Lukas Brekke-Miesner, "Oakland Students Turn the Tables," *The Forge*, August 19, 2021, <https://forgeorganizing.org/article/oakland-students-turn-tables>.

80. Sonja Kaleva and Lukas Brekke-Miesner, "Oakland Students Turn the Tables."

81. Sonja Kaleva and Lukas Brekke-Miesner, "Oakland Students Turn the Tables"; Samuel Getachew, "Oakland Students Won the Right to Vote in School Board Elections," *Teen Vogue*, November 30, 2020, <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/oakland-students-measure-qq>.

82. Samuel Getachew, "Oakland Students Won the Right to Vote in School Board Elections"; Sonja Kaleva and Lukas Brekke-Miesner, "Oakland Students Turn the Tables."

83. "MPS unanimously votes to end contract with Milwaukee Police Department," *CBS 58*, June 18, 2020,

<https://www.cbs58.com/news/mps-votes-to-end-contract-with-milwaukee-police-department>.

END NOTES

84. Latinos Unidos Siempre, Facebook page, accessed April 20, 2022, <https://www.facebook.com/LUSsalem/>.

85. "The Bias of At-Large Elections: How it Works,"

Nonprofit Vote, August 16, 2017,

<https://www.nonprofitvote.org/the-bias-of-at-large-elections-how-it-works/>.

86. "Election Checklist for 501(c)(3) Public Charities: Ensuring Election Year Advocacy Efforts Remain Nonpartisan," Bolder Advocacy, a Program of Alliance for Justice, last accessed on June 10, 2022,

https://www.bolderadvocacy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Election_Checklist_for_501c3_Public_Charities.pdf.

87. "Candidate Questionnaires and Voter Guides," Bolder Advocacy, a Program of Alliance for Justice, last accessed on June 10, 2022,

https://bolderadvocacy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Candidate_Questionnaires_and_Voter_Guides.pdf.