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I. INTRODUCTION

Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) is pleased to present this Final Report on the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF)’s investment in and support of the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP)’s Children in the Fields (CIF) Campaign. This report is the result of two years of study of AFOP’s efforts to end child labor in agriculture through the CIF Campaign. Our aim is to provide an overview and analysis of the key accomplishments and learnings, as well as challenges faced, in order to inform advocacy efforts that can improve the lives of farmworker children and their families. This report draws on a number of data sources, such as a document review of reports submitted to and published by AFOP, two rounds of interviews with campaign staff members at the national and regional levels, two rounds of site visits to the CIF Campaign regions, and our attendance at affiliated conferences and convenings.

Overview and Role of WKKF’s Investment

In 2009, WKKF awarded AFOP a $1.4 million dollar grant1 to support and expand AFOP’s Children in the Fields Campaign to end child labor in agriculture.2 The campaign, which was originally launched in December 1997, had been previously focused on policy advocacy work at the national level. AFOP’s efforts on this front were focused primarily on educating congressional leaders about the problem of child labor in agriculture, and in particular about how a loophole in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA) enables young children to work in agriculture without some of the same protections as in other industries. One of the primary goals of this national-level advocacy was to encourage passage of the Children’s Act for Responsible Employment (CARE Act), a bill introduced by Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard which proposed changes to the FLSA that would close the loopholes for the agriculture industry, making agriculture subject to the same child labor laws as all other industries.

---

1 This is the original grant amount awarded to AFOP for the Children in the Fields Campaign, with a grant end date of February 2012. AFOP was granted two extensions, to enable the work to continue through April 2012 and then through August 2012.

2 Note that there are multiple facets to the Children in the Fields Campaign, which receives funding support from multiple sources. Funds from this WKKF grant have been designated specifically for development and implementation of a grassroots component to the campaign that is specifically focused on raising awareness of the issue of child labor in agriculture. No funds from this grant have been used in any direct lobbying activities.
According to David Strauss, AFOP’s former Executive Director, despite the fact that ending child labor—particularly in hazardous environments—seemed a “naturally easy” cause to support, effecting legislative change was “surprisingly difficult.” In fact, despite the fact that the CARE Act was first introduced to Congress ten years ago, it has not moved very far in the legislative process. This prompted AFOP leaders to rethink their campaign strategy, as they realized that unless pressed by constituents to end the problem, movement on the legislative front would continue to be difficult. Strauss noted:

_We devised the idea that we really needed grassroots support. Otherwise, it just wasn’t working to have a series of Washington players in the child labor field go to Capitol Hill and try to move this massive thing called Congress. So that was the birth of this program._

The WKKF grant played an instrumental role in enabling AFOP to lay the groundwork for a grassroots movement for change, which would complement or augment AFOP’s national-level efforts. Specifically, the WKKF grant provided resources for the development and implementation of regional campaigns in five states: California, Michigan, Ohio, North Carolina, and Texas. The main goals of these regional campaigns were to (1) document child labor in these five states, (2) educate the public and decisionmakers about farmworker labor conditions, and (3) build a grassroots movement to keep children out of the fields and in school.

**SPR’s Evaluation of the CIF Campaign**

In March 2010, AFOP contracted Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to serve as the evaluator for the Children in the Fields Campaign. Our overall approach to the evaluation has been to focus specifically on documenting progress towards AFOP’s three aforementioned goals for the regional campaigns while also keeping in mind AFOP’s larger vision of ending the cycle of poverty and improving the health and well-being of farmworker children and their families.

**Children in the Fields Evaluation Framework**

As shown in Exhibit I-1 on the next page, SPR developed the Children in the Fields Evaluation Framework to guide our analysis of the campaign’s progress, outcomes, and lessons learned along the way. Key features of the framework include contextual factors that could impact education and advocacy efforts; organizational capacity to effectively implement the campaign; implementation strategies; short-term outcomes considered in this evaluation; the campaign’s movement-building trajectory; and potential, future intermediate outcomes, which are beyond the scope of the evaluation.

---

3 David Strauss served as AFOP’s executive director through the entire grant period. He retired in October 2012.
Exhibit I-1 – Evaluation Framework for AFOP’s Children in the Fields Campaign

**Project Goals**
- Document child labor in five states (California, Michigan, Ohio, North Carolina, and Texas)
- Educate the public and decision makers about farmworker labor conditions
- Build a grassroots movement to keep children out of the fields and in school

**Contextual Factors**
- **Policy-Related Factors**
  - Local school policies
  - Competing policy agendas
  - Existing or pending child labor laws
  - Presence of funding & support for programs
- **Community Factors**
  - Role of agriculture in regional labor market
  - Relationship of farmworkers to community
  - Availability of support services in community
  - Relationship of schools with local families
  - Experience and comfort with advocacy
- **Organizational Capacities**
  - Campaign management capacity
  - Relationship to community
  - Relationship to regional & national advocacy networks
  - Knowledge of policy climate
  - Public relations capacity

**Implementation Activities**
- **Documentation**
  - Research on regional and national reports related to child labor
  - Documentary films
  - Photo exhibits
  - Briefing reports
- **Education and Advocacy**
  - Community education campaigns
  - Media campaigns
  - Legislator education
- **Coalition Building**
  - Developing an effective infrastructure
  - Organizing community leaders
  - Ensuring diversity of members
  - Monitoring and ensuring growth
- **Youth Councils**
  - Recruiting and engaging youth partners
  - Providing a leadership and advocacy training for youth partners
  - Organizing and hosting national conferences of youth councils

**Short-Term Outcomes**
- **Education and Advocacy Campaign**
  - Earned media opportunities
  - Increased dissemination of education materials to key target audiences
  - Increased awareness of farmworker child labor issues among target audiences
- **Greater linkage between regional and national advocacy efforts**
- **Coalition Building**
  - Regional coalitions with a shared vision for change
  - Clearly articulated coalition missions & sustainability plans
  - Representative network of partners with well-defined roles
  - Workable infrastructure to support collaborative activity
- **Youth Councils**
  - Increased understanding about child labor issues
  - Greater commitment to serving as advocates
  - Increased awareness of agency to make meaningful change
  - Expanded and sustainable cadre of youth leaders

**Intermediate Outcomes**
- Increased sense of connection and commitment to addressing child labor issues
- Demonstrated changes in policies and practices that encourage children to stay in school
- Increased capacity for a sustainable grassroots coalition that can continue to advocate for child labor issues

Vision: End the Cycle of Poverty for Farmworker Families
**Contextual Factors**

We recognize the important role that context plays in influencing outcomes. For farmworker communities in particular, their lived realities and the policies that shape those realities are not well-understood by the community at large. Thus, as shown in Exhibit I-1, we considered the multiple contextual factors affecting advocacy work for farmworker communities, especially the ability of AFOP’s national office and regional coordinators to accomplish their goals. We categorized these contextual factors into two groups:

- **Policy-related factors.** The first group taken into consideration are policy-related factors such as local school policies, competing policy agendas, existing or pending child labor laws, and the presence of funding and support for programs that help families living in poverty.

- **Community-factors.** We also examined community factors in the different campaign regions, including the role of agriculture in local labor markets, local attitudes about immigration, the history of grassroots organizing in the region, as well as existing relationships between schools and families.

Our examination of the contexts in which these campaigns were implemented enabled us to cultivate a situational lens to each region, which was critical, given the wide range of variation across the different contexts.

**Organizational Capacity**

Another critical factor in the successful implementation of this effort is the capacity of AFOP and its regional coordinators to carry out this work. Thus, we examined the CIF Campaign’s organizational structure, staffing, and resources as well as the specific skills and capacity of regional coordinators. We looked at how implementation is shaped by the skills of the regional coordinators (e.g., their ability to engage in community organizing and youth development and leadership strategies), the adequacy of their resources, and their ability to adapt to challenging and changing environments. Lastly, we looked at the capacity of campaign staff at AFOP’s national office to manage and support the grassroots campaign.

**Implementation Activities**

In its proposal to WKKF, AFOP identified a wide range of activities that it intended to undertake as part of its educational and advocacy campaign. We have organized and examined these activities by categorizing them into four areas captured within the “Implementation Activities” section of the evaluation framework: documentation, education and advocacy, coalition-building and youth councils.

- In the **documentation** and **education and advocacy** categories, we examined the broad range of activities undertaken by the campaign to inform the public about the issue of child labor in agriculture.
For coalition building, we examined elements of each regional coalition, including the makeup of each coalition, the nature of its infrastructure, its capacity to carry out campaign work as a united body, and the growth of the coalition’s reach.

With respect to the development of youth councils, our evaluation focused on examining recruitment, retention, and engagement practices as well as the leadership-development training and opportunities provided to the youth.

**Short-term Outcomes**

In the “Short-term Outcomes” section of the framework, we articulate some key outcomes that, at the outset of this evaluation, we anticipated we would be able to capture. These outcomes are grouped into four categories, described below:

- **Education and advocacy campaign outcomes.** This set of outcomes combines the campaign’s efforts at documenting the problem with its efforts to educate the public and advocate for change. To measure the effectiveness of these efforts, we examined earned media and presentation opportunities, use of the education materials developed for and disseminated to target audiences, whose voices were shaping the advocacy agenda, and the extent to which AFOP and its CIF staff were sought out as resources for people and organizations interested in child labor issues in agriculture.4

- **Coalition building outcomes.** We focused primarily on measuring the stability and strength of the coalition’s infrastructure, using standard indicators of effective coalition building (e.g. development of a shared vision, articulation of clear roles and responsibilities, sustainability plans, etc.) We also examined the effectiveness of regional coordinators in recruiting, motivating, and sustaining members as well as their ability to capitalize upon the strengths of community leaders and aligned organizations to further their causes.

- **Youth council outcomes.** We anticipated a key outcome of this campaign would be the emergence of a sustainable cadre of youth leaders whose voices were at the forefront of the education and advocacy efforts. As indicators of their leadership development, we anticipated that the youth would be able to demonstrate a greater sense of understanding about child labor issues, as well as a greater commitment to serving as advocates to address these issues and a greater sense of agency about their ability to make meaningful change.

---

4 While it was not possible, to actually measure changing levels of awareness about child labor and exploitation of youth in agriculture in the scope of this evaluation, we were able, to a certain extent, to document the awareness-building activities nationally and regionally, and to use audience counts as ways of measuring reach.
**Movement Trajectory**

While we assumed that we would not be able to measure the campaign’s success at generating an actual movement during the short timeframe of the WKKF grant and this evaluation, we wanted our evaluation framework to articulate the campaign’s *movement trajectory* so that we could chart progress towards the longer-term goals and vision. To articulate our understanding of the movement’s trajectory, we began by looking at the grassroots campaign’s locus of change and how that might translate into larger, systemic change. As noted earlier in the introduction, the locus of change in the campaign’s early years was focused on policymakers, which proved to be challenging and resulted in little headway towards their desired outcomes. Thus, the resources from WKKF enabled the campaign to shift its locus of change, placing a greater focus on raising *awareness* in the American public in order to mobilize a constituency that would put pressure on congressional leaders to enact change.

This shift is articulated in AFOP’s proposal to WKKF, which indicates an assumption that the reason the problem of child labor in agriculture persists is because people are unaware of the issues. Therefore, as demonstrated in the framework, we articulated the campaign’s movement trajectory to be one that begins with raising *awareness* of the issues, to increasing the *will* for change, which would ultimately lead to explicit *action* in support of a larger change agenda.

**Intermediate Outcomes**

Lastly, while the scope of our evaluation is focused primarily on short-term outcomes, we added potential intermediate outcomes to our framework because it may be useful to AFOP in future campaign efforts. Intermediate outcomes include a *greater sense of connection and commitment to addressing child labor and exploitation issues* among key target groups, a *sustainable grassroots coalition* that can continue to serve as advocates and catalysts for change, and – ultimately—examples of *changes in policies or practice* that support keeping farmworker children out of the fields and in school.

**Evaluation Methods**

Our evaluation framework served as a useful guide throughout the evaluation period and as the launching point for our development of targeted research questions that we sought to address in the evaluation. The textbox on the next page highlights these key research questions:

---

5 See Appendix A for a full list of the research questions used for the evaluation.
To address our evaluation questions, SPR conducted a comprehensive analysis of a range of primary and secondary data gathered over the course of this evaluation. Data collection activities included:

- **Document review.** SPR reviewed and analyzed documents shared with us by AFOP. These included proposal documents, annual reports to WKKF; regional coordinator reports to AFOP (six month, annual, and campaign wrap up reports); publications produced by AFOP that were paid for by WKKF funds, background documents by other, aligned organizations that endeavor to end child labor (e.g. Human Rights Watch); and any collateral material developed by the regional campaigns and shared with SPR.

- **Interviews with AFOP national staff.** SPR conducted two rounds of telephone interviews with key AFOP staff that were responsible for overseeing specific elements of the campaign. These interviews were conducted at the beginning of the campaign in Spring 2010 and at the end of the grant period in 2012. They were primarily focused on (1) capturing the vision that informed the campaign’s goals, (2) gathering internal assessments of the campaign’s capacity for movement building, (3) discussing the national political landscape and the obstacles and opportunities it poses, and (4) garnering insights on the major successes and challenges faced by the campaign. Interviewees included AFOP’s former executive director, the campaign director, and the campaign’s Engagement Manager.

- **Interviews with the CIF Campaign’s regional coordinators.** SPR conducted two rounds of interviews with the campaign’s regional coordinators. The first round of interviews took place in April 2010, at the regional coordinators’ quarterly convening that took place in Sacramento, California. There, we
conducted in-person interviews with the regional coordinators from California, Michigan/Ohio, North Carolina, and Texas. These initial interviews were designed to help SPR learn more about (1) each regional coordinator’s experiences working with youth, with farm labor issues, and in community organizing; (2) regional campaign goals and contexts; and (3) AFOP’s campaign capacity. In 2012, we conducted final interviews with the regional coordinators from California, North Carolina, and Texas. These final interviews were primarily focused on capturing major accomplishments, challenges, and lessons learned.

- Development and implementation of a network survey. In June 2010, SPR developed a survey tool to assess the size, structure, and makeup of the social networks in each of the campaign regions. The survey was taken by all regional coordinators and the results were analyzed and documented in a memo that was submitted to AFOP on July 15, 2010. The survey was administered again at the end of 2012 as a means of assessing the strength of each coalition’s infrastructure, as well as to measure the growth of the campaign’s networks.

- Two rounds of site visits to the CIF Campaign regions. In the summer of 2010, SPR staff conducted one-day site visits to the campaign regions in California, North Carolina, and Texas. Site visit activities included interviews with regional coordinators, lead agency staff, campaign interns, farmworker youth and their families, and representatives from partner agencies. The site visits also included observations of youth council activities and visits to the areas where farmworker families live and work. A second round of site visits was conducted in the summer of 2011. This round of site visits included greater attention to the work of the coalitions and a stronger focus on farmworker youth and their families to inform the development of youth case studies, which are included in the appendix.

- Attendance at conferences and convenings. In January 2011, SPR attended WKKF’s Food and Community grantee convening in Santa Ana Pueblo, New Mexico. This trip provided opportunities to learn more about WKKF’s Food and Community Initiative, to consider AFOP’s allies in this work, and to check in with AFOP’s CIF Campaign director to get campaign updates. In April 2012, SPR attended Youth Voices in Action: Conversations from America’s Fields, a

---

6 At the launch of the campaign, Michigan and Ohio were conceptualized as being one region which would be served by a single regional coordinator.

7 Because of staff turnover at the regional coordinator level in North Carolina and California, these interviews took place at different times in the year, since not all of the original regional coordinators stayed in their positions at the official close of the grant in August 2012. In early 2011, a new regional coordinator was hired to cover Ohio (and eventually expand to Michigan). A baseline interview was conducted with this new regional coordinator, however because the regional coordinator resigned early into her tenure and before the campaign made much progress, no final interview was conducted for this region.

8 Because of staff turnover in Michigan and then again in Ohio, SPR did not conduct a site visit to those states.
two-day conference hosted by the CIF youth councils. This conference, which took place in Washington, D.C., served as a forum for youth council members to share their stories and educate national advocates on the lives of farmworker youth.

**Overview of this Report**

The remaining chapters of this final report are organized by key components of the evaluation framework. **Chapter II** focuses on the CIF Campaign structure, contexts, and capacity, examining the influence these factors had on campaign efficacy and outcomes. **Chapter III** focuses on campaign implementation, documenting the extent to which the campaign made progress along the first two of the four key campaign implementation activity arenas—documenting of child labor, and public education and advocacy about the issues. **Chapter IV** focuses on progress related to the second two implementation activity arenas—developing sustainable coalitions, and developing youth councils. The report concludes with **Chapter V**, which offers some considerations for developing a strong infrastructure for change and for movement building, which we hope will be helpful to AFOP in its efforts to move the campaign forward.
II. CHILDREN IN THE FIELDS (CIF) CAMPAIGN CONTEXTS

In this chapter, we look at the structural and external factors that influenced the campaign’s outcomes and those that affected the efficacy of the campaign. We offer mini portraits of the campaign regions by providing background information on the farmworking communities in the region, such as the role of agriculture in each state and the nature of the farmworking communities there, as well as the extent to which the educational systems are set up to support the needs of farmworker youth. We also examine the campaign’s infrastructure and capacity to support the CIF Campaign.

CIF Locations

Initially, AFOP targeted five states in which to launch this campaign: California, Michigan, Ohio, North Carolina, and Texas. AFOP strategically chose these regions because of their high presence of farmworkers and the availability of AFOP member agencies that could provide support for the campaign’s regional coordinators. Though the campaign was initially designed to encompass five states, turnover in the regional coordinator position in Michigan and Ohio presented serious challenges to the campaigns in those regions. Because the campaigns in Michigan and Ohio were still in nascent stages at the time of the turnover, campaign management staff decided to allow those regions to remain dormant and place more of their focus on the remaining three regions: California, North Carolina and Texas. Thus, of the five regions, the campaigns in California, North Carolina, and Texas were the only ones that were able to implement all four campaign activities (documentation, education and advocacy, coalition building, development of youth councils) and this evaluation will therefore focus primarily on the progress made in those three regions.

On the next page, we present a table that provides mini-portraits of the three campaign regions to give a sense of context for the farmworker communities in those regions as well as some of the external factors that had an impact on the efficacy of the campaign.
### Background on Farmworker Communities in the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **California:** The CIF Campaign was located in the progressive agricultural communities surrounding the state’s capital in Sacramento, which included Yolo, San Joaquin, and Sacramento County. Although, this location is optimal for state-level advocacy work, it proved to have some challenges for community organizing, particularly around the issue of child labor in agriculture. To illustrate, Northern California is home to a large number of organic farms that engage in progressive practices and where the slow food movement enjoys a fairly large following. As such, the issue of child labor in agriculture is not seen as a major problem in the region, making it difficult to both document the issue and rally supporters behind it. The regional coordinator expressed that child labor exists in California, but calls it a “hidden problem,” and one that would be difficult to uncover in the “progressive sphere of Sacramento.” Moreover, the farmworker communities in which he worked were approximately 30 miles away from the lead agency. This meant that he spent long hours commuting. Further explorations into other regions of California, where child labor and exploitive practices in farming might be more prevalent were not possible due to budget constraints.

- **North Carolina:** The CIF Campaign is centered in Eastern North Carolina in Lenoir County, where there is a high concentration of migrant and seasonal farmworker youth. North Carolina is considered a “receiving” state where migrant farmworkers travel from other states to work in agriculture on a seasonal and temporary basis. At the launch of the campaign, the regional coordinator in North Carolina found herself in a similar situation as the regional coordinator in California. She was originally provided with an office in Clayton, N.C., in Johnston County, which put her in close proximity to the Research Triangle area, but not to farmworking families. Thus, she had to spend a significant amount of time traveling long distances in order to gain access to farmworkers, which was not an effective use of her time. Moreover, she felt that in order to build trust in farmworking communities that are extremely (and justly) wary of outsiders, she needed to immerse herself in the community. Fortunately, with the help of nonprofit organization that donated office space to the campaign coalition, she was able to move her office to Kinston, N.C., an area in which many farmworkers reside.

### Education Opportunities and Supports for Farmworker Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **California:** California has a widespread Migrant Education Program that provides educational and supportive services to migrant farmworker youth. However, the regional coordinator encountered mixed support for farmworker youth from local school administrators and staff. For example, while there were many student groups such as 4-H and Future Farmers of America that were focused in agriculture, there were not many clubs that specifically supported farmworker youth. Additionally, the regional coordinator observed a wide disconnect between school administration and farmworkers families, who felt that school administrators did not understand their needs. The most support that is offered to farmworker youth came from the Migrant Education Advising Programs (MEAP) in local colleges and universities. There, college students volunteered as counselors to farmworker youth and their families, providing academic advising, career guidance, social and emotional support, and parent education courses.

- **North Carolina:** North Carolina’s Migrant Education Program appears to be strong and mainly focuses on serving Out-of-School Youth (OSY) by providing student-centered literacy education and farmworker health information. Moreover, the MEP is part of the Strategies, Opportunities, and Services for Out-of-School Youth (SOSOSY) consortium, which provides curriculum and professional development tools for migrant education providers. However, according to the regional coordinator of the CIF Campaign in North Carolina, migrant education programs are unable to provide sufficient services to farmworker youth due to budget cuts and staff capacity. Specifically, the regional coordinator in North Carolina notes “migrant education programs are challenged by the absence of rural resources, including travel and bilingual professionals willing to work nights and weekends to address the needs of migrant farmworker children.”

- **Texas:** Texas is home to a strong Migrant Education Program that has an infrastructure that better meets the needs and challenges of migrating students than programs in other communities. This infrastructure includes mechanisms that take into account the lived realities of migrating farmworker students while helping them continue to meet their academic requirements. For example, the MEP program in Texas, in conjunction with the Migrant State Information Exchange System, allows school districts in Texas to share educational and health information on migrant youth that travel between states to ensure that students are enrolled, placed, and receive the corresponding course credits in their schools. The MEP in Texas also provides a great deal of added support and instructional services for students, such as tutoring, TAKS testing, free distance learning for migrant youth and the provision of educational supplies.
CIF Administrative Structure

In addition to the local, regional and state contexts that influenced the campaign’s outcomes, its administrative structure also played a key role. In this section, we provide an overview of the CIF Campaign’s administrative structure, beginning with a description of the staffing structure and the roles at each level of the campaign. This is followed by a discussion of the internal communications structure that was designed by campaign leadership in an effort to bring cohesiveness to the campaign staff that were spread out across the country. Next, we describe the technical assistance opportunities afforded to the regional coordinators to help them build the skills needed to effectively run their campaigns.

Staffing Structure and Roles

Exhibit II-1 summarizes the staffing structure for CIF. As shown in this exhibit, the CIF management staff included the campaign director, who reported to the executive director and oversaw all campaign activities and also served as supervisor to the regional coordinators. The campaign director was supported by a campaign engagement manager who helped with regional campaign oversight and also managed social media efforts for the CIF Campaign. Both the campaign director and engagement manager were based out of AFOP’s office in Washington, D.C. Each campaign region was staffed with one full-time regional coordinator who was charged with refining campaign strategies to fit his/her region, brokering relationships with potential partners and community members, launching the documentation activities and education and advocacy campaign, and building and sustaining adult coalitions and youth councils. AFOP provided the regional coordinators some staff support via paid youth interns. Funding for these interns was limited, however, and thus the interns were only able to work on the campaign for a few months out of the year.

Exhibit II-1: CIF Campaign Staffing Structure
Regional coordinators were each situated at AFOP member organizations in their respective campaign regions that agreed to serve as lead agencies for the campaign. In fact, the selection process for the campaign regions hinged in large part on the willingness of these member agencies to support the campaign by agreeing to serve as lead agencies. These agencies were initially tasked with overseeing some of the regional campaign finances; providing mentorship, office space, and supplies to the regional coordinators; and giving campaign staff access to their farmworker networks.

**Internal Communications Structure**

AFOP leaders believed that having the support of these lead agencies, with their experienced staff and deep connections in the farmworker community could provide a strong jumpstart to the campaign. The campaign director recognized, however, that even with the support of lead agencies, the lean staffing in each region could easily result in feelings of isolation and disconnect from the larger movement-building effort. Thus, part of the internal communications structure for the campaign included weekly phone check-ins between the regional coordinators and management staff in the D.C. office. The hope was that these regular check-in calls would help to bridge the geographic distances across the campaign regions and build a sense of community and team. The campaign staff members also participated in quarterly, week-long, in-person meetings that were held in different campaign regions on a rotating basis. These convenings enabled staff to gain an understanding of the different contexts and issues for the farmworker communities across the regions as well as to continue to build learning opportunities and camaraderie across the regional campaign staff.

**Technical Assistance Support**

Though the regional coordinators were expected to gain the bulk of their learning from each other through peer sharing of best practices and approaches to challenges, funds from the WKKF grant also helped them to receive some direct technical assistance to build critical skill sets. Specifically, they were given communications training from AFOP’s Communications Director, Ayrianne Parks, and training in community organizing from Robert Johnsen, a trainer with decades of experience in community organizing. The communications training focused primarily on consistency of message, interview skills, and tips for going on camera. The community organizing training included an intensive workshop with regional coordinators at the launch of the campaign, followed by intermittent support at the campaign staffs’ quarterly meetings. Some regional coordinators received coaching via telephone, particularly if management perceived them to be struggling and in need of support.
Challenges in Campaign Capacity

Campaign staff noted that they made considerable traction in their efforts, despite experiencing the challenges that naturally arise from working with limited resources and within the short timeframe of the grant. An analysis of these key challenges provides a meaningful opportunity to help set the stage for considerations moving forward. The major challenges that emerged with respect to campaign capacity fall within the following three categories: (1) staffing, and (2) the administrative structure, and (3) technical assistance.

Key challenges associated with staffing include:

- **Staffing size.** Overall, campaign staff agreed that staffing at the regional and management levels was too lean, given the nature of the work and the goals of the campaign. On the regional level, while some of the regional coordinators were able to make tremendous progress in the specific farmworking regions in which they were based, none of them were able to grow the campaign to have a truly statewide presence, due to limited staff capacity. North Carolina came the closest, having formed strong alliances with coalitions and partners that have a statewide reach. Similarly, on the management level, there was a general sense that the campaign was understaffed, which posed limitations to the ability of campaign staff to align regional and national efforts and left the campaign vulnerable to staff turnover.

- **Staff turnover.** AFOP experienced turnover in six campaign positions, representing a 100 percent turnover rate over the course of the grant period. Although staff turnover is not uncommon in the nonprofit world, it presented challenges to the campaign on multiple fronts, including frustration at the loss of training investment and lengthy hiring efforts that diverted resources and attention away from actual campaign work. Additionally, turnover limited the campaign director’s ability to manage the regional campaign as effectively as she would have liked. To illustrate, during the bulk of the grassroots campaign’s first year, the campaign director played a dual role, filling in for the campaign engagement manager while also trying to recruit new staff and fulfilling her own responsibilities as the director. Finally, staffing only one full-time worker in each region proved risky and the loss of the regional coordinators in Michigan, Ohio, and California ultimately resulted in the folding of the campaigns in those regions.

Additionally, aspects of the management structure and administrative components posed some challenges, which include the following:

---

1 These positions included the original CIF Campaign Director, the campaign’s first engagement manager, and the regional coordinators in Michigan, Ohio, California, and North Carolina. The turnover rate was calculated by dividing the number of turnovers by the number of full-time campaign staff.
Location of national office relative to regional campaigns. Management and regional staff commented on the challenge of building relationships when the national office is in Washington D.C., and campaign locations were spread out across the U.S. Both management and regional staff commented that it was sometimes difficult to have an effective supervisory and support relationship when management and campaign staff were not in the same location.

Factors related to the budget. Not surprisingly, all campaign staff agreed that the campaign would have been able to accomplish more with a larger budget. Specifically, they said future budgets should include larger allocations for travel and funds to pay for, at minimum, a part-time adult staff to support the coordinators in each region. However, overall, the feedback surrounding the campaign budget had less do with budget size and more to do with planning, communication, and oversight. One regional coordinator noted that the campaign might have benefitted from more planning time so that regional coordinators could think through, plan, and budget for the things they would need to carry out their campaign work. For example, while documentation was a core component to the campaign, the regional coordinators did not have the necessary equipment to carry out this work. In order to get the resources needed to purchase this equipment, staff applied for grants from other funding sources. While they were ultimately successful in these endeavors, it slowed down the pace of their documentation efforts. Another regional staff member said that she would have benefitted from a more detailed overview and explanation of the budget for the campaign. She explained that the lack of understanding of the overall budget made it difficult for the regional coordinators to plan strategically, and to produce accurate monthly reports for coalition board members.

Role of the lead agency. All agencies met their commitment to provide office space and equipment to the regional coordinators and all staff were grateful for these resources. However, regional coordinators had mixed experiences with the role played by their lead agencies and the site liaisons at those agencies (who were supposed to serve as mentors to the regional coordinators). Most felt they did not receive the support they expected or needed from the lead agencies to help them in their campaign endeavors. One regional coordinator expected more mentorship and oversight and was frustrated at the lack of involvement from her site liaison. Another regional coordinator stated that the CIF Campaign was simply “not a priority” for the lead agency, adding that the staff at this agency were already “at full capacity” with their own work and thus had little time for support and mentorship. She also noted that there was some misalignment with the lead agency’s focus and the focus of the CIF Campaign, which made it harder to leverage the agency’s assets and networks.

Location of the lead agency. The location of the lead agency was a crucial factor in determining accessibility to target farmworker communities. Two of the three regional coordinators found it extremely challenging to engage in community organizing for their campaigns because the lead agencies in which they were placed were not located in or near their target farmworker communities. As noted in the “Campaign Context” section on California and North Carolina, the issue of “place” became a critical one for the campaign.
Lastly, staff expressed feedback about the technical assistance provided:

- **Investment in technical assistance.** Given the effectiveness of the technical assistance provided in media communications and community organizing, staff expressed a desire to have a wider offering of capacity-building support trainings. Overall, respondents noted that they could have benefitted from a greater investment in technical assistance to help them grow the variety of skills necessary to meet their objectives, such as youth development and youth organizing. They would have also liked to have had more training to help them build the host of skills necessary to successfully start up and run a nonprofit organization, since the regional coordinators were expected to apply for 501(c)3 status for their regional coalitions as part of their sustainability plans.²

**Lessons Learned**

As noted previously, the challenges faced by the campaign staff served as critical learning opportunities. Some key lessons about how regional coordinators overcame these challenges are as follows:

- **While staff turnover resulted in some losses for the campaign, regional staff members who persevered achieved the greatest successes in terms of meeting (and sometimes exceeding) their campaign goals.**³ While we recognize that the decision to leave a position is made up of a confluence of any number of factors, we also noted that the regional coordinators who persevered and were most successful in their campaigns also shared some qualities that are worthy of consideration in future hiring efforts. In particular, these regional coordinators were extremely resourceful and strategic about leveraging the assets of partners and allies to support campaign goals, unafraid to take initiative, and able to adapt to changing situations. They also demonstrated strong relationship-building skills and a willingness to immerse themselves in the farmworker communities to gain a better understanding of needs and to win the trust of community members.

- **Placing regional coordinators in AFOP’s member agencies provided some useful benefits to the campaign.** For example, there was strong value in situating the regional coordinators in AFOP member agencies because of their deep knowledge of and connections with the farmworker community. Additionally, given the lean staffing structure for campaign staff, the lead

---

² Obtaining 501(c)3 status was not a specifically-articulated goal at the launch of the campaign. This goal was added when the campaign in North Carolina started moving in this direction. The campaign in this region was making such strong headway with this effort that campaign management elected to make it a goal for all regional campaign coalitions.

³ We include Texas and North Carolina in this category of successful regions. While the regional coordinator of North Carolina eventually left her position, she did not do so until May 2012, which was after the original grant end date. Moreover, she did not leave until the coalition in North Carolina had a solid infrastructure in place and this was therefore the only regional campaign that did not fold when its coordinator stepped down.
agencies were able to provide a sense of community, so regional coordinators did not feel as if they were working in isolation.

- **Even though staff expressed a desire for a greater breadth of technical assistance opportunities, the technical assistance provided on community organizing was immensely helpful and beneficial for campaign staff.** The majority of technical assistance support the staff received was in community organizing, which was provided to the staff via an intensive workshop at the launch of the campaign, followed by periodic check-ins, all of which were conducted by longtime community organizer, Bob Johnsen. The majority of staff felt they benefited from his wealth of knowledge and the training and support they received, with one regional coordinator commenting that Johnsen’s popular education approach resonated with her. In general, most staff noted that Johnsen was “approachable.”

- **Taking into consideration the limited resources available, some campaign staff members were resourceful in finding relevant capacity-building trainings on their own.** The regional coordinator from North Carolina was the most successful at seeking out and successfully getting technical assistance support she needed. She took a course in photography to help her with documentation activities and attended a number of trainings related to running a nonprofit organization (e.g. financial reporting, fundraising, and strategic planning), which she learned about when applying for a small grant from another funder. It is therefore interesting to note that, of all the campaign regions, North Carolina is by far the most established in terms of becoming a fully-recognized and operational 501(c)3.

**Conclusion**

The CIF Campaign functioned on a very lean staffing structure and staff made effective use of available resources and opportunities to grow their campaign capacities. The campaign also operated in agricultural and political contexts that differed tremendously across the campaign regions. Some farmworking communities in “sending” or “home” states were strong and vibrant, while other farmworking communities in “receiving” states were relatively invisible. Some regions had strong and vocal opponents in large-scale agribusiness, while others had a growing focus in sustainable and just farming practices. Some regions had fairly strong educational supports for farmworker students while others had an education community that was disconnected from the needs of farmworker students or had little capacity to support them. We offer this context to provide a sense of place for the regional campaigns, as we recognize the importance that it had on campaign effectiveness and the ability to engage in the activities we describe in the chapter that follows.
III. CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

As outlined in the evaluation framework, the implementation activities of the Children in the Fields campaign fall into four categories: (1) documenting child labor; (2) educating the public and decisionmakers about the issues of child labor in agriculture and advocating for change; (3) creating coalitions to help with campaign activities and ensure continued strength of the movement; and (4) developing youth councils to help youth become their own agents of change. This chapter focuses on the progress made in the first two categories—documentation of child labor and education and advocacy activities. It begins with brief descriptions of these activities, followed by a discussion of the challenges faced by the campaign as well as some promising practices that emerged.

Documenting Children in the Fields

One of the campaign’s main goals was to bring the “hidden problem” of child labor in agriculture into the open. Thus, one of the campaign’s primary activities was to document the existence and nature of child labor, and to use this documentation to educate the public about the issue. Below, we describe the nature of the documentation activities and the overall progress made in this activity.

Key Documentation Activities

There were three main documentation activities that took place over the course of the campaign. These include photographing child labor, creating and participating in documentary films about children and youth working in agriculture, and gathering testimonies from farmworker children and youth about their experiences.

- **Photographing child labor in agriculture.** The campaign in North Carolina made the most significant contributions in this arena, with coalition and youth council members having captured compelling and vivid images, not only of children laboring in agriculture, but of the hardships faced by migrant farmworker youth and their families. These photographs were shared by the campaign through exhibits, education materials, presentations, campaign events, and social media. An exhibit of farmworker testimonies, videos, and photographs traveled throughout North Carolina and was also exhibited in Mexico City. This exhibit
was spearheaded by Peter Eversoll, who is an activist, photographer and founding member of NC FIELD, the CIF coalition in North Carolina. It included contributions by members of Poder Juvenil Campesino (PJC), North Carolina’s youth council. Photos taken by members of the youth council have been offered for sale at campaign events, photo exhibits, and through the NC FIELD website. All proceeds have been placed in a fund to benefit the youth council—for scholarships, and to fund youth council activities. The photographs in this section are some examples of the powerful photographs used in the CIF campaign.

- **Documentary films.** The campaign contributed to the development of a number of documentary films about child labor in agriculture. One of the campaign’s most notable “wins” included participation in the development of “The Harvest/LaCosecha,” an award-winning film about the lives of farmworker children, produced by filmmaker U. Robert Romano. This critically-acclaimed film was screened across the country and was used to jumpstart dialogues not just about child labor but also about food justice and the definition of “good food.”

The textbox below highlights additional, key filmmaking accomplishments from the campaign in North Carolina.

---

**Captured on Film**

The CIF campaign in North Carolina made significant contributions in the area of documentary filmmaking about the subject of child labor in agriculture. In addition to developing their own films for use in classrooms and for dissemination via social media, coalition and youth council members also participated in films produced by other documentarians. The following represent just a few examples of their successful efforts in this arena:

- **Overworked and Under Spray.** This six-minute documentary film focuses on the impact of exposure to pesticides in the fields on young bodies. It features interviews from young farmworkers who are members of the CIF youth council, as well as health outreach and advocacy experts.

- **Uprooted Innocence.** This documentary, developed through a partnership with the Farmworker Advocacy Network (FAN) and the Center of Documentary Studies at Duke University, included interviews with members of Poder Juvenil Campesino (PJC), the youth council for the CIF campaign in North Carolina. The video can be accessed via a number of different advocacy websites and is easily accessible through a simple online search. Screenings of the documentary took place throughout North Carolina.

- **Enfant Forcats (Child Slave Labor).** This documentary, produced by French filmmaker Hubert Dubois, is about the international problem of child labor and it features interviews with Emily Drakage, regional coordinator for the CIF Campaign in North Carolina, and Peter Eversoll, one of the founding members of NC FIELD. The film, which credited AFOP for its work in this issue, was screened in Geneva for World Day Against Child Labor.
• Testimonials from farmworker youth. Testimonials from farmworker youth about their lived realities are another critical part of the campaign’s documentation strategy. They are powerful because they humanize the issues of children in the fields, providing imagery of the hardships faced as well as the desires farmworker youth have for bettering their futures. Regional coordinators have been collecting these testimonies from members of their youth councils while also providing the youth with a variety of venues through which to share their stories. Testimonies from farmworker youth are also collected via AFOP’s annual Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Essay and Art Contest, wherein children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers are encouraged to use creative expression to share their experiences as farmworkers or as children of farmworkers. Winners are offered a monetary prize and the opportunity to attend AFOP’s annual conference to see their work displayed and to be recognized by the farmworker community. Their work is also included in educational packets that are shared with members of congress and other decisionmakers.

Educating the Public and Advocating for Change

At the beginning stages of the campaign, the education activities were focused squarely on raising awareness of the issue of child labor in agriculture to lay the groundwork for advocacy. The hope was that raised awareness of the issue would drive a grassroots movement that would ultimately result in legislative change at the national level. Over the course of the campaign, however, it became clear that the unfavorable political climate (i.e. growing anti-immigration sentiment, and a combative congressional ethos) made legislative change an untenable goal for the immediate future. Thus the CIF campaign’s focus was broadened beyond child labor issues to include raising awareness of the harsh and often dangerous conditions under which farmworkers live and work and the effects these conditions have on farmworker children, youth, and their families. Additionally, CIF management staff members working on national-level efforts recalibrated their initial goals to focus more on administrative advocacy efforts focused on encouraging changes in procurement practices and hazardous rule orders to motivate behavioral

Rhythm of the Harvest

We arrive at one of the fields I will be working in today, and wince as the tires screech to a stop. I look at my mom there is determination in her eyes as we look forward and see no end to the rows of tobacco. I look back and smile at the boy, with the big, brown eyes.

I still remember the song of the night, but I like this song too. You hear a squish as our shoes connect with the moist dirt. We line up like marchers next to the row of tobacco we will be working in. I look at my mom and see as her eyes water, making her look vulnerable and small. There is little to no noise as we work now.

You hear a baby boy cry and pound his tiny, fragile, fists against a car window, as he watches his mother disappear into a long field of tobacco....

--Excerpt from essay by Neftali Cuello, AFOP’s 2012 Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Essay Contest Winner
change by growers, consumers, and farmworkers. The hope was that though legislative change did not seem imminent, they could still work towards providing greater protections for farmworker youth by engaging in administrative advocacy while continuing to educate the public and decisionmakers about working and living conditions for farmworkers.

**Key Education and Advocacy Activities**

Campaign staff, youth councils, and coalitions engaged in a wide array of activities as part of their education and advocacy campaigns, using the material they generated in their documentation efforts as content for their work. Audience sizes varied, depending on the scope of the activity, but overall, AFOP estimates that within the grant period, the campaign reached over 20,000 people through events led by its campaign staff across the country, not including its media and social media campaigns.

Key activity areas are as follows:

- **Presentations.** Campaign staff, youth, and coalition members have presented information about a range of topics related to child labor in agriculture and farmworker conditions in general. These presentations have taken place in a variety of venues, including in high school and college classes, panel discussions, and conferences.

- **Special Events.** Further illustrated in the textbox to the right, the sites have organized special events aimed at educating the community on child labor and farmworker issues. Regional campaigns capitalized upon holidays such as César Chávez Day and other days of celebration for the farmworker community, such as El Dia de los Migrantes (Day of the Migrants) and Farmworker Awareness Week, to host celebration events. Those events were also used as venues to discuss farmworker issues and publicize the work of the campaign.

- **Media Relations.** Campaign staff at both the national and regional levels have developed strong media relations over the course of the campaign, helping to make AFOP the “go to” organization for information regarding child labor in agriculture. The CIF campaign and its staff have been featured on several news

---

**Education through Celebration**

In North Carolina, the CIF coalition and youth council hosted a two-day event entitled *Holy Mole: Spirit of Food and the People Behind it*. The event included cooking classes; discussions about food, farming, and farm labor by topic experts; and an exhibit displaying photographs taken by youth council members. Over 200 people attended the event.

In Texas, one of the CIF youth councils organized a César Chávez Day event to celebrate the life and work of Chávez and educate the community about the lives of migrant farmworkers. This event, which featured presentations and activities created by youth council members, was attended by over 500 people.
outlets, including but not limited to *Que Paso*, *The Huffington Post*, *Sacramento News and Review*, *the New York Times*, *the Wall Street Journal*, Fox News and 60 Minutes. Ultimately, AFOP reports that the campaign contributed to 67 media stories about issues of farmworker children and estimates that they reached 114.5 million people through these stories.¹

**Social Media.** The campaign was active in using social media to disseminate information about the campaign and to educate the public about issues facing the farmworker community in general and youth farmworkers in particular. Their social media campaign strategy included dissemination of information, photographs, videos, stories, and regional events via multiple platforms, including Facebook, Twitter, the campaign’s blog, Flickr, and Youtube. AFOP estimates 3.5 million people were reached through the campaign’s social media efforts.

**Research Reports.** With resources from the WKKF grant, AFOP developed and published two reports about the issue of child labor in agriculture: *America’s Farmworker Children: Harvest of Broken Dreams* and *Sowing the Seeds of Change: A Snapshot of Child Labor in America*. These reports serve as helpful tools to educate the public about the campaign and about issues of children in agriculture in general.

---

¹ Estimates for viewer reach were derived through research on viewership and circulation numbers as well as by estimates from *Vocus*, AFOP’s media tracking service.
because they are concise and full of data and imagery, which make them easy to disseminate and digest. Campaign staff members also contributed to the literature through their advisement on other high profile reports. The textbox on the previous page provides examples of some of these reports.

- **“Hill” Visits.** On the national front, CIF campaign staff working in the Washington, D.C. office continued to meet with legislators to discuss the issues facing farmworking families and youth. They also engaged in administrative advocacy, meeting with key agencies responsible for regulation of the food industry, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). Specifically, they explored options on how to make farming practices safer through tighter regulations, changes to hazardous orders, and changes to procurement practices that would encourage contracting with farmers who follow strict safety standards and who do not violate child labor laws.

  On the regional level, campaign staff also met with state legislators and local decisionmakers to educate them about issues facing farmworking communities. They also provided advocacy training for farmworker youth and provided youth council members with opportunities to meet congressional leaders and to share their stories as farmworker youth. (This is discussed in more detail in the section on the CIF youth councils in Chapter 4.)

- **Film screenings.** All regional campaigns held screening events for “La Cosecha/The Harvest,” the award-winning documentary film by Robert Romano that followed the lives of migrant farmworkers. CIF campaign staff were strategic partners in the film, and they used the screenings as a forum to discuss migrant labor issues. Youth council members that were featured in the film served as keynote speakers in several screening events and at conferences where parts of the film were used as launching points for discussion.

- **Safety information sessions and trainings.** Campaign staff and youth councils engaged in activities designed to provide information about hazardous work conditions, particularly with respect to pesticides, heat stress, and the dangers of working in certain crops such as tobacco. These trainings were not only focused on information dissemination but also provided guidelines on protective measures that should be taken when working under these conditions. Trainings and information sessions were offered in a variety of formats, including the production by youth councils of a play about pesticide use (this is discussed in more detail in the Youth Council section in Chapter 4.)

**Challenges in Documentation and Education and Advocacy Activities**

Though campaign staff at all levels demonstrated successful progress in their documentation and their education and advocacy activities, we acknowledge that there have been challenges encountered while trying to accomplish these efforts. The analysis of these challenges provide
meaningful areas of consideration to note for AFOP’s ongoing work while also highlighting the ways in which campaign staff demonstrated resourcefulness to address these issues.

The key challenges for documentation include the following:

- **Migration.** Migration posed interesting documentation challenges in North Carolina and Texas, the states with a large number of migrating families, because those families were perpetually on the move. In Texas, the regional coordinator noted that for her, the challenge was in documenting child labor in her state. She noted that child labor affected many families from her region, but that because Texas is a “sending state,” the incidents of child labor were happening in other states. This made photographing or videoing child labor in her campaign region a somewhat untenable goal.

![Typical U.S. Migrant Farmworker Stream](image)

- **Gaining access to the fields.** Gaining access to the fields in general was a tremendous challenge for all regional campaigns. The biggest obstacle lay in the unwillingness of growers to become involved in or support the campaign. In Texas, the regional coordinator noted that she struggled to get buy-in from growers, who were opposed to the campaign because they viewed the issue of children working in agriculture as a kind of character-building exercise, noting that there was “nothing wrong with forming a strong work ethic starting at a young age.” Others were simply threatened by the campaign and worried that providing access to their fields might result in a threat to their livelihoods. Indeed, the regional coordinator in North Carolina stated that certain campaign “wins” ended up posing greater obstacles in her efforts to engage in documentation work. For example, while campaign staff were pleased that the issue of child labor in agriculture captured national attention after ABC News produced and aired an investigative report on child labor violations on blueberry
farms, it also resulted in an increased sense of suspicion and mistrust by growers and increased fears of negative repercussions by farmworkers.

- **Earning community trust.** Earning the trust of the farmworker community was not easy. At the heart of the issue is the challenge of earning the trust of a community that has long suffered from exploitive practices and that has been under even more intense scrutiny as a result of growing anti-immigration sentiment. This issue is echoed throughout the campaign regions, where a culture of fear pervades many of these farmworking communities, making the process of trust building very slow. The regional coordinators recognized and were sensitive to the issues. As one regional coordinator mentioned, “We are asking them to take big risks to speak about these issues. We could not guarantee outcomes or consequences of that action.” The challenge of earning community trust was not insurmountable, but it was critical to the success of all aspects of the campaign and required a significant investment of time. All regional coordinators recognized the importance of the investment, noting that relationship building is the heart of their work as community organizers, but it did have an effect on the pace of the campaigns early on, particularly in California.

- **Placement.** Where the regional campaign offices were located posed some challenges to the ability to document child labor in agriculture. For example, both the California and North Carolina campaigns were housed in lead agencies that were located in urban areas that were not in close proximity to farming communities where child labor was likely to occur. In California, the regional coordinator noted that the campaign’s proximity to the “protective sphere” of the state’s capital made the presence of child labor less likely in the immediate campaign region, adding that the travel budget was not robust enough to enable him to explore areas where child labor may be more of an issue. In fact, both regional coordinators found themselves having to drive fairly long distances to work with farming communities in general. However, the campaign in North Carolina was eventually able to move its operations to a location that was in the heart of farming communities in eastern North Carolina, thanks to a donation of office space from community-based nonprofit agency.

The key challenges in the education and advocacy activities include the following:

- **Competing and Conflating Issue Agendas.** A major challenge for the campaign was the extent to which other issues diverted attention away from the issue of child labor. The challenge of competing issue agendas was most apparent in the media campaign. While the campaign exceeded expectations in terms of the number of earned media opportunities, campaign staff members noted that in fact, they had contributed to more stories than have been aired. The campaign does not

---

2 *The Blueberry Children*, a special investigation by ABC news, first aired on ABC’s *Nightline* on October 30, 2009. After it was aired, Walmart announced that it severed its contract with the blueberry grower highlighted in the investigative report.
always win when it is forced to compete for “air time” with other issues that may be perceived to be more “urgent” or “newsworthy.”

Another major challenge staff experienced in their efforts to educate the public and decisionmakers about the issue of child labor in agriculture was the extent to which farmworker issues were conflated with another extremely controversial topic: immigration reform. Regional coordinators said, with frustration, that it was difficult to engage people in dialogue about the problem of child labor when they kept equating farmworkers with undocumented immigrants. As the regional coordinator in California commented, “we’ve just been lumped into the undocumented immigrants issue” and thus farmworker issues in general have fallen off of people’s radars and they “are just not hearing it at all anymore.”

- **Active Resistance.** Campaign staff experienced some resistance to the campaign, which created obstacles in their efforts to educate the public about the issue and advocate for change. As indicated previously, growers were resistant to the campaign, in large part because they perceived it as a threat to their work. But campaign staff also experienced some resistance from farmworkers themselves. Farmworker parents in Texas, for example, said with pride that their experiences as migrant farmworkers contributed to a strong work ethic and to family cohesion. They expressed concern that the campaign was ultimately denouncing their way of life. Campaign staff members were, in fact, very sensitive to this concern, particularly given that two were former migrant farmworker youth themselves and recognized the value as well as the hardship of their experiences. Regional coordinators thus took greater care in their framing to farmworker families, placing a greater emphasis on the issue of equity in child labor protection.

**Promising Practices in Documentation, Education, and Advocacy**

As mentioned before, despite some complex challenges, the campaign overall was remarkably successful in its documentation, and education and advocacy efforts. Much can be learned from the regional coordinators’ approaches to the work and their efforts at addressing challenges. Some promising practices in documentation emerged that are particularly noteworthy:

- **Harnessing and leveraging the power of community champions.** In North Carolina, the partnership with documentary photographer Peter Eversoll was a critical factor to the success in the campaign’s documentation efforts. Eversoll is a community champion who helped to broker relationships with farmworkers and who shared his knowledge and resources with the coalition and youth council to support the goals of the CIF campaign. This included providing photography training to coalition and youth council members as well as access to his wealth of photographs documenting child labor in agriculture and the working and living conditions of migrant farmworkers in general. He served as a strategic partner to
the campaign and ultimately became a co-founder of the campaign’s coalition, NC FIELD.

- **Building the skills of youth to be effective documentarians of their own experiences.** Perhaps the most promising of practices that emerged from the documentation efforts was the incorporation of the youth council into documentation activities. To this end, North Carolina led the way, once again capitalizing upon the talents of Peter Eversoll, who trained the youth in photography so that they could document their own lived realities. The campaigns in Texas and California followed suit, recognizing the power of having youth serve as documentarians of the farmworker experience. This was an incredibly successful practice, not only because it circumvented field access challenges, since the youth farmworkers were able to document “from the inside,” but because it ultimately served as a vehicle for youth empowerment. Youth were able to share their experiences through their own lenses, rather than letting others advocate on their behalf, and this gave them a sense of agency and purpose in the effort to enact change for their communities.

Moreover, some noteworthy promising practices in education and advocacy that emerged over the course of the campaign are the following:

- **Leveraging organizational social capital.** As noted previously, over the course of the campaign, AFOP was increasingly sought out by media and allied organizations as the “go to” organization with respect to child labor in agriculture. Regional coordinators capitalized upon this status and the “know how” of AFOP’s communications team to help them in their efforts to gain media attention on a local level. Being associated with AFOP brought more media opportunities to the regional coalitions than they would have received if they were operating alone, as new start up coalitions.

- **Engaging in multiple levels of activity.** There was a remarkable kind of dynamism to the campaign, which is reflected in the multiple levels of activity that occurred over the course of the grant period. On the national front, AFOP approached the issue of child labor from multiple angles including, but not limited to: supporting the CARE Act, launching the *Year of the Farmworker Child*, administrative advocacy with government agencies such as the DOL and the USDA, and hosting a national youth conference. On a regional level, the campaigns engaged in a variety of activities and worked across multiple communities (school peers, college youth, farmworker communities, legislators, etc.) in their efforts to raise awareness about issues facing farmworker youth. As a result of the efforts made at the national and regional levels, the campaign had a fairly wide reach, one that is exceptionally impressive when considering the leanness of the campaign staff.
• **Involving youth in the design and implementation of education strategies.** Again, where the campaign shone was in its thoughtful and purposeful incorporation of youth in both the design and the implementation of education and advocacy activities. The youth played active and important roles in this aspect of the campaign, serving as educators, trainers, and ambassadors of their community.

• **Being sensitive to the needs and contexts of target communities.** The vision guiding the CIF campaign is to end the cycle of poverty for farmworker families by “getting children out of the fields and in school.” While the goal seems fairly straightforward, the lived realities of migrant farmworker families are extremely complex. The regional coordinators were exceptionally sensitive to these complexities, recognizing, for example, that some decisions about allowing children to work in the fields are borne out of necessity and are a reaction to extreme financial hardship and limited options, while others are rooted in a sense of pride related to a parent’s own history as a farmworker youth. Still others reflect a love of farming and the desire to instill in children and youth a passion for the profession. These complex layers were woven accordingly into the framing and approach of each regional campaign, reflecting not only their success in accessing community voices, but a deep respect for those voices, even those that may, on the surface, appear to be in opposition to the campaign’s overall goals.

• **Being reflective, self-critical, and receptive to challenges.** All campaign staff expressed some level of frustration at how difficult it has been to effect change with respect to child labor, an issue which AFOP’s former executive director, thought would be a “no brainer” and easy to fix, given the egregious nature of the issue. Despite their frustrations, CIF campaign staff demonstrated a remarkable sensitivity to those who may feel threatened by the campaign and have used the critiques of their campaign as learning opportunities. What is striking is the tenor of the campaign’s response to attacks and criticism. Rather than engaging in counterattack, campaign staff focused on listening, correcting erroneous assumptions, and continuously reframing their messages in ways intended to reduce threat and invite partnership.

• **Focusing on dignity and safety.** One critique that campaign staff really took to heart was the feedback that some people perceived their efforts to be an attack on farmers and farm work. This was not at all the intention of the campaign, but staff recognized how their work could be easily misconstrued or misused. They thus took care in trying to create a more balanced message that included not only a frank discussion of farming practices that exploit farmworker children and their families, but also included in their efforts positive examples of labor practices that are safe, fair, and just and that do not violate the integrity of farming as a profession, nor the dignity of the people who work in it.
The next chapter focuses on the last two components of the CIF campaign’s implementation activities: building coalitions and youth councils to drive the movement to end child labor in agriculture.
While the last chapter focused on the key activities of the CIF Campaign, this chapter is focused on the people who helped to design and implement those activities: the CIF regional coalitions and the youth councils. These two groups were not only instrumental to the campaign’s successes but they have a strong role to play in the continuation of the movement to end child labor in agriculture.

Coalition Building

One of the key goals of the CIF Campaign was to develop strong and sustainable coalitions in each campaign region that would spearhead and implement campaign activities. The hope was that these coalitions would grow strong enough to continue the work of the campaign’s efforts past the sunset of the WKKF grant. As mentioned previously, of the five initial campaigns, two of them were able to establish sustainable coalitions (North Carolina and Texas). We should note that while the California campaign made good progress in its coalition-building efforts, the resignation of the regional coordinator near the end of the grant and the inability to secure future funding led to the suspension of the campaign in the region. However, since California’s campaign lasted for the majority of the grant period, this region still yielded significant information for our analysis, along with North Carolina and Texas. Therefore, our examination of coalition-building efforts will focus on these three regional campaigns since they made the most traction.

To assess the depth and breadth of their coalition-building efforts, SPR administered a pre- and post-network survey in 2010 and 2012\(^1\), respectively, to the regional coordinators to measure the

\(^1\) The final survey was administered in April 2012 for the California campaign and in December 2012 for North Carolina and Texas.) A baseline survey was administered to the regional coordinator in Michigan, but because the campaign in that region closed while it was still in nascent stages, no final survey was administered. Neither a pre- nor a post-survey was administered to the regional coordinator in Ohio, as the campaign started much later in the grant period and made very little progress before finally closing.
campaign’s network reach in the early phase of the campaign.² In this survey, respondents were asked to list each individual with whom they worked as part of the CIF Campaign, the role that person played in the campaign, and the sector that person represented. For the latter two items, we established categories for regional coordinators to choose from to describe the pivotal members in their coalition-building efforts. These descriptions are as follows:

- **Representation of sectors.** Taking into consideration some of the larger goals of the campaign (supporting farmworker families, building a movement to change child labor policies in agriculture, and helping farmworker children finish their education), we identified ten sectors/types of organizations and entities within which campaign staff could link with individuals who could help advance campaign efforts. These options included the education sector, advocacy organizations, the health and human services sector, elected officials, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, local business owners, farm owners, community leaders and others.

- **Role in the campaign.** We divided member roles into three categories: coalition members, partners and other. We created these specific categories because, while one of the major goals of this evaluation is to assess progress on coalition-building efforts, we recognize that networks are comprised of multiple players that work together in different ways to reach campaign goals. Thus, in addition to coalitions members, we added the roles of partner (those who were formal partners in the campaign but who were not coalition members) and other (those who supported the campaign through services, volunteerism, etc. but were not coalition members.) Creating these added roles enabled us to measure coalition growth as a distinct evaluation component of the campaign while also allowing us to see the greater picture of participation.

We used these survey results to help illustrate the progress made in efforts related to building the coalition. It is important to note that we acknowledge the impact of context on coalition makeup and growth. Thus, we are not using the survey results to compare the regions against one another as an indicator of success, but to measure individual coalition growth (and the growth of their overall networks), as well as overall network growth across the regional campaigns, in addition to highlighting trends across the regions.

**Coalition and Network Growth**

Exhibit IV-1 below offers an overall picture of the growth of the CIF coalitions in California, North Carolina and Texas as well as the growth of their networks between 2010 and 2012. The graph offers side-by-side comparisons of the numbers of network participants in each role

---

² A sample of this survey is located in Appendix B. It is important to note that while we are treating the 2010 administration of the survey as a baseline to measure growth over time, it is not a true baseline, since the grassroots campaign had already technically started before SPR was brought on board as evaluators.
(coalition member, partner, other). As the graph demonstrates, partners made up the largest number of campaign participants overall by 2012, followed by coalition members and then “other.”

**Exhibit IV-1:**
Growth in Networks Between 2010 and 2012

Exhibit IV-2 below compares the total network participation numbers across all regions in 2010 and 2012, including the overall increase of the number of participants in each of the roles (coalition member, partner, and other) and the percent change between 2010 and 2012.

**Exhibit IV-2**
Overall Campaign Network Growth from 2010 to 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total in 2010</th>
<th>Total in 2012</th>
<th>Difference from 2010 to 2012</th>
<th>% Change from 2010 to 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition Members</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>+101</td>
<td>+184%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>+73</td>
<td>+304%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>+199</td>
<td>+134%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key findings regarding overall campaign network growth are as follows:

- **The campaign experienced healthy growth in its overall networks between 2010 and 2012.** Between 2010 and 2012, a total of 199 individuals were added to the campaign networks across all regions, representing a 134 percent increase in network participation overall.
• **Overall, healthy growth was also reflected within each participation role (coalition member, partner, other).** Overall, the category of “other” reflects the largest growth, with a 304 percent rate of increase between 2010 and 2012.³ The next largest area of growth is in the “partner” role, which shows a 184 percent increase between 2010 and 2012. Finally, by 2012, a total of 25 new coalition members were added to the regional campaigns overall, representing a 36% increase from 2010.

An examination of network growth within each region yields some interesting findings regarding network growth in the regional campaigns. Exhibit IV-3 therefore offers a *regional* breakdown of network participation numbers, by participation role, followed by an analysis of trends that these numbers yield.

**Exhibit IV-3:**
Regional Network Growth From 2010 to 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition Members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **California had a sizable network, however the majority of its network fell into the category of “other.”** In 2012, the California campaign reported the greatest number of participants at 147, however the majority of those participants were in the “other” category, as opposed to the more formally committed “coalition member” and “partner” categories. This may indicate that while there was strong interest in the campaign, the commitment levels were not as strong. In fact, California’s network had the smallest percentage of coalition members, when compared to Texas and North Carolina, whose coalitions each made up over a third of their networks.

• **Campaign “partners” represented a majority of the networks in North Carolina and Texas.** In both North Carolina and Texas, campaign partners made up 51 percent of the networks in each region by 2012. Interestingly, when adding up the participant numbers in the “coalition member” role and the “partner” role in North Carolina and in Texas, the totals amount to roughly 86 percent of the networks in each region. This is a positive finding, since it indicates that a strong majority of the networks in these two regions was made up of participants that had specific commitments to the campaign.

³ This figure may be somewhat misleading, however, because while there were increases in this category across all regions, California’s network has an unusually large portion of participants who fall under the category of “other” and therefore that region may be skewing the results.
Network size may not be an indicator of campaign strength. Interestingly, by 2012 North Carolina’s network was the smallest, compared to the other two regions. Moreover, the California campaign, which was the least successful of all the three campaign regions in terms of progress on implementation activities, had the largest network in 2012 when compared to the other two regions. This may serve as an indicator that size of networks is not as significant as network makeup and strategic use of network strengths to achieve campaign goals.

Campaign Network Makeup

Exhibit IV-4 below provides some details on sector representation in the regional campaign networks in 2010 and 2012. This is immediately followed by a table that highlights growth in each sector across all campaign regions between 2010 and 2012 (Exhibit IV-5). Together, the data in these tables help to illuminate the nature of the diversity of these networks. The data also show where strategic areas of growth occurred, and where the campaign has room to grow in its network building. We note again that the networks formed across the regional coalitions vary in size and in composition, which is to be expected.

Exhibit IV-4: Regional Network Composition by Sector 2010 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools and other educational organizations. (afterschool programs, mentoring orgs, etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and human services agencies/ programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community-based organizations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local business owners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm owners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key findings regarding network makeup and growth within specific sectors are as follows:

- **The education sector has the largest representation in the campaign overall.** As shown in Exhibit IV-5, the sector with the largest representation in the CIF Campaign in both 2010 and 2012 was the education sector. Though results from the baseline survey indicated that this sector already had strong representation in the beginning phases of the campaign, healthy gains continued to be made through the end of the evaluation period. By 2012, representation in the education sector increased by 83 percent, with 95 individuals from this sector engaged in the campaign. Interestingly, though there were strong successes overall in terms of the actual rate of increase in the number of participants from the education sector, the representation of this sector relative to the other sectors in the coalition decreased by the end of 2012, shifting from 36 percent representation in 2010 to 27 percent in 2012. This indicates some success in the coalitions’ efforts to create more balance and sector diversity in their networks.

---

4 Given the small number at “baseline,” some of these growth percentages suggest changes that appear somewhat dramatic. We recognize that while this is simply a function of having a denominator of 1, we also recognize that it can appear misleading. For that reason, we include raw figures in our data table, to get a more holistic sense of growth in each sector.
• **Representation by farm owners in the campaign networks was low.** By the end of 2012, there were only two participants representing the farm owner community in the overall CIF Campaign networks. This outcome is not surprising, given the growers’ resistance to the campaign.

• **By 2012, the networks reflected significant increases in key sectors that are aligned with the campaign’s goals of advocacy and support for farmworker children and families.** Between 2010 and 2012 there was a 182 percent increase in individuals representing advocacy organizations, a 94 percent increase in representation from the health and human services sector, a 50 percent increase in representation from elected officials, and a 169 percent increase in representation from community-based organizations. Also noteworthy was the significant increase made in participation by community leaders indicating success in the regional coordinators’ efforts at relationship building and community organizing.5

### Development of Youth Councils

As mentioned in Chapter I, the campaign created youth councils in each region to provide opportunities for youth leaders to serve as peer educators in their schools and communities while also educating adults about the existence of child labor in agriculture, its impact on educational outcomes, and the hazards faced by children in the fields. The campaign’s vision was to build coalitions of youth leaders who would train other youth to serve as ambassadors for their communities and who would advocate for fair, sustainable, and respectful treatment of farmworker youth and their families. Ultimately, the youth councils far exceeded the campaign’s expectations, and were lauded by AFOP’s former executive director as “one of the best things that have been done under this grant.” The table below presents a brief description of the youth councils in California, North Carolina and Texas.

**Exhibit IV-6: Youth Councils By Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description of Youth Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td>The CIF youth council in California—Students Together Organizing for Progress (STOP)—was located in Dixon, a small community 20 miles southwest of Sacramento. The council was formed with support from the Dixon Unified School District and Dixon Family Services, a community-based nonprofit organization that provided meeting space and support to the youth council. In addition to participation in campaign education and advocacy activities, the youth council had focused much of its efforts in developing a peer mentor and student support program in Dixon. Council activities were suspended when the CIF regional coordinator transitioned out of his role, though the executive director of Dixon Family Services expressed her intention to support the youth council with its activities at least through the end of the WKKF grant period. By the end of the regional coordinator’s tenure, there were approximately 10 high school youth in the youth council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The increase was up from one participant in 2010 to 16 in 2012—technically a 1500 percent increase, though we recognize this figure is misleading, given the small baseline number.
Thus, in this section, we focus primarily on campaign activities related to developing youth already documented in the CIF youth councils. The following are core leadership activities of the youth councils in the CIF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description of Youth Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>The CIF youth council in North Carolina, Poder Juvenil Campesino (Farmworker Youth Power) meets on a tobacco and blueberry farm, at the home of one of the youth participants. Youth who participate in the council hail from three different counties (Johnston, Lenoir, and Wayne). In addition to their participation in the campaign’s education and advocacy activities, the youth council members were trained in photography and made significant contributions to the photo documentation efforts of the campaign. They also started their own community garden, where they grow food for local restaurants and markets. Proceeds from sales of their photos and produce from their community garden fund youth council activities. Given that the students in the youth council were migrants and some aged out and went to college, membership fluctuated. By the end of 2012, there were approximately 22 members, 11 of whom were “core” members who participated regularly and 11 who continued to contribute to the campaign periodically but who had to cut back on their participation levels due to other obligations. The age range of youth council members varied. While most were high school students, some brought younger and older siblings into the fold and some who graduated from high school continued to participate, but on a less regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>By the end of 2012, the CIF Campaign in Texas had two active youth councils that served as extensions of the CIF adult coalition, Migrants in Action (MIA). These youth councils were hosted at two different high schools—Economides High School in Edinburg and United High School in Laredo. A college-level youth council was also piloted at the University of Texas Pan American, though this council eventually merged with a similar farmworker student organization and now serves a partner to the Children in the Fields Campaign, with its members serving as mentors to younger youth council members. In addition to participation in the campaign’s education and advocacy activities, the youth councils in Texas have had a strong focus on peer education, including efforts to educate non-farmworking students about the lives of migrant farmworkers as well as work with farmworker youth to emphasize the role of education in ensuring better futures for them and for their families. By the end of 2012, there were approximately 35 members in the youth councils. Like in North Carolina, most participants were high school youth, though some included involvement from younger siblings. Membership also fluctuated because of migration and “aging out.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Youth Council Leadership Activities**

Accounts of the youth councils’ support in implementing education and advocacy activities are already documented in the *Education and Advocacy Campaign Activities* section in Chapter III. Thus, in this section, we focus primarily on campaign activities related to developing youth leadership skills and in building the capacity of the young farmworkers in the youth council to be agents of change. The following are core leadership activities of the youth councils in the CIF Campaign.

- **Public speaking opportunities.** Youth council members were offered ample public speaking opportunities wherein they shared their experiences with the public and media about working in the fields and the impacts of migration on their education and on their health and well-being as well as that of their families. They also shared their visions of hopeful futures and, for some, examples of progressive farm labor practices that instill a sense of loyalty to certain growers and a love of farming. The speaking venues ranged from classroom presentations, to panel discussions, to keynotes at film screening discussions and at conferences. The textbox below highlights some key conferences in which the youth participated. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the youth not only hosted the conferences, but they designed them, including the format and content of panel discussions.
Youth-Led Conferences

In 2011, Poder Juvenil Campesino (PJC), the CIF youth council in North Carolina, designed and hosted YouthSpeak, a community forum designed to bring the community into dialogue about issues facing farmworkers and their children. The forum consisted of panel discussions led by farmworker youth, who discussed the challenges they faced in their living and working conditions. The community was then invited to engage in discussions with the youth and to seek out potential solutions together. Empowered by the success of YouthSpeak and encouraged by the willingness of the community to hear their stories, PJC made YouthSpeak an annual event.

YouthSpeak served as the model for Youth Voices in Action: Conversations from America’s Fields, a youth conference that was hosted by AFOP and held in Washington, D.C. in 2012. At this conference, youth were invited to speak about their experiences to an audience that included representatives from national-level advocacy organizations working in a variety of fields, including child labor and education. Youth shared the podium with other distinguished speakers, including U.S. Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard (author of the CARE Act), and Dr. Juan Andrade, Jr., former child farmworker and current president of the U.S. Hispanic Leadership Institute.

- **Advocacy training.** Select members of the CIF youth councils were afforded the opportunity to attend the Bert Corona Leadership Institute in Washington, D.C., where they received advocacy training offered via an “experiential learning” format. This training provided youth with opportunities to practice their advocacy skills while they were learning them. While in the nation’s capital, the youth met with key decision makers such as former Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis, and with Kathleen Merrigan, the Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

- **Academic support and mentorship.** Academic support and mentorship were critical components of the youth councils’ work. In addition to encouraging peer mentorship and providing academic support, the regional coordinators provided opportunities for youth to be exposed to college. These included tours of college campuses, mentorship programs with college groups, or project partnerships with college classes. The textbox above highlights an effort by a Texas youth council to promote the advantages of a college education.

---

From Harvest to Harvard

Members from the University of Texas Pan American youth council designed this one-day interactive conference in an effort to encourage youth to stay in school and complete their educations. The conference was specifically designed for migrant students who were in the 8th and 9th grades, since these are the grade levels where dropout rates are highest. Youth council members hoped that this conference would inspire a college-bound mentality in these students while also providing them with specific skills to help them succeed academically. Youth council members thus shared their own successes and struggles as migrant students and also worked with attendees on specific skills such as how to plan their education and career paths and how to set goals and work towards them. Two hundred students from five high schools attended the conference. It has become an annual event.
• **Opportunities to teach.** In North Carolina, youth council members have been asked to teach other groups about youth organizing strategies. The youth have also attended workshops on farmworker safety and now serve as trainers to adult and youth farmworkers about certain dangers associated with farm labor, including heat stress. The textbox to the right highlights the work of the Texas youth councils in using theater to teach about the hazards of farmwork.

• **Community Service.** All youth councils engaged in community service activities on a regular basis. These activities enabled youth to lead efforts in making small changes to their communities. Examples of service activities included launching food and clothing drives, working at local food banks, and repairing homes for migrant families.

• **Farming.** As they worked to encourage change in labor laws and safety standards to ensure the health and well-being of farmworkers and their children, the youth council also engaged in activities that built their leadership and practical skills in farming. For example, the youth from Poder Juvenil Campesino, the youth council in North Carolina, chartered one of the only Latino 4-H clubs in its area and its members participated in 4-H conferences and leadership retreats. According to the CIF Campaign director, by chartering their own 4-H club and having a presence in 4-H conferences and retreats, the youth are “creating a path to one day owning their own farms, and all the while teaching other future farmers to appreciate the contributions farmworkers make and to improve working conditions in the fields.” The textbox on the next page offers another example of PJC’s leadership efforts that empower the youth to reframe their notions of and participation in farming and farm work.

---

6 4-H in the United States is a youth organization administered by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The name represents four personal development areas of focus for the organization: head, heart, hands, and health. This agriculturally-focused organization has over 6.5 million members in the United States, from ages five to twenty-one, in approximately 90,000 clubs.

---

*Teaching Through Theater*

In 2010, on El Dia de Los Migrantes/Day of the Migrants, youth council members from the CIF Campaign in Texas performed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Play *El Moscas y Los Pesticidas* at the Basilica of Our Lady of San Juan in San Juan, Texas. The play, which highlights the dangers associated with pesticide exposure, was performed before hundreds of farmworker families.

The production was a success and the Environmental Protection Agency awarded Migrants In Action a grant to fund more performances by the farmworker youth. According to CIF Campaign staff, none of the participating youth had prior acting or set production experience. The opportunity to participate in this play was an opportunity to learn new skills while also teaching farmworker families about the hazards of pesticides and how to protect themselves. The successful performance was a source of pride for these students, one of whom noted:

> *I don’t consider myself just an actor, I consider myself a teacher because I have given information to the public about pesticide awareness.*
Challenges in Building and Sustaining Coalitions

These examples of youth and adult-led coalitions provide a snapshot of the impact they are making in their local communities. Despite these accomplishments, CIF Campaign staff members faced several areas of challenge in their coalition-building efforts, both at the adult level and the youth level. These are listed below.

- **Recruitment.** Of the three campaign regions highlighted in this evaluation, California experienced the greatest challenges in the area of recruitment, both for the adult coalition as well as the youth council. The regional coordinator cited two key obstacles to recruitment: regional relevance and competing priorities. In terms of regional relevance, the regional coordinator in California noted that because people in his region did not believe that child labor in agriculture was a problem, he had a difficult time building a sense of passion for the issue. He eventually made some shifts in the campaign, focusing more on educational equity, “because that was something people could rally around.” In terms of competing priorities, the regional coordinators noted that the people in his region were already “tapped out.” He noted that many of the people he reached out to, even those who expressed interest in the campaign, were already involved in other issues and could not devote significant and consistent time to the campaign. The issue was the same for the youth, though the priorities the campaign was competing against were different (e.g. homework, jobs, afterschool activities.)

The textbox above highlights one suggestion made by the regional coordinator in California.

**Incentivizing Participation**

Though the regional coordinator in Texas was successful in her efforts to recruit participants to her coalition and to her youth councils, she did express discomfort with some limitations in her recruiting capacity. In particular, she felt uncomfortable with her inability to compensate people, particularly farmworker families, for their participation. She found it troubling to ask families that “are very poor to begin with” to drive long distances to attend a meeting after normal business hours. She suggests that, at minimum, future efforts should include funding to provide these families with a meal during the meeting or a gas card to cover the cost of travel.

**Farming with Integrity**

Using half an acre of donated land, PJC, the youth council in North Carolina, created its own sustainable community garden. The produce is sold at local restaurants and at the farmer’s market and proceeds from their sales fund the cost of maintaining the garden as well as other youth activities. The community garden project offers youth council members an experience with farming that is entirely different from their experiences as migrant farmworkers. Campaign staff noted that, for some youth, it has changed their notions of agriculture. In this community garden, the youth are the farm owners. They are able to work at their own pace, without the dangers of pesticides, and still bring in a successful and lucrative harvest. Through their community garden project, the PJC is able to model the kind of farming that is sustainable and productive while still maintaining the health and dignity of those who labor in it.
Texas to incentivize participation and to help offset the costs of campaign participation, particularly for farmworker families.

- **Engagement.** The recruitment efforts for the campaign in Texas were so successful that the coalition grew large very quickly, making it somewhat difficult to manage and posing some challenges to effective engagement among coalition members. Figuring out how to strategically and effectively harness the passion in the room at each coalition meeting towards purposeful movement-building action was a challenge the regional coordinator wrestled with regularly. For her, the challenge may have been more about the development of her coalition infrastructure not quite keeping pace with the rapid growth of the coalition. To her credit, the regional coordinator was able to sustain the passion and energy of the coalition until she was able to develop a more workable infrastructure, including the development of specific committees charged with different aspects of the work.

In terms of youth council engagement, regional coordinators identified a number of challenges. The first was the challenge posed by migration schedules, which made it difficult for regional coordinators to help the youth maintain a sense of continuity and connection to the councils as they were “on the move.” Immigration status also posed some limitations to engagement for some youth council members who were unable to travel via airline and therefore could not attend some of the leadership events in Washington, D.C. Finally, the regional coordinator in North Carolina noted that negative influences (gang activity, high dropout rates) also posed impediments to youth council engagement. The regional coordinators note that a strong focus on relationship building between the youth was key to helping overcome these obstacles. The regional coordinator in North Carolina added that providing youth with leadership opportunities and a sense of ownership of the campaign was also critical to keeping students engaged, even as they migrated.

- **Representation.** While regional coordinators did a remarkable job of increasing the size and diversity of their coalitions over the course of the campaign, some expressed regret at not having been able to facilitate further growth in some key sectors, including:
  - **Farm owners.** As shown in the data table in Exhibit IV-5, by the end of the campaign, only two farm owners were engaged in the campaign—one from California and one from North Carolina. As noted previously, the regional coordinators had hoped that they would be more successful in engaging growers as partners in their work but the political obstacles proved immensely challenging.
  - **Farmworker Families.** The regional coordinator in California expressed some regret at not having been able to engage more farmworker families in his coalition, noting that his coalition was largely made up of professionals and would have benefited from greater inclusion of the “affected community,” to ensure alignment with the priorities of the farmworker families in his region.
— **Elected officials.** North Carolina was the only region that had no representation from elected officials in its coalition or network. The regional coordinator in North Carolina noted that agriculture was one of the top industries in the state, and since the work of the campaign was seen as a threat by agribusiness in the region, it was difficult for the campaign to gain open support from elected officials.

Though they expressed some disappointment with coalition and network representation in certain sectors, the regional coordinators continually worked to address the deficits in these sectors by persistent outreach and adjustments to the framing of the campaign.

- **Technical assistance support.** As noted previously, the only formal technical assistance provided to the regional coordinators was in community organizing and media strategies. The regional coordinators were seeking training on topics with immediate relevance to their campaign work, such as facilitating coalition meetings and youth leadership development. Given that each region was also expected to work towards getting official nonprofit 501(c)3 status for their coalitions, the regional coordinators would have also benefitted from some training in nonprofit organizational development and organizational capacity building.

- **Sustainability.** By the end of 2012, the campaigns in North Carolina and Texas were the only ones that were still active. Both were able to obtain nonprofit status and while the loss of WKKF funding has resulted in some strain, the coalitions and youth councils in those regions have been able to continue their efforts. The CIF Campaign’s director is hopeful that AFOP will be successful in its efforts to obtain funding to revive the campaign in its dormant regions. She adds that even though the campaigns may have folded in other regions, the networks formed through the regional campaigns remain strong and serve as vital sources of support for national-level advocacy efforts.

**Implications**

The findings from this chapter give rise to a number of important implications in the area of coalition building and the development of youth leadership within the CIF Campaign. We divide our discussion of these implications into three areas: partnerships, strategic planning and management, and investment in youth leadership.

- **Partnerships.** Each of the three campaign regions achieved some measure of success in specific campaign arenas by strategically leveraging networks or partnerships. The CIF Campaign in Texas, for example, demonstrated the greatest success (measured in sheer numbers) in terms of recruiting participants to serve at the coalition and partner levels. The success of the regional coordinator’s efforts was rooted in the strategic leveraging of the already formidable networks she developed over her decades of service in migrant education. The California campaign’s partnership with Dixon Unified School District was key to finally getting a youth council up and running in the region. The success of the North Carolina campaign overall is due largely to the regional
The power of the CIF Campaign is rooted in the people who served as voices of the campaign and who helped to design and implement campaign activities: the regional CIF coalitions and the youth councils. The growth of the coalition networks and the demonstrated leadership and engagement of the youth serve as strong indicators of the promise this campaign holds in effectively creating a movement for change. In the concluding chapter, we will examine this “promise” by providing an in-depth discussion of considerations for AFOP as it continues in its efforts to move the campaign forward.
V. MOVING FORWARD

The Children in the Fields Campaign made remarkable progress over the past two years, particularly when considering the ambitious nature of its vision and goals. In this concluding chapter, we step back to consider the overall progress of the campaign and considerations for moving forward. We begin with brief highlights of the short-term outcomes that resulted from this work. We then offer some areas for consideration as AFOP moves forward in its efforts to build a grassroots movement to end child labor in agriculture and improve outcomes for farmworker youth and their families.

Short-Term Outcomes

The Children in the Fields Campaign is an effort in movement building. Because movement building takes time, and given the short time frame of this evaluation, SPR’s charge was not to capture outcomes, but instead to monitor progress along the campaign’s four implementation activity arenas, which we discussed in Chapters III and IV. Though we were not charged with measuring outcomes, we included in our evaluation framework some potential short-term outcomes which we hypothesized might be possible to witness by the end of the evaluation period. In this section, we provide a brief overview of those short-term outcomes, summarized in Exhibit V-1, and the extent to which these outcomes were realized over the course of the evaluation period.
### Exhibit V-1:
Short-Term Outcomes for the CIF Campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Area</th>
<th>Overall Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and advocacy campaign</strong></td>
<td>Overall, the campaign was very successful in this outcome area. Campaign staff contributed to the literature on child labor in agriculture, both through the production and dissemination of their own reports as well as advisement on other key reports. They also added to the evidence base of the existence of child labor through their contributions in photo documentation and filmmaking. Their earned media opportunities were significant and included exposure in major media outlets in print, television, and radio, which reached millions of people. Their efforts at linking regional and national advocacy efforts also paid off, with attempts made in both North Carolina and in Texas to replicate the CARE Act at the state level, and to provide safety trainings that fall in line with the administration advocacy efforts at the national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coalition Building</strong></td>
<td>Overall, success in this outcome area was somewhat mixed. Of the five campaign regions, three (California, North Carolina, and Texas) were able to get coalitions up and running. Two of those regions (North Carolina and Texas) successfully developed coalitions with shared visions, clearly articulated missions, and workable infrastructures. These same coalitions had also obtained 501(c)3 status by the end of the grant period, which made them eligible for more funding opportunities to ensure sustainability. These coalitions continue to be active. All three regions that made up the focus of this evaluation (California, North Carolina, Texas) were successful in building a network of coalition members, partners, and supporters of the campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Councils</strong></td>
<td>The success experienced by the campaign in this outcome arena far exceeded expectations. The youth involved in this campaign played an integral role in the successful implementation of campaign activities. Not only did the youth build their advocacy and leadership skills but they were able to utilize those skills in multiple arenas. The youth also served as documentarians of the issue, making them not only the voices of the campaign but also its eyes and ears.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerations Moving Forward

The findings from this evaluation and the momentary “pause” in campaign efforts at the regional level provide an opportunity for reflection so that AFOP leaders can consider how to leverage learnings to provide a solid infrastructure for change and to ensure forward progress in movement-building efforts. As noted throughout the report, the campaign achieved a number of important “wins” and made remarkable progress on meeting their goals. Campaign staff also experienced some challenges, many of which they confronted and overcame. Yet the one challenge that proved too formidable was not having enough resources to sustain most of the regional campaigns beyond the sunset of the WKKF grant. Despite these setbacks, AFOP leaders remain undaunted in their resolve to continue the campaign. As they do so, we offer two main areas for consideration, based on lessons learned over the course of the campaign. The first area addresses issues of capacity by focusing specifically on considerations regarding the development of a solid infrastructure for change. The second area is focused specifically on movement building, using an ecosystem lens to frame important areas for consideration as AFOP engages in strategic planning for the CIF Campaign’s future.

Building an Infrastructure for Change

Launching a grassroots, movement-building campaign was an endeavor that was completely new to AFOP and the funds provided by the WKKF grant gave the organization a strong start. To AFOP’s credit, though this was unchartered territory for the organization, campaign staff dove right in, trying different approaches and continuing with efforts that were successful and adapting and redirecting efforts that were not as successful. As the campaign director noted, there were many lessons learned along the way. Below, we build off of some of those lessons, offering some specific issues for consideration, particularly as they relate to campaign capacity and the building of an effective infrastructure for change.

- **Consider the distribution and dilution of resources.** Trying to spread the campaign across five different states may have been too ambitious a goal, given the level of resources available to the campaign and staff experience with movement building. As AFOP moves forward in its efforts to revive and/or add regions to the campaign, it is important to recalibrate campaign goals and expectations to better match resource levels. It may be worth considering, for example, concentrating efforts on fewer states and perhaps smaller, more defined campaign regions within those states in order to successfully grow the campaigns in those regions and solidify practices and procedures before expanding out.
Ensure appropriate staffing at all levels. Across the board, campaign staff agreed that the staffing was too thin at all levels of the campaign. At the regional level, there was simply too much work for one person to effectively undertake, especially given that the original vision for the regional campaigns included having a statewide reach. Moreover, regional campaign staff members noted that the nature of the work was not only difficult but isolating. Regional coordinators noted that having at least one other part-time staff to share the load and “bounce ideas off of” would have been beneficial not only to campaign efficiency but also to staff morale. Campaign staff also agreed that staffing was too thin at the management level, noting that the burden on management-level staff to oversee a campaign in five different states while also running a national-level campaign seemed too great. Moreover, staff turnover required staff at the management level to focus attention on hiring efforts, diverting energy away from the work of managing the campaign itself.

Clarify and formalize the role of the lead agency. One of AFOP’s greatest strengths is its formidable network of member agencies that serve farmworker communities across the country. Leveraging these networks by having member agencies serve as headquarters for regional campaigns was a smart way to capitalize upon this strength and give the regional coordinators a “leg up” at the launch of each campaign. However, the selection of lead agencies were made based on whichever agencies agreed to support the campaign through provision of office space, equipment, access to networks, and mentorship. While executive directors of these agencies agreed to support the campaign primarily through the provisions of the aforementioned resources, no formal agreements were put in place. This resulted in some confusion for regional coordinators and it hampered their ability to take full advantage of the partnership. The campaign director notes that future efforts will include greater clarity of the role of the lead agencies as well as more formalized agreements so that everyone has the same expectations of the relationship.

Invest in “prep time.” Regional coordinators noted that before they could launch into campaign activities, a significant amount of time was needed to effectively prepare for this work. This included devoting adequate time to study the “lay of the land” in order to create an effective strategy that was relevant to the campaign region. It also included investing adequate time for relationship building and trust building with farmworker communities and with potential campaign players. Recognizing the need for this investment is an important consideration for AFOP in developing realistic timeframes for campaign efforts in the future.

Ensure adequate resources for continued training and technical assistance. As noted in Chapter II, regional coordinators received ample training in community organizing, but desired more training in other arenas that would have enabled them to be more effective in their work, including training in effective meeting facilitation, working effectively with youth, and general trainings on organizational development to support efforts to sustain their coalitions. Another area wherein campaign staff desired more support was in message framing for
multiple audiences. Given the sensitive nature of the issue, the regional coordinators struggled to develop balanced campaign messages that emphasized the importance of education to improving outcomes for farmworker youth, highlighted the dangers and inequities of current labor practices for farmworker children and youth, elevated the dignity of farming as a career and farmwork as a profession, and provided growers with a path to campaign participation that would not feel “threatening.” According to regional coordinators, the key to developing this kind of balanced messaging was to “humanize” the issue. How to do this in ways that were effective across multiple audiences was challenging and thus an area where they could have used more support.

- **Start sustainability planning early in the process.** Campaign staff members agreed that they needed to address the issue of sustainability much earlier than they did. Some campaign staff also noted the desire for broader sustainability plans. These staff members felt uncertain that aiming for independent nonprofit status was an appropriate goal for all regions. While it worked well for North Carolina, the regional coordinator in California questioned whether or not it was the “most efficient structure” for his region because it added a “whole other layer” to the work.

This “added layer” was also a source of struggle for the regional coordinator in Texas, particularly at the end of the grant period. While she understood the reasoning behind trying to obtain nonprofit status, and while she was successful at obtaining it for her coalition, she felt insufficiently prepared for the work of running a nonprofit. The regional coordinator in Texas noted with some frustration that if becoming a nonprofit was a goal of the campaign, then they needed more training on the “nuts and bolts” of nonprofit management.

**Movement Building—Considering an Ecosystem Approach**

Recognizing that movement building takes time, we did not expect to witness the successful launch of an actual movement to end child labor in agriculture within the time frame of this evaluation. We did, however, insert a movement trajectory into our evaluation framework in order to articulate what we felt the campaign was moving towards in its efforts. To that end, we saw the movement trajectory for the CIF Campaign as one that was focused on **raising awareness** of the issues of child labor in agriculture in order to **build the will** to take **action** for change. Interview respondents agreed that the campaign is still primarily in the “raising awareness” part of the movement-building trajectory, though there is some evidence of small progress in the other two arenas. In this section, we offer some issues to consider that are specifically related to movement building. In particular, we focus our discussion on considerations of the larger advocacy ecosystem1 in which the campaign functions in order to

---

1 SPR first introduced an ecosystem framework for analysis in 2010. The framework borrows from the natural sciences to demonstrate the importance of looking at the ecosystem in which an advocacy effort is launched,
highlight areas of concern as well as spaces of possibility as AFOP moves forward in its campaign efforts.

- **Consider the players in the ecosystem and form strategic alliances.** The campaign in North Carolina serves as a prime example of the power of strategic alliances. As noted in Chapter IV, the regional coordinator in North Carolina demonstrated exceptional savvy in that she focused more on growing strategically instead of growing by increasing her participation numbers. To that end, she invested considerable time in understanding the “lay of the land” in her region, and recognizing who the key players were in terms of other movements that were already strong and underway and that had potential for alignment with the efforts of the CIF Campaign. Thus, she partnered with farmworker movements that were focused in adult populations, the tobacco cessation movement (since tobacco is a toxic crop in which young people labor), and other movements that were focused on health and safety, including movements to educate the public about pesticide use. Key to this regional coordinator’s movement-alignment strategy was the notion of reciprocity. Specifically, she noted that the success of her advocacy underscored the point that effective advocacy is reliant upon a healthy advocacy ecosystem. Key to this is the understanding that a thriving ecosystem is dependent on the health and strength of each of its component parts. An in-depth discussion of the advocacy ecosystem can be found in the following report issued by SPR in 2010: Inouye, T.E. and R. Estrella, “Building the Capacity of Advocates Representing Communities of Color: A Scan Commissioned by The California Endowment,” 2010.

---

**Understanding the Importance of Reciprocity**

One of the reasons the campaign in North Carolina was so successful despite the fact that the coalition and its networks were relatively small, was because the regional coordinator was able to align the work of Children in the Fields with other, allied movements such as the Tobacco Cessation movement and efforts focused on supporting adult farmworkers. However these movements were already fairly strong and underway in North Carolina so “breaking in” was not easy. The regional coordinator’s strategy was to begin her own advocacy work by supporting the work of others. For example she became an active member of North Carolina’s Farmworker Advocacy Network (FAN), a statewide coalition working on state policy to improve farmworker rights and protections. Prior to her participation, FAN had not focused on child labor as part of the farmworker issues they addressed. As she worked to support FAN’s efforts and build strong relationships with the organization, the regional coordinator also highlighted how the issues of the CIF Campaign were relevant to FAN’s work. By 2011, FAN had launched the Harvest of Dignity campaign, which included the development of a state assembly bill that was almost identical to the CARE Act and which was aimed at ending discriminatory child labor laws that enabled children as young as 12 years old and, in some cases, as young as 10 years old, to labor in the fields. FAN became a powerful ally to the CIF Campaign, and the regional coordinator’s strategy in building this alliance demonstrates the power of reciprocity in coalition-building work. According to North Carolina’s regional coordinator, the key to getting support from others was to begin by providing support to others.
efforts was rooted in the fact that she began her own advocacy work by first supporting the work of others. The textbox on the previous page sheds light on her reciprocal approach.

In general, staff members at the regional and national levels made strong headway in their efforts at examining the players in the ecosystem and growing their efforts in strategic ways, as is evidenced by the growth in their strategic networks across multiple sectors. Examples of areas where they might continue to focus their partnership growth include the allied health movements related to farmwork in particular (as exemplified in the work of North Carolina), more strategic partnerships with the Office of Migrant Education at the national level, and more purposeful partnerships with individuals and organizations involved in food justice and “good food” movements. Campaign staff had already started alliances with “Dreamers” (supporters of the Dream Act) and further efforts in this arena might prove fruitful, particularly with respect to improving education outcomes for farmworker youth.

- **Consider the power of external forces that could impact campaign efficacy.** An ecosystem is subject to external influences, both positive and negative, and the success of advocacy efforts is at times predicated on the ability of players to capitalize upon positive forces and to effectively stave off negative external forces. In the case of the CIF Campaign, positive forces included President Obama’s appointment of Hilda Solis as Secretary of Labor—the first Latina ever to serve in a U.S. Cabinet. Under Ms. Solis’ direction, the U.S. Department of Labor became much more aggressive about seeking out child labor violations and enforcing fines for violations. AFOP capitalized upon the opportunity presented in the appointment of Ms. Solis and as a result, she became a strong ally to the campaign.

An example of negative external forces included an increasingly combative congress as well as a rise in anti-immigrant sentiments and policy agendas. The combative congressional ethos made the goal of legislative change on the national level untenable and growing anti-immigration sentiments detracted from issues of child labor and human rights violations in general with respect to farmworker populations. The textbox on the next page highlights another example of a negative external influence faced by the campaign: the formidable opposition waged by the Farm Bureau.
**Ensure an adequate supply of “nutrients” (resources).** All ecosystems require an adequate supply of nutrients to maintain optimal health. For advocacy ecosystems, these nutrients include appropriate levels of resources to ensure the effective functioning of its component parts. These resources include such things as technical assistance (addressed earlier in the infrastructure section) as well as an adequate supply of funding to support advocacy activities. For the CIF Campaign, the campaign director noted that a big lesson learned was the importance of investing time to ensure adequate diversification of the campaign’s funding stream and “not looking to one funder and hoping for the best.” AFOP now has an advisory committee in place to help with efforts to seek alternative funding sources, but the campaign director notes that sustainability plans on this level should have also happened earlier and that the unfortunate result was that “no plan was in place to avoid interrupting the work.”

**Continue to capitalize on strengths: leverage youth power.** Over and again, interview respondents referred to the youth councils as one of the strongest components of the campaign. Significant investments were made in developing

---

**Recognizing the Power of the Opposition**

The CIF Campaign has some fairly strong opponents. Chief among them is the American Farm Bureau Federation (Farm Bureau). The Farm Bureau, which touts itself as “the unified national voice of agriculture,” opposes the CIF Campaign on the premise that it is opposed to farm regulation in general. Thus, the Farm Bureau has not only actively opposed efforts to close the loopholes in child labor laws as they relate to agriculture, but it also mounted strong opposition against AFOP’s efforts to encourage changes in hazardous rules orders that would have provided more safety protections to farmworker youth.

The Farm Bureau’s opposition was felt not just in national-level campaign efforts, but also in regional efforts. The executive director of NC FIELD recalled an event that she said served as a “wake up call” regarding the power of the opposition. NC FIELD members brought three child tobacco workers to a meeting of North Carolina’s Child Fatality Task Force, hoping to give the young farmworkers an opportunity to testify about their experiences and the dangers of working in tobacco. Members of the Farm Bureau came to the meeting, bringing five journalists with them, and declared that this was a “non-issue” since the Department of Labor did not pursue changes to Hazardous Orders. A legislator asked for data on child farmworker fatalities in the last year and since none was available at the time, he declared there was no evidence of danger and motioned to have the topic removed from the Task Force’s purview for the year. The child farmworkers were effectively silenced, with none of them being given the opportunity to voice their opinions. NC FIELD’s executive director described this as a “jaw-dropping” moment, adding, “The Farm Bureau is intimidating. They don’t play—they throw their weight around. I don’t think I realized it before until we were in that meeting. It was a real learning experience.”

The youth left the meeting feeling frustrated and upset. But they also learned about the power of the opposition and this led to some strategic decisions. Among other things, they are currently working to document the health effects of working in tobacco on young children and are resolved to fill every Task Force meeting in the coming year with farmworker children so that even if they are silenced, they will be seen.
their leadership. Continuing to optimize and leverage their leadership skills by providing opportunities for youth to serve as ambassadors and spokespersons for their community will continue to benefit the campaign (and farmworker communities) in multiple ways. In particular, the humanizing power of youth voices, their experiences, and their visions for better futures is key to raising awareness about an egregious issue and building the will for change.

Conclusion

Though some of the regional, grassroots components of the Children in the Fields Campaign are currently experiencing a moment of “pause,” after the end of funding from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, it is important not to lose sight of the tremendous contributions made by the campaign over the short WKKF-grant period. In addition to the progress made on campaign implementation activities and the short-term outcomes highlighted in this evaluation, the campaign was successful in developing a foundation for launching future efforts. The campaign director offered an optimistic view of the campaign’s future, stating:

*We now have that foundation. We feel a lot more comfortable and confident in executing this program. And we have a lot of lessons learned about setting up in the right place, finding the right organizers, [knowing] what tools they need to do their job. Now I feel we’ll be light-years ahead in finding ways to support their work.*

It has been an honor to serve as evaluators of this important work and to have witnessed the tremendous efforts of the CIF Campaign staff as they strove to improve the lives of vulnerable children and families who work tirelessly to put food on our tables, often at great cost to themselves. The CIF Campaign laid a solid foundation for change and we eagerly look forward to witnessing what comes next.
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Research Questions
Research Questions Guiding the Evaluation

Using the evaluation framework as a guide, the following are the research questions for this evaluation:

**Contextual Factors**
- What are the contextual factors that serve as facilitators or barriers to AFOP’s progress? To the progress of each of the AFOP regions?
  - How does the *policy context* influence project implementation (e.g., existing policies, levels of funding, existence of issue “champions” within legislative bodies)?
  - How does the *community context* influence project implementation (e.g., regional demographics, role of agriculture in regional labor market, public sentiment on issues of immigration, existing school-family linkages, history of organizing, etc)
  - How does the political climate facilitate or impede the campaign’s activities and outcomes?
- How does the availability of economic and educational opportunities and other youth services affect the nature of AFOP’s project activities and outcomes?
- What other contextual factors have been particularly influential on project and youth outcomes?

**AFOP’s Capacity**
- What is AFOP’s capacity to engage in education and advocacy campaigns? To what extent has the grant enhanced AFOP’s capacity to reach community leaders and community members through its campaigns?
- What leadership/management structure has been established for overseeing the project in each region? What is the role of volunteers and how are they mobilized?
- What is the lead agency’s organizational capacity (budget, longevity, experience with grassroots advocacy, history in community, coalition building)?
- Are there significant variations across the regions in leadership, staffing, services, activities, or other key characteristics?
- What are the strengths and limitations to the staffing structure established at the regional level?

**Implementation of Project Activities**
- What is the general approach to the regions’ campaign work?
- Have the regions targeted a specific local area for its campaigns? Which one(s) and why?
• What is the nature of the documentation activities? How do different regions approach documentation of migrant child labor issues? What products have emerged from these efforts?

• What is the nature of the education campaign? How do different regions approach their education campaign efforts? Who are the target audiences for the education campaign?

• What is nature of AFOP’s coalition building efforts? How do different regions approach coalition building? Who are the partners that are recruited to be a part of the coalition and why? Who is missing from the table? What are the challenges in building grassroots coalitions in each of the four regions? How do coalitions develop a shared change agenda? How do they articulate and implement regional advocacy campaigns?

• How are youth recruited for the Youth Council? What are the characteristics of the Youth Council members?

• What are the activities that Youth Council members participate in? What is the quality of these services?
  − Are there significant variations across the regions in these activities and are these variations associated with different outcomes for youth and for the project?
  − To what extent are the activities of the Youth Councils linked to one another across regions?

• How do AFOP’s national efforts leverage and build upon what is taking place in each of the four regions?

• How do different Regional Coordinators structure their regional activities? How do they leverage the work of other regions? What additional supports are needed to carry out their regional work?

• What have been the challenges and opportunities that surfaced?

**Short-Term Outcomes**

• To what extent does AFOP’s documentation of child labor issues get disseminated to key stakeholder groups? Approximately how many people are reached with the educational campaign?

• What is the evidence that AFOP’s efforts have begun to translate into raised awareness about child labor issues within migrant families? How have key stakeholder groups (e.g., policymakers, school leaders, community members, migrant families and youth themselves) started to shift their thinking about the importance of AFOP’s long-term vision of children staying in school and ultimately breaking the cycle of poverty?

• What were the key alliances and grassroots efforts that resulted from the educational campaign? What are the strengths of the relationships? How are
coalitions guided by a shared vision and mission? Are roles well defined? Is there workable infrastructure for collaborative activity?

- To what extent do sustainable regional youth coalitions emerge from AFOP’s efforts? Do youth participating in Youth Councils report that the experience has changed their knowledge of and perspective on child labor in their community? Does it change how youth view themselves and their educational or career goals? Does it influence their sense of leadership and commitment to continued advocacy around these issues?

- To what extent do regions develop and implement advocacy campaigns? To what extent are advocacy agendas informed by community and youth voices? How do youth serve as leaders in regional and national advocacy efforts? What is the evidence that these regional efforts are connected to AFOP’s national advocacy efforts?

- What are anecdotal examples that regional and national stakeholders are taking action on these issues as a result of AFOP’s efforts? [For example: How are community members pressuring policymakers to take action on migrant child labor issues? How are community leaders now serving as champions on migrant child labor issues? To what extent do educational partners change their outreach or retention strategies? What is the evidence that state and local policies are changing to support keeping migrant children in school?]

**Overarching Lessons Learned**

- What was learned about coordinating a national campaign around a policy issue that is invisible and distant from the daily concerns of the majority of citizens?

- Are there emerging models for having education campaigns move from raising awareness of key stakeholders, to increasing their will for change and ultimately having stakeholders take explicit action in support of the change agenda?

- What evidence suggests that regional grassroots coalitions are sustainable beyond the sunset of WKKF funding? What is the sustainability of youth voice within these coalitions? How are regional coalitions positioned to continue to advocate for migrant child labor issues going forward? How has AFOP built sustainable infrastructure for national advocacy efforts to continue to stay connected to grassroots coalitions and campaigns?
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Sample of Pre- and Post- Network Surveys
Part One: Coalition and Network Reach

### Coalition and Network Reach

This sheet is designed to capture the reach of your coalition and network in terms of the people you are working with and the sectors they represent. There are several fields to fill out for each person with whom you are working:

1. **Name:** Enter the first and last name of the person with whom you are working.

2. **Organization:** Type the full name of the organization they represent. If they are not representing an organization, please type "individual" and specify if possible (i.e., student, mother, migrant farmworker, etc.)

3. **Sector:** Select which sector that person/organization represents from the following options in the drop-down menu. To access the drop-down menu, select the cell and click the down button on the right of the cell. (The arrow will appear when you click on the cell.) The following list will appear:
   - Schools and other educational organization (afterschool programs, mentoring organizations, etc.)
   - Health and human services agencies/programs (including Head Start, WIC, etc.)
   - Elected official
   - Faith-based organization
   - Advocacy organization
   - Other community-based organization
   - Local business owner
   - Community leader
   - Other

4. **Involvement in the campaign:** Select how that person is involved in the campaign from the following options in the drop-down menu.
   - Coalition member: This person is part of the coalition.
   - Partner: This person is formal partner in the campaign, but not part of the coalition.
   - Other: This person is engaged in the campaign in another way.

5. **If other, specify below:** If this person's involvement in the campaign falls under the category of "other," please specify in column 5 in what capacity they are involved in the campaign.

Once you are done filling out this page, click on the tab at the bottom of the window titled "2. Coalition Development" to fill out the second half of the survey.

If you need help, please contact Rachel Estrella at rachel_estrella@spra.com or (510) 763-1499 ext. 658 or Anna Rubin at anna_rubin@spra.com or (510) 763-1499 ext. 647.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name</th>
<th>2. Organization</th>
<th>3. Sector</th>
<th>4. Involvement in the campaign</th>
<th>5. If other, specify below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>John Estrella</td>
<td>College Assistance Migrant Program</td>
<td>Schools and other educational organization (afterschool programs, mentoring organizations, etc.)</td>
<td>Coalition member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Two: Coalition Development

The next set of questions are intended to measure your coalition's development along several key dimensions. While we included items that we understand to be common and key elements of coalition development, we emphasize that there is no expectation that all of you are addressing each of the items, or that it makes sense for everyone to address them. Please indicate “not applicable” (n/a) if a particular item is not relevant to your coalition situation and/or leave us notes in the “comments” section.

Please rate the statements on the following scale in the drop-down menu (An arrow to access the drop-down menu will appear when you select the blank cell):

- **Not on our radar**: It is too premature for our coalition to even begin to approach this issue.
- **To be addressed**: Our coalition has discussed this issue as priority but has not taken any action yet.
- **Struggling through**: Our coalition is addressing this issue but is encountering some challenges in moving forward.
- **Well underway**: Our coalition is addressing this issue, and we feel confident that we are progressing forward in a steady way.
- **Completed**: Our coalition has successfully addressed this issue, although we will continue to fine tune as the work progresses.
- **N/A**: This particular item is not relevant to our coalition situation

When you are done with this page, please save the file and e-mail it to rachel_estrella@spra.com

### 1 Developing a Shared Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developing a Shared Vision</th>
<th>Progress Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>Our coalition has established a shared understanding about our mission/vision for coming together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>Coalition members have reached consensus on our action plan for accomplishing our collective objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.</td>
<td>Coalition members have reached consensus on a sustainability plan for our coalition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d.</td>
<td>Please add any comments you have about developing a shared vision below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 Coalition Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coalition Membership</th>
<th>Progress Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>Coalition has established criteria for membership in the coalition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>Coalition has strategically recruited appropriate community and/or systems stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c.</td>
<td>Coalition has discussed who is missing from the table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>Coalition has inventoried assets that coalition members bring to the table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e.</td>
<td>Please add any comments you have about coalition membership below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3 Establishing Coalition Infrastructure and Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Progress Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>Our coalition has established a formal governance structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.</td>
<td>Our coalition has created infrastructure to support internal communications across members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c.</td>
<td>Our coalition has established processes for coalition decision-making (e.g., consensus, majority vote, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d.</td>
<td>Our coalition has defined clear roles and expectations for its members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e.</td>
<td>Our coalition has established infrastructure to support external communications (e.g., formal communications plan, designated spokespeople, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f.</td>
<td>Please add any comments you have about establishing coalition infrastructure and processes below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Addressing Coalition Interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Progress Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>Our coalition has cultivated relationships with external partners and networks that can advance coalition goals (e.g., policymakers, advocacy groups, statewide organizations, community leaders).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>Our coalition has formalized strategies for mobilizing farmworker communities behind our coalition endeavors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c.</td>
<td>Our coalition has implemented strategies for identifying and building grassroots community leaders to support our goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>Please add any comments you have about addressing coalition interface below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 Please put any overall comments on coalition development below:
Appendix C

Case Studies of Youth Leaders
ARNULFO

Arnulfo is a 19 year old young man who officially began working in the fields when he was fourteen. He recalls, however, that he unofficially started working them when he was “really young.” Arnulfo lives with his family in Texas, but each year from July to October, they travel to other states, such as Michigan, Georgia, Nebraska, or Iowa for the harvest picking season. He grew up in a family of farmworkers; his entire family including his brother (12), sister (16), uncles, aunts, grandparents, and cousins all work in the fields. While his family lives in Texas, his mother stays at home and his father works as a truck driver. His father worked as a migrant farmworker in Mexico, but as soon as he married Arnulfo’s mother, they immigrated and settled in Texas. Arnulfo recounts his experience as a migrant farmworker and describes the long hours and arduous working conditions, but he also talks about his family’s encouragement and the value of education and hard work. He also sought to become a community leader to increase awareness about the challenges facing child migrant farmworkers.

Experience working in the fields. Arnulfo talks about his first seasons working in the fields, where he worked in Iowa detasseling corn. When he was 14 or 15, each workday began at 6:45 a.m. and ended at 3:30 p.m. Children under the age of 16 were only allowed to work 40 hours per week. Once he turned 16, he started working 12 hour days, seven days a week along with the rest of his family in difficult working settings. He stated, “I didn’t like working the fields. You’d get all wet in the morning when everything was humid and be wet for hours. But it was family bonding so that was a good thing.” He also mentions that the growers he worked for treated him “alright” and provided transportation to and from the fields and drinking water throughout the day.

Value of education. In Mexico, Arnulfo’s father only completed his 6th grade education but his mother graduated with a degree in Accounting. His parents have always instilled in him the value of education and encouraged their children to excel academically. His parents exposed their children to agriculture work to show them the difficulty of working in the fields. Arnulfo says, “My parents said it’s important so I’ve always thought it was important. They took us to work with them so that they can see how hard it is...how bad it is to work in the fields.” He considers his parents to be role models and states that “they had nothing and now they have their own house and vehicles. They’ve taught us good values and encouraged us to succeed and not end up in the fields.”

Arnulfo has always been a bright and determined student and graduated from high school at the age of 16. He enrolled at the University of Texas, Pan American (UTPA) when he was 17 and, at the time of our interview, was a junior, majoring in Biology with a minor in Chemistry. He hopes
to become a doctor. The previous summer, he chose not to migrate with his family and instead stayed behind to complete his summer classes. He saw the need to take care of his parents’ home while his family worked in the fields. He says “I stayed at home alone. I cook, wash, take care of the dog, pay the bills…I don’t want my parents to worry about things when they are gone.” However, he mentions that his family have both helped and hindered his success in college. While they have encouraged him to pursue his education, he still finds it difficult to be apart from them while they work in other places. “My parents have been really supportive and have taught me how hard it is to make money without an education. But we are a close family and it’s hard to be away from them.”

**Involvement at UTPA and in the CIF Youth Council.** Arnulfo works for the university’s migrant program as a tutor and mentor to incoming freshmen students. He was also a key leader in the development of the CIF youth council on the UTPA campus. His involvement with the council began when he auditioned for a role in *El Moscas y Los Pesticida*, a play about the hazards of pesticides that was showcased before hundreds of people at a celebration event for Dia de los Migrantes celebration at the local church. Arnulfo led the effort to establish the council as an official organization at the university. In collaboration with other members, they wrote the bylaws and designated the council’s leadership and Arnulfo was elected president of the council. Arnulfo enjoys his involvement in the council and says, “I love that we can help students going through what we went through. We were in their place a couple of years ago and can be role models to them.” Additionally, participating in the council has given him a higher degree of self-confidence. He states that “participating in the council is helping me get over my shyness. My public speaking has really improved and I’m better at planning and coordinating things. I’ve really gained leadership skills from running and organizing activities.”

In terms of the council’s role in the CIF campaign, he states:

*I see CIF as a push to help kids not have to work in the fields, especially if it’s just a result of their parents having no other place to take them. With the youth council, we want to strive for something better and get them out of the mindset that working in the fields is their only option. They need somebody there to motivate them and push them…not just listen to them, but to actually be there keeping on them and pushing them along.*
Liz

Liz is a 13 year-old girl that lives with her family in a simple cinderblock house outside of McAllen, Texas. She lives with her mother, father, four brothers, grandmother and grandfather. Prior to moving to this house, her family lived in a mobile home but had to move when it burned down two years ago. Liz’s parents migrated to the U.S. about 25 years ago and started working as migrant workers in the onion fields of Colorado and New Mexico during the harvest season. The family enjoys living in their community. She states, “We have lots of friends and other families around here. Everyone is supportive and it’s safe.”

**Arduous working conditions but pride in helping family.** This is Liz’s second summer working in the fields. During harvest, her family’s routine begins at 3a.m. when they wake up to make breakfast, sharpen their tools and prepare the truck. They begin work in the fields at 4a.m. or 5a.m., using the headlights of the truck to harvest the onions in the early dark morning. They continue working until 7p.m. before heading back home for the day. The family works seven days a week during these months. Liz says, “It’s exhausting.” Her mother adds, “It’s good that we have work. We are lucky, but it’s tiring.”

**Falling behind in education and coursework.** Liz begins her school year in Colorado during harvest season, but returns back to Texas in November. Consequently, she has to switch schools mid-semester. She mentions that the schools in Colorado are behind than the curriculum taught in Texas so she has already fallen behind when she starts school. She explains:

> It’s hard because I don’t understand the work when I get here because I’m behind. I don’t know how I end up catching up, but I do. I guess because we’ve been migrants for a long time so I’m used to playing catch up. I’m used to having to pay attention to the teacher and just ask questions if I don’t understand something. I know how to learn fast. My friends also help me in subjects.

Liz and her family highly value education. Liz understands that she needs to work hard to prepare herself to go to college and have other employment opportunities. She says, “Education is important because in order to get into college I need to make the grades. I don’t want to fall behind. It’s important so that I can learn about other jobs.” Her mother has also tried to encourage them to make use of the opportunities available in the U.S. She states:

> Education is very important. We have always told our children that if you don’t want to work as hard as we do, you have to do your school work and get an education. The kids don’t always like going to school and then they tell us, ‘Well, why didn’t you go to school so you wouldn’t have to work so hard?’ They don’t understand that the opportunities here and in Mexico are different…school is free here.
Supportive social and educational services available. The family has been able to take advantage of some social services provided in the community, such as food stamps. Also, all of the children have attended a local childcare center, TMC, which serves migrant families with children ages 0-5. Before finding out about TMC, Liz’s mother stayed at home with the children and only her father worked. His sole income forced them to share a small home with relatives since they could not afford a larger home. Once the children started attending TMC, Liz’s mother was able to work as well and the family moved into their own place.

Liz's family wants a better lifestyle for their children. Her mother states, “Our hopes for our children are that they continue with their studies and don’t end up working in the fields like us. We want to support them in any way they can.” Liz is hopeful for the future. Despite having to migrate with her family every year, she hopes to succeed academically. Liz says she plans to “get into college and become a lawyer.”
YESENIA AND NEFTALI

Yesenia and Neftali are two sisters who live in a trailer park in Kinston, North Carolina, a small agricultural town about 80 miles outside of Raleigh. When they initially moved to the area about 15 years ago, they were the only family living in this area, surrounded by woods and tobacco fields. An entire trailer park community, primarily made up of Mexican migrant families, grew around them in the last few years. The family—mother, two sons (ages 6 and 20), and four daughters (ages 19, 18, 16, 12)—all live together in the small trailer. Yesenia, the oldest daughter mentions that the sisters usually share one room, but that at times everyone hangs out and falls asleep in the same room. Giselda, the girls’ mother, finished high school in Mexico and migrated to California with her Dominican husband. She left for North Carolina when her relationship became abusive. Upon arrival, she worked on a hog farm, but for the last decade, she has been working in the tobacco fields—planting, harvesting, and processing. Overall, Giselda and her daughters, Yesenia and Neftali, enjoy their community and feel safe there.

Mother’s encouragement toward higher education. Yesenia and Neftali have always been dedicated students and their mother has encouraged them to do well in school. Yesenia is beginning her 5th year of early college. Early college is a five-year program during which students receive both their high school diploma and their associate’s degree. Neftali is entering 11th grade in high school. Yesenia said, “Mom has always pushed us to do well…and working in the fields motivated us. Some kids look forward to the summer but not us!” Both Neftali and Yesenia have not found their classes too challenging and have always believed education to be important, particularly because of their mother’s influence, “Mom would get mad if we missed a day of school. She would put us to work at home if we did.”

Unsupportive teachers and school environment. Neftali mentions that many of the teachers at her school do not seem to listen or care about the needs of students. She says that some of her friends have been sick or hurt and have had to miss class and the teachers have not helped them catch up. She gives the example of how she has had three surgeries over the last couple of years and said that catching up is really difficult because the teachers are not very supportive and understanding. She did note, however that there were a couple of “good teachers who you know were on your side.”

The girls have wanted to participate in school activities, but have been unable to do so because they lack transportation. Neftali says that she used to participate in the schools’ theater arts group but had to quit because she could not find transportation after the meetings. The meetings were held after school, but the bus only runs at the end of the school day.
Neftali mentions that she has also been helping some of her friends, also Mexican migrants, in one of her classes because they had difficulty understanding the teacher and course concepts. She said they were doing really well in one class but not others and they said that it was because they were too scared and embarrassed to ask questions when they did not understand something. Yesenia had a similar friend, “My friend had okay English but one of my teachers likes using really large words which are hard. My friend was shy about not understanding and ended up dropping out.” Unlike Neftali’s experience with her high school teachers, Yesenia feels her teachers in the early college program are supportive. “It’s a smaller school so the teachers are good. They stay after school if you need help even though they’re probably not getting paid after that.” Yesenia and Neftali said that the support and encouragement from their mother, the CIF regional coordinator, and the executive director of NC Field helps them get through school. “What’s really helped is Mom, Emily and Melissa encouraging us that we can do it.”

**Exhausting working conditions.** Yesenia and Neftali both have experience working in the tobacco fields. Yesenia started when she was 14 and Neftali started at the age of 12. Their mother found the positions for them even though she was hesitant to allow them to work in the fields because of the extreme working conditions. The girls convinced their mother to let them work in the summer because they wanted some money to buy new school clothes and supplies. Yesenia said, “We were raised to value our independence and convinced our mom to let us work there.”

The girls were paid $7.25 per hour working in the tobacco fields. Giselda insisted on accompanying her daughters to the farms to make sure no one took advantage of them. “Our mom would always go with us to jobs because the growers or the [labor] recruiters will always try to take advantage of us and pay us less. Our mom always wants to go with us so that she can make sure we get what we are owed.”

The girls worked in the fields for four summers and said it is exhausting hard work. Yesenia described:

> We wake up around 5a.m. or earlier, depending on how far away the fields are. Sometimes it’s really far. We start work at 6a.m. and finish around 6p.m. or will keep working if there is any work left...You get there and you put on gloves it they have them and then it’s just ripping off the tobacco flowers or picking the leaves below.

During the summers, it is not uncommon for the temperatures to reach into the 90s and 100s. Yesenia said:

> The heat and humidity is the worst. There is no shade. You have to wear long clothes—jeans, long shirt, a hat. Sometimes the growers offer us water. Sometimes not. Or they’ll
give you one of those little cups and once you’ve had your cup, you’re done. The worst is when we actually have to share cups. They’ll just leave one or two cups by the water cooler and you just use that cup, the same as everyone else. I hate sharing cups.

**Active involvement in Youth Council.** The girls have been heavily involved with the Youth Council. They have participated in photography lessons provided by photographer Peter Eversoll, and have helped with photo documentation efforts in the campaign. The sisters have helped with the Holy Mole event, organized and run food drives, tended a community garden, and helped fix up two houses. They have also gained an interest in immigration policies and mentioned, “We have also been learning a lot more about immigration laws. Like how if police are in an area where they see a lot of Mexicans, they’ll make a road block to check drivers licenses.”

As part of the council activities, they have also participated in a town hall on youth farm labor issues where they had an opportunity to meet a panel of local officials and ask questions. The council empowers youth to become more active in advocating for farm labor issues. Yesenia said:

> In the council, they really give us the opportunity to play a role in the community. We got to go to a town hall meeting and meet lots of important county and city people. We got to ask questions about local policies and advocate for other youth like ourselves. The town hall meeting really helped raise awareness.

As a complement to the town hall, the youth designed and implemented *YouthSpeak*, an event that brought together community members, local politicians, and subject experts to learn more about farm labor issues through presentations, panels, and discussion groups.

Yesenia recently became the CIF coalition’s youth intern. She has traveled with the regional coordinator to Raleigh to meet with legislators and share her experience working in the fields. She wanted to continue engaging with policy makers to change the laws around child labor.

**Future plans for college.** The council has motivated the youth to pursue higher education. The girls mentioned that their sister, Kimberly (19), was not focused on academics and on the verge of dropping out prior to becoming involved in the council. That perception changed when the council visited the University of North Carolina, Wilmington. They received a tour of the campus and listened to a presentation on the requirements to go to college and financial aid. Now, Kimberly is engaged in her schoolwork. Her grades have improved and she is now on track to graduate and is planning to apply to college.
The girls are unsure of what careers they want for their future, but they do know they do not want to continue working in the fields. Yesenia continues to explore different options and is focusing on taking courses that are transferrable to a four-year degree program. Neftali would like to go to college, but is unsure of what career path she will take. She mentions, “I have no clue what to do. I love children and dogs. I love math. I’ve thought of maybe becoming a surgeon. I’ve learned about interesting prenatal surgeries.”

The girls mention that many of their peers drop out of school. Yesenia said, “They drop out because they just don’t see a future. They don’t realize college is something they can do. A lot don’t see the point because they don’t have papers.” The girls state that being a part of the council has motivated them to do well in school and pursue college. Neftali said, “I’ve always been indecisive but being a part of the council has really encouraged me to be decisive about college. For me that has really helped.”