



## ***Anti-Poverty Community Organizing and Learning (APCOL) Project Final Case Study Report***

### **Identification**

Community:

**Kingston Galloway – Orton Park (KGO)**

Major Theme of Case Study:

**Housing and Safe Shelter**

Community Co-Lead (include all contact information):

**Israt Ahmed**

Academic Co-Lead (include all contact information):

**Peter Sawchuk**

Report Author(s):

**Joseph Sawan**

Date Submitted (dd/mm/yyyy):

**07/09/2010**

## 2. Overview of Case Study (1pp)

### a. Summary of focus of case study

The focus of the case study was to follow community organizing activities around housing and safe shelter in East Scarborough, specifically the Kingston Galloway – Orton Park (KGO) neighbourhood. The study followed a local campaign to develop a local affordable housing strategy that incorporated several community organizations.

### b. Relation to APCOL project themes

This case study relates to the APCOL project theme of Safe Shelter / Housing, which is among the four basic needs cited in the APCOL proposal; a) Health/Nutrition/Food Security; b) Safe Shelter / Housing; c) Opportunity for Adequate Education; and d) Access to a Jobs, Vocational Training and Living Wages. In addition to this direct connection to the four basic needs, this case study also emphasized the importance of the overall goal for the APCOL project; "... to *develop an integrated, city-wide perspective* on community anti-poverty organizing efforts in the GTA with an emphasis on the contributions of popular education and learning processes." The clear emphasis on learning among the community animators and organizers is evident throughout the case study and will prove fruitful when considering implications for anti-poverty organizing throughout the GTA.

### c. Linkage to community need:

Prior to the APCOL KGO case study, several community organizations had been working extensively to address housing concerns in the area. The initial introduction to the KGO community was during a housing consultation on Sept. 30, 2009 where residents voiced their diverse concerns to a local MPP. East Scarborough is home to the highest density of public housing units, and while there have been a variety of efforts by local organizations, residents and politicians to improve conditions, there have been limited efforts that bring together the diverse concerns and issues. While there are a variety of issues facing the KGO neighbourhood in addition to housing, it is clear that in part due to the geography of KGO, housing activism takes on a unifying role among anti-poverty organizers and participants in the area. The case study provided an opportunity to take an existing campaign and put it at the forefront of antipoverty organizing in the area.

### d. Summary of major achievements/outputs.

We completed 16 one-on-one in-depth interviews and 2 focus groups with existing KGO leaders and activists. Several key achievements that emerged from the participatory nature of the case study include the following: 1) Out of the initial seven animators and organizers, four are continuing their community activities with the broader APCOL project in addition to their local activities. 2) The KGO APCOL team organized five focus group meetings to develop a local housing strategy that addressed the needs of youth, seniors, newcomers, people with disabilities and people living in public housing. 3) As a culmination of the focus groups, the team organized a housing forum where residents had the opportunity to learn about housing resources and ways to get involved with housing campaigns in KGO and throughout the GTA. The APCOL KGO team is in the process of developing their own analysis from the focus group meetings to put together a local housing strategy for the KGO neighbourhood. Finally, participants have emerged as strong community leaders working on diverse activities/campaigns in their community to address issues of poverty.

### 3. Description of University-Community Research Partnership (1p)

- a. Roles of organizations involved in the case study, their contributions and changes in capacities in relation to APCOL project themes.

Social Planning Toronto (SPT)  
Israt Ahmed, Community Planner

The KGO case study was conducted in partnership with Social Planning Toronto (SPT) and their current GTA antipoverty campaign. The local housing campaign was coordinated by Israt Ahmed, a community planner for SPT and resident in KGO. Israt provided extensive trainings for APCOL animators and organizers, in addition to coordination of local community meetings that would be pertinent to the campaign. In addition to campaign coordination, she participated in case study meetings with graduate student researchers and faculty in order to provide input on the direction of the case study interviews. Furthermore, interviewees were cited by Israt for their relevance to the APCOL project themes. During the course of the case study, other organizations that provided direct support include the East Scarborough Storefront, Residents Rising and Action for Neighbourhood Change. Staff and participants in these organizations were included in the interview process and provided researchers with opportunities to learn more about various organizing activities in KGO.

Project themes emerged throughout the case study in relation to the community partnership, most directly when considering *social networks*, *resources* and *learning*. At the beginning of the study, participants were unclear as to the role of *learning* in their community activity. One of the most valuable contributions cited by participants throughout the case study was the opportunity to learn about ways to encourage social change in their communities. The *resources* provided by the APCOL project were also of paramount importance, as they ensured time and space for local activists to reflect and discuss the day to day activities. Prior to the case study, participants were engaged individually in their respective communities, but did not specifically have the opportunity to dedicate time to reflect on their actions and develop strategies for future antipoverty activity. Finally, the development of *social networks* was a key outcome as bridges across age, gender, ethnicity and religion were built among local activists. While several participants had strong connections to each other, due to personal and familial ties, most had limited ties through antipoverty activity. As the case study progressed, participants became intimately familiar with each others' experiences and capacities as organizers and activists. In addition to the core group of participants, relations across communities were fomented. For example, traditionally there are limited ties across newcomers, seniors and youth groups. Participants quickly developed outreach strategies to bring together these groups and strengthen antipoverty organizing in KGO.

#### 4. Financial summary (2pp)

{Not included in Condensed Final Report}

#### 5. Summary of Work Plan & Case Study Outputs (3pp)

- a. Final copy of case study work plan document including brief notes of explanation where revisions were made to approved original work plan document;

Objectives	Tasks	Number of events/group sessions/time	Timeline/ status
<b>Goal 1: Develop APCOL team in KGO</b>			
Developing of APCOL team (Phase 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Identify SPT team</li> <li>-Identify research team from OISE</li> <li>-Visit KGO community and meet with leaders</li> </ul>		End of September / completed
Developing of APCOL team (Phase 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Advertise team positions in the community</li> <li>-Interview candidates</li> <li>-Complete hiring</li> </ul>		Mid November/completed
<b>Goal 2: Training of APCOL leaders</b>			
Identify training needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Brain storm session with leaders and OISE grad students of our understanding of community organizing and APCOL project goals</li> <li>- Identify general and specific training needs</li> <li>- Discuss the research aspect of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 sessions</li> <li>-Jan 26 (10 a.m. - 12 p.m.)</li> <li>- Neighbourhood Orientation, Jan 28 (10- 11:30)</li> <li>- Jan 29 (9-11:30)</li> </ul>	End of January

Training workshops  (one specifically on research techniques)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training of leaders using popular education methods including meeting with other campaign groups such as SAPC and attending community events</li> <li>- Send leaders to SAPC meeting</li> <li>- send leaders to NAP meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 in-house training sessions ( February 1 9:30-3:30)</li> <li>Tuesday , Feb 2 from 9- 12, <sup>Feb</sup> 8 at 9-3:30))</li> <li>and participate in 2 external meeting (Feb 3<sup>rd</sup>, 10-12, north york hall,</li> </ul>	February
Participation in public events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leaders to attend SAPC meeting on December 4</li> <li>- Leaders to attend NAP meeting in January</li> <li>-Leaders to attend a community speak event</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 meetings and a public event</li> <li>TBA</li> </ul>	February
<b>Goal 3: Understanding local issues and infra-structure</b>			
Learn about the community, its leaders and partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leaders to attend community (KGO) orientation session</li> <li>- meet local politicians and other partners</li> </ul>	Reflection session, February 10 from 9-1 p.m.	February 2010
Identify local housing issues and stakeholders	Planning exercise for APCOL team	Friday, Feb 12 from 9-12	February 2010
Poverty and housing e-scan	Grad students to share their findings with leaders	Feb 15 from 9-3:30	February 2010
Understand housing and poverty issues from a community perspective	Organize an event with residents to discuss local initiatives on poverty reduction and housing	1 special meeting with RR and TCHC leaders	February2010
<b>Goal 4: Hands on community organizing (* to develop a local housing strategy through community</b>			

<b>input and participation)</b>			
Plan community organizing around a local housing strategy	Develop an organizing plan, tools, identify other leaders, and plan a community event involving all stakeholders	APCOL team meeting (with animators on February 15 at 9-3:30)	February – April 2010
Training of animators (may be 4 more from the community)	New leaders (animators) to participate in the bi-weekly meetings and be trained by our organizers with the support of rest of the APCOL team	APCOL planning session with animators on Feb 16 from 9-3:30	
Plan a community event involving others on local housing strategy	Door knocking, outreach, media training, promotion of the event, phone calls and follow up strategy	TBA	May , 2010
Develop a LHS community event	Gather data and complete the LHS	TBA	June, 2010
Identify next steps with the LHS	Plan the sustainability for the plan	TBA	June, 2010
<b>Goal 5: To reflect upon identify, and share learning</b>			
Research and analysis	Interview leaders and other partners about the lessons in community organizing		January- July
Prepare project report and lessons	Share the lessons with others as appropriate		August –September, 2010

- b. Training, skills development: community organization and community members (list names of all people involved and the capacity in which they participated)

During the case study, animators and organizers participated in multiple trainings to assist in their antipoverty activities. Trainings and workshops led by Israt Ahmed were focused primarily on leadership development, political process and campaign strategy. In addition to these sessions, we conducted a Power Analysis workshop, led by Sharon Simpson.

At the beginning of the case study, participants had varied knowledge on the topics we were addressing. Through carefully facilitated meetings that addressed issues specific to the community, we encouraged participants to not only learn from facilitators, but more importantly, from each other. Since the central aim of the case study was to conduct one-on-one interviews, we began with trainings focused on interviewing techniques (for research as well as organizing efforts), followed by facilitation methods for focus group discussions. In the following months, everyone had the opportunity to conduct outreach and facilitate focus groups. Another key component of the campaign was the political aspect, where participants engaged in meetings with local MPP's. To prepare for such meetings, we provided two trainings that discussed the various roles of government, strategies for influencing policy-making and coalition-building techniques. Workplans for each animator and organizer were developed and followed-up by Israt Ahmed. In addition to the group activities, participants were encouraged to attend various committees on housing and antipoverty initiatives in order to broaden their understanding of the issues and report back to the group team on the activities taking place in Scarborough and the GTA.

### **29 Jan 2010**

Interview Techniques Training at 4205 Lawrence Ave East, TCHC Building where Gail Murray lives

Discussed the definition of leadership and overall discussion of the APCOL project. Interviewed animators and organizers during this training.

### **12 Feb 2010**

Training at Gail's Building

Discussed overall goals, targets and strategy of the campaign for a local affordable housing strategy. Israt led discussion to emphasise importance of storytelling and testimonies in order to push politicians towards policies that benefit our communities. Emphasis on the political process, how to get your voice heard.

### **19 Feb 2010**

Planning Session for Campaign

Tashnim and Gail attended several community meetings on antipoverty issues, mostly around housing. Discussion from school issues, HNO, rooming houses, SHRA, TTC, Childcare.

### **16 Mar 2010**

Training/Discussion on Organizing Challenges

Israt began training on policies and governmental divisions that impact communities. Tax breakdown, OW, ODSP, EI, ...

Training on Governmental Responsibilities and Power

By learning the intricacies of politics, the participants gained more comfort in tackling the various issues facing their communities. Meetings with politicians were a key

repertoire for this campaign, and for residents to be effective, they must understand the background of the issues they raise (i.e. who has the power and who's gonna listen).

### **23 Mar 2010**

#### Power Analysis Training with Sharon Simpson

c. Events (including dates, location, number of attendees)

1. 30 Sept 2009, Housing Consultation & Tour, Scarborough Village Recreation Centre, ~100 participants
2. 26 Jan 2010, APCOL Orientation Meeting, Residents Rising Office, 12 participants
3. 29 Jan 2010, Interview Techniques Training at 4205 Lawrence Ave East, TCHC Building where Gail Murray lives, 9 participants
4. 10 Mar 2010, OISE Panel Presentation with Tashnim Khan, Israt Ahmed, Peter Sawchuk and Joseph Sawan; ~ 30 graduate students
5. 16 Mar 2010, Training on Governmental Responsibilities & Power led by Israt, 4205 Lawrence Ave E., 8 participants
6. 23 Mar 2010, Power Analysis Training with Sharon Simpson, 4205 Lawrence Ave E., 10 participants
7. 3 April 2010, SESE Conference Presentation on Case Study, panel with Gail Murray, Tashnim Khan, Israt Ahmed, Rakhat Zholdoshalieva and Joseph Sawan, at OISE, ~15 participants
8. 7 July 2010, Community Forum on Housing, 4175 Lawrence Ave E., 50 participants; Panel discussion with Anne Fitzpatrick, Housing Action Network (HAN); Yutaka Dirks, Housing Network of Ontario (HNO); Michael Kerr, Colour of Poverty.
9. 5 Oct 2010, Presented on "Empowerment through Action: How housing activism impacts immigrants in Ontario" with Joseph Sawan and Israt Ahmed, at 15<sup>th</sup> International Metropolis Conference in The Hague. 15 people attended from around the world.

d. Written outputs (titles, authors, length, date)

1. Sawan, Joseph E., "It's where we live: Housing and anti-poverty organizing in Scarborough," *Learning Changes*, Vol. 1 No. 2, Spring 2010; (2229 words)
2. Sawan, Joseph E., "Not another survey! Conducting the APCOL questionnaire in KGO," *Learning Changes*, Vol. 2 No. 1, Autumn 2010; (1270 words)

e. Summary of changes in community and/or community partner capacity for anti-poverty activism

There have been several changes that can be attributed to the community-university partnership. First, by providing spaces for activists to reflect and learn from each other, community organizations have been able to further justify the importance of these activities in their antipoverty activity. Rather than addressing learning as a footnote to community organizing, there is a renewed commitment to engaging residents using popular education techniques that not only inform, but *empower* participants to take action for social change. Second, the terminology introduced by the project has allowed participants to broaden their scope of community organizing in order to engage with other communities and organizations that may have previously seemed unrelated to community activity in KGO. By learning more about the political process and community organizing techniques, local organizations and participants can more effectively build coalitions across various issues of poverty in the GTA.

## 6. Research Findings (8pp)

- a. Summary of academic and policy research literature relevant to the concerns of the case study;

Existing studies on the issues facing the KGO neighbourhood demonstrate that housing and safe shelter is a continuing concern for this community (United Way of Toronto, 2004; Social Planning Toronto, 2006). With the highest density of Toronto Community Housing (TCH) units, KGO is a unique context for community development initiatives and organizing opportunities for residents. Often times there is a strong distinction between *community organizing* and *community development*, and Stoecker (2003) demonstrates the challenges and possibilities in establishing an *organizing-development dialectic*. He argues that while both community organizing and community development activities are complementary, there are potential contradictions in their goals, worldview, strategy and resources. In the case of KGO, the organizational makeup of the participants involved with the case study demonstrates how individuals and organizations are engaged in a similar struggle to balance organizing and development models. In light of the specific campaign to develop a local affordable housing strategy, the case study participants adopted a strategy that took aspects of both models and it is clear that among the sixteen interviewees, they included a wide spectrum of participation and social movement repertoires. However, they all shared components of what can be defined as a social movement, including;

- 1) campaigns of collective claims on target authorities; 2) an array of claim-making performances including special-purpose associations, public meetings, media statements, and demonstrations; 3) public representations of the cause's worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment. (Tilly, 2004, p. 7)

While defining social movements is not as simple as fitting Tilly's three conditions, it does provide us with an initial framework to understand how seemingly different community activities can be viewed under a broad and complex umbrella of anti-poverty movements. As anti-poverty organizing continues to expand across North American cities, there is growing literature that details specific campaign efforts, while a lack of studies that provide systematic analyses of process and outcomes of organizing activities. From this literature, we may be able to glean valuable lessons and potential frameworks for considering how community and neighbourhood organizing activities develop.

In order to better understand how collective action takes place in different contexts, the APCOL proposal cites five key themes that have varying levels of explanatory power in understanding community organizing activities; social networks (e.g. Bourdieu, 1985, 1999; Portes, 1998), social differences, local labour market conditions (e.g. Shiva, 1989; Vaillancourt and Jette, 1997; Shragge and Fontan, 2000; Cranford, Vosko and Zukewich, 2003; Jackson, 2004; Martin, 2006), grievance construction process (Conway and Hachen, 2005; Osterman, 2006) and material, communication and cultural resources (e.g. Jenkins, 1983; Buechler, 1993; McAdams, McCarthy and Zald, 1996). In understanding the dimensions of community involvement in the KGO neighbourhood, we can observe how participants engage in relation to the

above themes. Furthermore, it is necessary to begin to ask questions around how participants *learn* due to community activity. Whether it is an active process where one learns for organizing goals, or a process where activities contribute to a richer understanding of her community, the broad understanding of *learning* can be approached from both cognitive and social dimensions.

Did residents engage in workshops based on models of popular education? Did their families discuss politics at home? Did they seek learning opportunities through self-directed methods? Such questions demonstrate how learning is at the foundation of community involvement, and helps understand how participants engage in activity. In order to facilitate a preliminary analysis of the housing case study, we will focus on three aspects of participant engagement and learning.

In the following analysis, these aspects help guide the potential for understanding and engaging in anti-poverty activities. These themes emerge in the various quotes and discussions highlighted and provide us with a means to explore in further detail. First, there is evidence of links between the formation of networks, resources/artefacts and organizer/activist activation. By considering material and symbolic resources within the community, we can understand how they mediated the engagement of KGO residents. In this segment, we consider how community activity is affected by and affects the production of various artefacts and resources. Second, we may consider the grievance construction process as the means by which people became able to “re-frame” key questions (e.g. what *is* poverty and what *counts* as anti-poverty activities?). This learning process demonstrates how biographical and social contexts influence grievance construction and how opportunities for activist engagement hinge upon these learning opportunities (whether facilitated or incidental). Finally, questions of *legitimacy* emerge throughout the study, and consistently pose critical opportunities to engage in learning around power relations, community building and collective action. Within these areas, we explore some of the contradictions of who is included/excluded and the opportunities that emerge to envision alternatives to current housing policies that address access and affordability. How can local community activities impact provincial measures on anti-poverty issues? Can alternative community-based decision-making bodies prove effective for the development of local affordable housing strategies? How does an ‘organizing/development’ dialectic impact grassroots efforts for social change? These are a few of questions that will be explored as we discuss the case study interviews and focus groups around housing in the KGO neighbourhood.

b. Summary of initial data analysis;

Among the case study participants, it is clear that anti-poverty organizing manifests in a diverse array of activities that overlap and sometimes diverge throughout time. It is important to begin with a few notes regarding definitions and methodological decisions at this point. From the sixteen interviews and two focus groups, there were 6 professional paid staff, 4 community activists/volunteers and 6 APCOL animators/organizers. All of the APCOL animators and organizers were formerly unpaid volunteers in the KGO community with varying forms of community involvement. As the study progressed, the APCOL team took on various roles and responsibilities, including

involvement with the APCOL Survey. As we proceed with the analysis, we use aliases and interview ID numbers to maintain the anonymity of case study participants.

### Considering an Activist Typology

There are caveats in attempting to develop an *activist typology* and we must remember that in community organizing, participation is dynamic and roles are fluid depending on various factors. However, understanding how residents and professional staff are activated in particular roles and responsibilities is key to illustrating power relations and dynamics between the various actors in a particular campaign. Furthermore, it is crucial to emphasize how actors move between these types of activity, where one's work often falls into different categories depending on the particular context. In this case study, there are three clear activist types that emerged:

1) Professional organizer – In social movement literature, this would most closely align with the *social movement entrepreneur*. This includes all organizational staff that engage with residents to either provide direction to resources or facilitate activities that hope to reduce the effects of poverty. Some examples include staff from the East Scarborough Storefront and Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) who provide day-to-day drop-in services as well as facilitate opportunities for residents to come together in contentious activities (e.g. Rallies for improving public transit). Often they do not live in the community where they work and lead different work/community lives. While engagement varies greatly, they mostly liaise between residents, public officials, foundations and other institutions.

2) Community activist – This is a broad type of activity that includes paid and unpaid work, and is driven by experiences of injustice and a sense of the 'big picture'. Often times, we consider these participants as leaders who can articulate social conditions in a manner that encourages further participation and drives policymakers to respond to community mobilization. Most of the APCOL community researchers entered the project with some level of experience in this type of activity or were activated into this form of activity during the case study.

3) Community volunteer – Throughout the KGO neighbourhood there are residents who engage in daily community work to improve the conditions of everyday life. As one participant explained; "I can help get the job done...I just see a need, and I can try...I can say hey this is happening here, how can we fix it?" (KGO07). This is the community activity that can be observed on multiple levels, most clearly in everyday social relations that present themselves outside of relations mediated by the exchange of money.

How do these three types of activity relate to one another and to what extent do they support each other to encourage lasting social change? This is one of the questions emerging from the narratives of case study participants and will continue to emerge when looking at how different neighbourhoods, campaigns and activists engage in social movement activity.

### Grievance construction and re-defining 'poverty'

Throughout the interviews, the theme of *grievance construction* is evident in different ways, and we find that activities that bring people together go beyond building a sense of community; they provide opportunities to understand the diverse barriers to community prosperity and develop strategies for overcoming the conditions of poverty. At the centre of this is the recurring discussion of *what is poverty?* For policy-makers it is often a numbers game, but as we saw in KGO, some activists took their understanding beyond monetary terms.

*Interviewer: Every time we think about poverty we seem to think about it in terms of money. Now if we inject this community with ten million dollars would poverty be done?...*

*Omar: With ten million dollars where would poverty be? I feel like if you do that it might create construction jobs: Lots of big buildings and things. But then this neighbourhood would be just some other downtown then. So, I think: What do we really want? We want to live in peace. In the right place where, I dunno... Some nature, some people, and some simple things.*

*Alice: Yeah simple things! That's what I want. [For instance] I like our market. Our Festival Market. It's green. You see the kids playing. You watch the seniors just sit and gather. That's what it is for me when I think of anti-poverty... Like me for instance, I do volunteer work around the neighbourhood. And I can't seem to say no. I like doing it... But I'm living on a month on what I used to make in a week. And I've been successful at it for six years, seven years. It's wearing me down... But then again I can't see me getting too burnt out with this because I love it. I feed off it... For me, it's when my friend went through a tough thing this week. I say, "Call me. If you need to talk, just call me". And that's where [anti-poverty] starts... I think a problem shared is a problem cut in half. It doesn't solve the problem, but at least you can get to where the action is! (KGO20)*

The above discussion occurred early in the case study between a university researcher and two participants from the APCOL team. We can immediately observe how learning takes place through informal discussions around *what is poverty* and strategies for combating it. Understanding poverty outside of strictly monetary terms allows participants to envision an alternative to the existing structures that influence their activities. Central to this change is the emergence of certain resources (or artefacts) that allow residents to engage with their community differently. For Alice, she identifies the 'simple things' as central to her fulfilment, and defines them as relations between neighbours, volunteer work and learning how to fulfil her community's basic needs through collective activity; "I think a problem shared is a problem cut in half. It doesn't solve the problem, but at least you can get to where the action is!" This further demonstrates how sometimes *activity itself* can activate solutions to the conditions of poverty, even when it is not immediate.

But what happens if one cannot imagine *change*? The learning process that allows one to imagine an alternative to existing social conditions is evident throughout the case study. For one KGO resident, experiencing change was central to this process;

*You know, we started off feeling like – “Can we change anything?” Especially when you are in Toronto Community housing... Well, we had a march in this community when the Storefront lost funding... This was 2005-2006 and so we had the march on the hottest day in June and Oh my Gosh we had hundreds of people. Now that was very empowering to residents!... So that was another way of community feeling: Wow! We marched! The Storefront didn't disappear and we still have it. And now it's actually growing! So, in some ways, we must have done something to affect that change. So yeah, I would say that from the time I started in this community in the crime prevention aspect to now 10 years later it is a whole different ballgame for residents. They're really starting to know that they have a venue and have an ability to speak out. It's all collaboration. It's not just Residents Rising, it's not just Westhill organizing, it's not just the Storefront – its all of us together doing this and that's why I think it's been successful because it's not one core group that is doing all the work, it is expected of everybody. (KGO07)*

Clearly, KGO “*must have done something to affect that change.*” But what exactly was it, and what were the kinds of visions of change that animated activists? Organizing, campaign tools, the accumulation and sharing of activist resources and a growing coherence and influence of a network of community groups is important. But, what is at the heart of anti-poverty activism as KGO activists in the trenches see it?

- c. Summary of three contributions the research has or may potentially make to the academic and/or policy research literature.
  - In depth qualitative study of anti-poverty activist individual and group learning process in action;
  - Detailed study of how housing as well as other related poverty issues shape the specific form of individual and collective organization activity;
  - Additional information on the historical account of multiple forms of anti-poverty activity in the KGO community.

## **7. Lessons for Improving Learning for Anti-poverty Organizing (4pp)**

- a. Summary of key applied information for use by organizers and community residents to facilitate improvements in various forms of anti-poverty action
  - Popular Education sessions/materials related to organizing strategy, effectiveness, successes and barriers as well as organizers' perspectives on them;
  - Community outreach strategies;
  - Feedback on processes of working in the area of anti-poverty within political sphere;

- Coalition-building across four pillars as identified in the APCOL research project as a whole;
- Understanding conditions of poverty locally and in the GTA;

## **8. Appendix A: Case Study Materials**

{Not included in Condensed Final Report}