Overview

The Health Care Foundation of Greater Kansas City (HCF) has invested significantly in tobacco-related advocacy work in Kansas and Missouri through both grantmaking, as well as internal human capital, since its inception in 2003. The foundation can point to outright policy wins as one indicator of the success of these investments, as many local smoke-free ordinances and a statewide clean indoor air act have passed in Kansas.

HCF was one of many funders working towards these changes. Learning how HCF and its grantees contributed to these wins requires a deeper dive into how their tactics and strategies influenced important target audiences over the course of several years of funding. For some tobacco policy goals, such as increasing the tobacco tax in Missouri, there has not yet been a policy win and the signs of progress are more difficult to detect.

In an effort to understand the role and influence of HCF’s advocacy grantees—as well as the influence of HCF itself—on tobacco-related policy efforts in Kansas and Missouri, the foundation commissioned a retrospective assessment of its related grantmaking and auxiliary support (convening, research, communications, etc.). The guiding questions for this assessment were:

• To what extent did the efforts of HCF’s grantees—and HCF itself—influence the passage of smoke free ordinances and legislation in Kansas?
• What role and influence have grantees and HCF had in spurring progress toward increasing the tobacco tax in Missouri?
• How can HCF best increase its own influence and credibility on tobacco policy, as well as that of its grantees?

Although there is insufficient data for a full evaluation of the impact on tobacco policy of HCF’s advocacy grantmaking, this assessment can help HCF gain a better picture of the effect of its work.

Overall, the findings of this assessment suggest that HCF has been influential in tobacco advocacy efforts, in part due to funding lobbying activities, unlike many other private foundations. HCF has also played a significant role in convening important actors, connecting organizations and advocates, providing resources for coalitions, and bringing successful policy lessons from local and statewide efforts in Kansas to Missouri. Most of HCF’s grantees (or the advocacy tactics and campaign messages they used) were named by policy insiders, without prompting, as playing a significant role in tobacco policy progress to date. This report explores these conclusions and offers recommendations to the foundation for continuing to improve the effectiveness of its advocacy grantmaking.

1A list of grantees is available at the end of this report.
Assessment Approach

Assessing the impact of advocacy in the absence of an outright policy victory—such as the passage of a piece of legislation or a ballot initiative—can be difficult. The policy environment is complex, with many uncontrollable external factors affecting whether progress is made.

Even when a policy goal is reached, as is the case in much of the Kansas-based tobacco advocacy work, it is virtually impossible to prove with certainty that the win was the result of a particular advocacy strategy or the efforts of a particular organization or coalition.

Most often, policy victories occur because of the efforts of multiple actors using many different tactics over a long period of time. While the part of advocacy work that is most visible usually occurs just prior to a key decision-making moment, there are normally years of work that have built the foundation for change. Assessing impact requires understanding what role and influence an advocate or strategy had within the larger array of players and efforts, and at different stages of the policy process.

Laying the groundwork for policy change includes generating awareness and agreement about the nature of the problem and its potential solutions, increasing the salience or relative importance of the issue among key audiences, and building a base of supporters who will take action when the opportunity arises. This matrix visualizes the array of advocacy tactics (charted in the grey boxes) that may be required to increase the level of engagement (the y-axis) in different audiences (the x-axis) over time.

The matrix also provides a useful framework for assessing the role and influence of a particular advocacy strategy or advocate in the larger policy process. Based on the advocacy tactics grantees reported using, we can construct a picture of which audiences each grantee was attempting to move further along the spectrum of awareness, will, action.

Because there are no data available that show how audiences moved along the spectrum, it is difficult to establish the clear contribution of each grantee. As a result, the assessment team used a combination of document review and key informant interviews to understand how policy insiders viewed the role of grantees and HCF in the larger movement toward policy change.

---

2This matrix was originally developed by Julia Coffman with funding from the Irvine Foundation. See: Coffman J. Foundations and Public Policy Grantmaking. San Francisco: The James Irvine Foundation, March 2008.
Tobacco Related Advocacy and Policy Change Tactics Supported by the Health Care Foundation of Greater Kansas City’s Grantmaking

It is easy to see that HCF’s grantmaking covers a diverse range of tactics that hoped to reach a wide variety of audiences at different levels of engagement.

The document review included internal foundation documents on its tobacco funding approach, grant applications and progress reports, and evaluation reports by other researchers. Grantee applications and progress reports contain substantial information on grantee activities, which allowed the assessment team to match grantees to the campaign strategies and tactics that the interviewees cited as most effective.

The chart above illustrates how HCF grantees were positioned in the tobacco advocacy field in Kansas and Missouri. The tactics in red are those that HCF grantees listed in their grant proposals and final reports submitted to the foundation. The tactics in black are other common tactics that were not reported as being undertaken by HCF grantees. From this framework it is easy to see that HCF’s grantmaking covers a diverse range of tactics aiming to reach a wide variety of audiences at different levels of engagement. This broad strategy may allow HCF to have influence in the tobacco policy process in many different ways. Conversely, resources and energy spread across such a diverse array of activities may dilute impact.

The majority of information about the impact of their strategies came from the bellwether methodology because grantee progress reports did not consistently report data about target audiences. This qualitative technique featured structured interviews with 11 bellwethers—influential people in Kansas and Missouri who have their “finger to the wind” of opinion in the political area and whose positions require them to track a wide variety of policy issues and players. The opinions of these interviewees about policy issues and advocacy efforts carry substantial weight in assessing the role of HCF in advocacy efforts, as well as predictive value for how to continue to address tobacco related issues.
Because the number of interviewees was small, it is important that this assessment not be read as conclusive evidence of impact. Instead, it gives HCF a deeper understanding of how key insiders perceived the influence of HCF’s efforts and those of its grantees.

The majority of bellwethers were **not** HCF grantees or directly connected to HCF’s tobacco advocacy efforts. To ensure that responses were unprompted and unbiased, we did not provide the bellwethers with advanced notice about the nature of the inquiry. Interviewees were told they would be interviewed about the history of tobacco policy in Kansas and/or Missouri and then were asked open-ended questions about which organizations and strategies were most impactful during the last five years. The interviewees then listened for whether bellwethers, unprompted, mentioned HCF and its grantees as key players and why.

Bellwethers included:
- Key policy makers
- Representatives from disease prevention organizations
- Health advocacy organizations
- Foundations
- Other health related organizations

Tobacco Related Advocacy and Policy Change Tactics Supported by the Health Care Foundation of Greater Kansas City’s Grantmaking that were Recognized by Bellwethers
Bellwethers were asked to reflect on how the policy environment—and important target audiences—have shifted with regards to tobacco policy in the past five years. They then described the advocacy strategies and tactics that seemed most and least effective in triggering this shift, along with the organizations they viewed as most influential. Finally, they were asked what role, if any, they believe HCF itself played and how it might be more effective in the future.

The tactics that are underlined were identified by more than three bellwethers as particularly influential in the tobacco advocacy process:

- Lobbying
- Community mobilization
- Media advocacy
- Political will campaigns
- Advocacy capacity building
- Public education
- Public polling

When compared to the list of tactics HCF’s grantees were using (illustrated in the chart on the previous page), it is evident that the tactics HCF supported were viewed by policy insiders as pivotal to progress made on tobacco policy. The tactics highlighted in yellow are those identified as HCF’s specific and most significant contribution to policy progress. These were also tactics that were identified as the most effective in advocacy efforts in general.

KANSAS

Key Findings

1. The most significant changes in target audiences’ level of engagement in tobacco policy were increased in public awareness, policymaker will, and policymaker action.

In addition to the passage of the Kansas Clean Indoor Air Act and local ordinances, bellwethers reported that advocates’ work increased public awareness of the health risks associated with tobacco use, the public will for tobacco related policy reforms, and lawmakers’ willingness to support tobacco policy reforms. All bellwethers agreed that the local smoke free ordinances that have gone into effect have helped to “build grassroots support,” “create momentum,” and “tip the scales” which led to the passage of the statewide Clean Indoor Air Act in 2010. One bellwether stated that the “percolation of this up from the local to the state level was helpful.”

Because HCF purposefully selected grant recipients that were gaining momentum on a local level and then sought to replicate progress in other locations, this finding affirms HCF’s strategic choices. **Local-to-state scaling may be a valuable niche for HCF in the future for other policy issues.** However, one bellwether warned that as more local ordinances were passed some legislators became more reluctant to tackle a statewide ban and preferred to keep it a local issue.

2. Grassroots mobilizing, strategic communications (storytelling), public polling and direct lobbying were cited as the most effective tactics deployed by advocates. Bellwethers had no consensus on which tactics were ineffective.

Numerous tactics were mentioned in the interviews as being effective in the Kansas tobacco advocacy efforts. All bellwethers agreed that grassroots mobilization was crucial in raising public awareness, and having constituents influence legislators.

Sharing personal stories about the health impacts of tobacco with legislators was mentioned by 4 of the 5 bellwethers as the most effective tactic in influencing legislators. Of these four, three mentioned by name the “10,000 Voices Campaign, which HCF helped to support.”
Bellwethers referred to this campaign as “unique,” “innovative,” an “extremely important tactic,” and a “game changer.” One mentioned that the legislative districts in Kansas are small, so when legislators received the recordings of constituents’ stories they often recognized the people telling the stories and were moved to support the advocacy efforts.

Most bellwethers mentioned public polling (3 of 5) and direct lobbying to target policy makers as important tactics (4 of 5). The Clean Air Kansas coalition, with HCF support, was able to hire a lobbying firm, a grassroots organizer, and someone to coordinate media and messaging. To support grassroots mobilization, advocacy organizations were using both earned and paid media, providing resources and information to local coalitions tackling tobacco related issues, and holding regular meetings to bring together key players in the state.

A few mentioned traditional public health information and social networking in rural areas were ineffective tactics. Other challenges that were mentioned include:

- Circulation of untrue information that damaged the integrity of the campaigns
- Lumping too many issues together in policies
- Infighting among advocacy groups
- A lack of data on constituents
- Poor follow up with recently mobilized populations.

3. The target audience showing the most significant movement along the spectrum were state legislators. A meaningful shift was also witnessed in the media’s coverage and framing of the issue.

All of the bellwethers agreed that legislators changed their position and level of support the most throughout the course of the debate. They attributed this change to the pressure legislators felt from their constituents. This contributed to the passing of the statewide act and is evidence of the effectiveness of the direct lobbying and personal constituents’ stories.

One mentioned the importance of having champions of the policy reform efforts at the state level. Two mentioned the value of advocates knowing how many votes they needed to get the act passed so they could target their efforts on those districts and legislators.

Two bellwethers also noted that media outlets changed their issue framing and position based on the polling data showing strong public support for tobacco policy reforms. Throughout the advocacy efforts in Kansas, the hospitality industry, including restaurants and bars, and the tobacco industry were the strongest opposition forces mentioned by the majority of the bellwethers.

4. Key HCF grantees were recognized by bellwethers as credible and influential players in the policy debate.

- All five of the bellwethers mentioned the American Cancer Society, American Heart Association and American Lung Association as influential actors in the advocacy efforts. They were seen as credible organizations that were able to provide information on the health implications of tobacco use.
- Three mentioned local health departments.
- The tobacco control groups –Smoke Free Kansas, Tobacco Free Kansas and Clean Air Kansas– were each mentioned twice as important actors.
When asked about the roll of foundations in the tobacco advocacy efforts in Kansas the bellwethers reported that their most important contributions were funding (5 out of 5) and statewide polling (2 out of 5).

Other important roles that were mentioned were the foundations’ ability to bring in the disease prevention organizations, organizing the statewide coalition, and providing funding for lobbying in particular.

All bellwethers mentioned the Sunflower Foundation as influential and 4 out of 5 mentioned HCF. Others mentioned were the REACH Foundation and the United Methodist Health Ministry Fund. When discussing the Clean Air Kansas coalition one bellwether said: “These foundations chose not to take an outright role, they did not want it to be identified as their project. They allowed the process to work and a collaborative effort to work. I think in an unspoken way it brought credibility to the work because funds were coming from two respected health foundations.”

5. HCF’s ability and willingness to fund lobbying, help shape strategy, and encourage coalition work were important to the success of the effort. Four of five interviewees did not name any challenges working with HCF.

- All of the bellwethers found the Health Care Foundation of Greater Kansas City to be an important player in the tobacco policy arena and described it as “extremely helpful,” “an important part of the whole puzzle,” and a “tremendous help.”
- Four of the five bellwethers mentioned funding, particularly funding for lobbying efforts, to be HCF’s most helpful contribution to tobacco related advocacy efforts.
- Three of the five mentioned the helpfulness and accessibility of HCF’s staff.

Other helpful roles that were mentioned were fact-finding, keeping the process moving, strategy formation, direction and leadership, having a long-term view, and providing resources for local coalitions.

One bellwether stated: “When you’re working with a group of people and you help them write a grant and the Health Care Foundation of Greater Kansas City funds it, it changes the whole dynamic. It ramps it up. They can see how they will be able to make things work.”

Another bellwether noted that HCF’s financial support reassured their organization’s board of directors that they could take on the risks associated with advocacy work because they were not going it alone.

Four of the five bellwethers said that there were no challenges in working with HCF and only one person mentioned the grant reporting as a challenge.
Suggestions for HCF’s Future Advocacy Work in Kansas

The bellwethers had numerous recommendations on how HCF can continue to be involved in tobacco advocacy and in health advocacy in general in Kansas.

Two of the five bellwethers mentioned continued funding for tobacco advocacy in Kansas as important. More specifically they mentioned the importance of hiring lobbyists and political campaign staff as well as funding tobacco advocacy efforts in Missouri.

One bellwether encouraged HCF to continue to work in conjunction with the American Heart Association, American Lung Association and American Cancer Society, as well as with community health departments. One bellwether said “I think that HCF came out of the Clear Air Kansas being seen as a foundation willing to get involved in public policy and spend resources to influence policy makers. That’s important.”

Looking more broadly at the role of HCF in health advocacy, bellwethers suggested the foundation engage in childhood obesity prevention, promoting green spaces, and conduct research on the impacts of health policies.

One suggested HCF provide more information on accessing the benefits of the Affordable Care Act. Another recommended a constant ad campaign to increase the visibility of the foundation as resource for people on health related issues. Lastly one bellwether emphasized the importance of HCF’s ability to convene people with the right skills, including media, lobbying and grassroots mobilization experience.

MISSOURI

Key Findings

Missouri advocates are working toward both smoke free ordinances/legislation and legislation that increases the tax on tobacco, which is currently the lowest in the nation. The assessment team interviewed seven bellwethers involved in tobacco-related advocacy efforts in Missouri, one of whom was also involved in related efforts in Kansas previously mentioned. Some of the bellwethers were involved in only one of the two main policy issues.

Bellwethers included:

- Representative of an organization involved in local coalitions working on smoke free ordinances
- Physicians working in health care organizations
- Staff of disease prevention organizations
- Staff of other foundations

1. While nearly all (6 out of 7) of the bellwethers felt that the most significant change in tobacco policy in Missouri has been the increase in smoke free ordinances at the community level, there is little consensus about what significant groundwork has been laid for state-level policy wins.
Close to 30% of Missouri is now covered by local smoke free ordinances. According to most bellwethers (6 out of 7) local wins have created momentum toward statewide regulations, but advocates working in Missouri have had difficulty parlaying local momentum into movement on the state level. Finding an alternative approach to translate local wins into statewide momentum may be an important next step for advocates.

Although no bellwether could note significant change in the last five years, others cited an increase in public awareness about the risks of tobacco use and increases in influencer will and action in the form of increased advocacy capacity and coalition building as the groundwork laid to date.

2. Public education and grassroots organizing have had the most traction in recent years, but bellwethers also identified many ineffective tactics that are seen as failing to move key audiences beyond basic awareness.

The two most effective tactics that surfaced in the interviews were public education (6 of 7) and grassroots mobilization (5 of 7).

In particular, bellwethers cited speaking in-person to groups, using earned and paid media, and phone calls as effective public outreach approaches. There was also a heavy emphasis on the importance of the advocacy campaigns being run locally (4 of 7) and utilizing local volunteers (3 of 7). Close to half mentioned the importance of providing local coalitions with resources, training, and technical assistance to help pass local ordinances. Supporting peer education and resource sharing between local campaigns, and helping local advocates discern the right timing for their efforts in relation to other policy efforts were also noted as important to the success of local ordinances.

Less effective tactics include:
- Engaging in public debates
- Using social media in rural areas
- Letter writing to newspapers
- Using outside consultants
- “Just passing out brochures”
- Research in life science
- Engaging in individual liberties discussions

Some of the main challenges were:
- Infighting amongst advocates
- Not having engaged the faith-based community
- Moving too fast without having laid the groundwork for a campaign
- Being outspent by the opposition
- Not being able to convey the message that nonsmokers are subsidizing smokers through higher health insurance costs

There was also disagreement on the use of ballot initiatives. They were a useful tactic for communities where the city council would not consider a smoke free ordinance. They suggest that advocates could benefit from assistance with message framing and coalition building.

3. Bellwethers showed little consensus about which target audiences had advanced along the spectrum of engagement. A more targeted analysis and approach for distinct audiences may help trigger greater progress.

Regarding efforts to increase the tobacco tax, three of seven bellwethers thought that the public moved the furthest along the spectrum of engagement during the course of the debate. Interviewees attributed this change to increased education, the momentum of the smoke free efforts, and the power of messaging related to Missouri’s claim to the lowest tobacco tax in the country. Two bellwethers believed that legislators had started to change their opinions on the tobacco tax due to budget short falls and the momentum of the local smoke free ordinances.
In terms of the smoke free ordinance efforts, three of seven bellwethers reported that the business community had changed their opinions the most because they haven’t seen the negative impacts on their businesses. Improved dissemination of the economic impact of smoking ordinances on business may continue to build momentum with this audience. The public (2 of 7) and the media (2 of 7) were sited as having become more supportive of the advocacy efforts due to increased education on the hazards of tobacco. A few bellwethers expressed frustration with the lack of support or strong champions in the legislature.

Unsurprisingly, restaurants and bars were identified as the primary opposition group by four of the seven bellwethers. Three people identified the Libertarian and Tea Party groups in the state as a major opposition force. Two bellwethers mentioned the effectiveness of the Petroleum Marketers & Convenience Store Association’s messaging against the tobacco related advocacy efforts. The tobacco industry and city councils were also sited as being opposition forces.

One bellwether had this to say about how the opposition’s arguments have changed over time: “Three years ago, the argument was about loss of business. We didn’t see that happen, so now it’s about a rights argument. They’ve had to switch their argument. And I think the number of people that actually believe they have the right to smoke in public is a smaller group.”

4. Several of HCF’s grantees were recognized by policy insiders as among the most influential actors in the Missouri tobacco debates. Six out of seven bellwethers cited HCF and the Missouri Foundation for Health as crucial players who lend legitimacy to the effort in a difficult political environment.

The American Cancer Society, a grantee receiving significant funding from HCF, was identified by just over half of the bellwethers as a leader in the campaign to increase the tobacco tax, noting that the organization brings credibility and significant funds to the effort. Tobacco Free Missouri was recognized for its ability to organize volunteers and mobilize grassroots networks—tactics that contributed significantly to changes in public awareness.

In smoke-free ordinance efforts, the majority of bellwethers identified the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association as influential actors that are viewed widely as credible sources of information. The associations have also provided resources for the local coalitions, a pivotal function in building advocacy capacity on the local level. The American Lung Association and the Tobacco Free Missouri coalition were again identified as influential. And even before they were asked about the role of foundations, three bellwethers listed HCF as a primary player in the smoke-free work in Missouri.

When asked about the role and influence of foundations in tobacco advocacy in Missouri, bellwethers shared no common perspective. Of course bellwethers listed funding, particularly for education and lobbying, as the most important contribution of funders. Others noted funders’ ability to leverage national resources, offer expertise and objectivity, provide structure, and support the unanticipated needs of advocates. HCF and the Missouri Foundation for Health were both identified by six out of seven bellwethers as important players.

HCF was seen as more influential in the tax efforts and on “general advocacy,” while the Missouri Foundation for Health was seen as a leader in the tobacco prevention and cessation initiative, education, and working with smoke free coalitions.
5. HCF has played an influential role in Missouri’s tobacco policy arena with its funding of lobbying and ballot initiatives, as well as its support for coalitions.

All seven bellwethers were directly aware of HCF’s role in both tobacco tax and smoke-free ordinance work. Bellwethers also mentioned the helpfulness and accessibility of HCF staff, their ability to help build momentum, and the resources they have helped to provide, such as the Smoke Free Workbook and connecting coalitions with Joyce Morrison. One bellwether also mentioned HCF’s ability to bring lessons learned from their work in Kansas into Missouri. Below are some of the comments bellwethers made about working with HCF.

“I view them as an asset in helping us knit together some kind of tobacco control. The funding is critical. A few years ago I wouldn’t identify them as a tobacco control resources, but they have really grown into that role.”

“I know that HCF has been really helpful to their grantees in providing funds for education materials. There’s a smoke free workbook that the Kansas City Metro Coalition developed to walk people through how to do an ordinance, which is a really good resource.”

“They are a dream to work with. They don’t drive you crazy with reporting. They get that advocacy has bigger health effects than direct care. I give them full credit.”

“The one thing they bring to the table that few can is the lobbying dollars. That money is really hard to come by, especially when you’re talking about a public campaign.”

“They are the seed money that helps attract other money. If we don’t have it I don’t think we’d be where we are. I can’t emphasize how important they are.”

There were not any challenges mentioned in working with HCF other than the general difficulty of policy work.

Suggestions for HCF’s Future Advocacy Work in Missouri

Most bellwethers (4 out of 7) identified continuing to build public and political will for the tobacco tax as the top tobacco policy priority in Missouri. Many see the recent cuts to higher education and ever-increasing budget gaps as a prime opportunity to make the political case for a tobacco tax increase.

Two bellwethers thought that the statewide smoke free ordinance was an important next step, but they also warned against tackling both statewide policies at the same time. Others mentioned simply continuing to strengthen the statewide coalition so that it is representative of and can mobilize people across the state when a better window of opportunity opens.

Some suggested the importance of getting more communities to go smoke free and engaging local community coalitions in statewide efforts.

One bellwether said, “I keep waiting for someone to say we want to get the communities who have done this on a conference call to engage us around the larger state wide effort. There’s a community of us that have worked on this with some success, we can be engaged on this larger statewide effort. It seems like that group would be a natural fit for mobilizing on tobacco tax.”
Other suggestions included clear and consistent messaging, more cessation efforts, and continuing to make resources available for tobacco advocacy efforts. When asked specifically about the role HCF can play in these continued efforts, three of bellwethers identified the importance of HCF in the tobacco tax increase campaign as well as continuing to be a source of funding for lobbying and advocacy work. Others suggested continued conversation and collaboration with key players including joint summits with the Missouri Foundation for Health to coordinate advocacy efforts across the state.

Below are additional recommendations for HCF to consider regarding their involvement in tobacco policy issues.

“A couple of things that would be mistakes not to repeat: Don’t come riding in thinking you’re going to save the world. When it comes to other areas of the state, HCF is an outsider, they need to know the lay of the land, there aren’t as many organizations that are comfortable with them. Use the existing networks, tread carefully. It takes a long time to build those relationships”

“HCF funds different organizations, nobody is going to bad mouth the foundation. If they decide to really give out their money where their mouth is and only give grants for advocacy, especially matching and challenge grants, that might motivate other funders and get money found elsewhere.”

Looking more broadly at health advocacy issues in Missouri, bellwethers suggested:

- Promoting green spaces and city planning
- Addressing childhood obesity prevention
- Food desert issues
- Tobacco prevention and cessation programs
- Funding community organizing
- Discussing the social determinants of health
- Providing more resources on the Affordable Care Act

Interestingly, during the tobacco advocacy interviews bellwethers in both Kansas and Missouri mentioned the important role HCF can play in providing resources on health reform and ACA, including providing information for individuals on how to access benefits.

One stated, “I think this is a niche that would fit HCF’s mission. Even among people that are very knowledgeable, there is still misunderstanding about what the ACA will do and will not do. If I was on the Board of one of those foundations, I would be thinking about what is our outreach to that population that will be very benefitted, but doesn’t know it or doesn’t know what to do.”

Another bellwether said, “I know HCF is doing some stuff around ACA. Trying to provide some resources around the ACA, after the Supreme Court decision. There is so much misleading information. Even providing some resources to do a poll on how to communicate to voters on the ACA. The opposition is running that conversation and we need to understand how to fight that. HCF in partnership with other foundations could have a joint effort to raise educational awareness about ACA and what it does. We need to go on the offensive as advocates. We need resources behind getting the messages out that we know will work.”
Recommendations

The results of the interviews suggest that HCF should consider the following things as it moves forward in developing a plan for their continued involvement in tobacco related advocacy issues in Kansas and Missouri.

- One of the key things that HCF brings to the table is their ability to fund lobbying activities. Policy insiders are acutely aware of this leverage. This is a unique niche for HCF, as other foundations are restricted from funding lobbying activities, and advocacy organizations are limited by what they are able to accomplish when they do not have funding for lobbying activities. Given the challenges of passing a statewide smoke-free ordinance and raising the tobacco tax in Missouri, two of the key issues identified by bellwethers as needing be addressed, significant funding for lobbying may help make headway on these issues possible.

- Public education and grassroots mobilization stood out as two of the most effective techniques in tobacco related advocacy efforts. The lessons learned from the “10,000 Voices Campaign” in Kansas could be brought to bear in the statewide efforts in Missouri. Without strong public awareness campaigns and coordinated efforts to get the voices of those in favor of tobacco controls from the local level to the state policy makers there is likely to be little progress. Sustaining such public pressure, and making it visible in the media and with influential non-legislative champions will be particularly important as legislators cycle through limited terms.

- HCF’s behind-the-scenes ability to bring organizations and players together appears to be one of their most valued strengths. HCF can continue to serve as a network weaver, connecting key players in the advocacy efforts as well as strengthening the existing coalitions working on these issues. This could include mobilizing successful local coalitions to get involved in statewide efforts. Without these connections there is a risk of advocates working in isolation and at odds.

- The most successful campaigns appear to be those where there has been collaboration between various organizations. HCF’s partnership with the Sunflower Foundation in the successful Clean Air Kansas campaign is a model that could be applied to tobacco related campaigns in Missouri. These collaborations and partnerships bring legitimacy to the campaigns and give decision-makers political cover to participate in campaigns that might otherwise be too controversial. HCF’s coordination with other funders allows for the coordination of complimentary tactics, leveraging of resources, capitalizing on different strengths, and development of strategic frameworks that can marshal advocates more productively than if multiple funders are each looking for a grantee to execute different strategies.
• Advocacy capacity building is another area where HCF could use its experience and resources to make a big impact on the health advocacy community. By funding trainings, providing information and technical assistance, and creating opportunities for collaboration, the foundation can help to strengthen the ability of advocates to tackle challenging policy issues. HCF is particularly well positioned to do this because it provides general operating support and allows for lobbying. The need for clear and consistent messaging stood out as an area where advocates could use more assistance.

HCF’s experience in tobacco related advocacy work, as well as its positive reputation as a behind-the-scenes credible broker, make it well positioned to play a role as a leader in the continued tobacco advocacy efforts in Kansas and Missouri.

Perhaps most importantly, HCF’s comparatively flexible and low-burden funding approach position it to quickly fill strategic gaps and seize unexpected opportunities that other foundations may have difficulty moving nimbly enough to support.
## HCF Advocacy Grants Related to Tobacco Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Funding Awarded</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Primary Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Lung Association of MO</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$206,266</td>
<td>Tobacco tax</td>
<td>Public education, communications, coalition building and grassroots mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates for Healthy Independence</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$32,050</td>
<td>Smoke-free</td>
<td>Public education, media, ballot initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Lung Association of Central States</td>
<td>MO &amp; KS</td>
<td>2006-2009</td>
<td>$185,163</td>
<td>Smoke-free</td>
<td>Policy research, public education, legislator education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners in Public Health for Clean Air Kansas City</td>
<td>MO &amp; KS</td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>Smoke-free</td>
<td>Grassroots mobilization, public education, legislator education, lobbying, advocacy capacity building, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breath Easy Kansas City</td>
<td>MO &amp; KS</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Smoke-free</td>
<td>Initiative petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Yes for Clean Air Lee's Summit</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Smoke-free</td>
<td>Public education, public will building, political will building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Foundation for Clean Air Kansas</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>2009-2011</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>State wide smoke-free</td>
<td>Lobbying, political will building, grassroots mobilization, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrive Allen County</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>2009-2011</td>
<td>$69,482</td>
<td>Smoke-free</td>
<td>Public education, political will building, public will building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Cancer Society, High Plains MO</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Tobacco tax</td>
<td>Voter mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Air Economic Impact Assessment</td>
<td>MO &amp; KS</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>Smoke-free</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO Cigarette Tax Opinion Survey</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Tobacco tax</td>
<td>Policy research, voter education, public polling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO Foundation for Health</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NA $14,500</td>
<td>State wide smoke-free</td>
<td>Public polling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Coalition Tobacco Strategy Session Initiative</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Smoke-free and tobacco tax</td>
<td>Coalition building, advocacy capacity building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>