

## “Lines-in-the-Sand” Tool for Policy and Campaign Decision-making

The VWC Policy Committee developed a set of criteria for determining lines-in-the-sand for specific policy issues that may arise over the course of a campaign. Examples of such situations include a threat to existing campaign policy positions (e.g. public healthcare financing), and newly arising issues the campaign has not previously focused on (e.g. changes to the ACA “marketplace”). A “line-in-the sand” means that the campaign commits to taking action (e.g. intervening or moving to escalating tactics) when the line is crossed. These criteria are similar to organizing criteria, criteria for campaign strategy decisions, and union contract defense criteria.

Our 10 criteria are listed below, in rough order of priority. Once the answers to questions 1 - 10 have been tallied and weighted, the summary assessment should take into account a final question: Will the benefit of winning be greater than the cost of losing?

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Issue X (Yes/No)</b>
<b>1</b>	Does the issue violate HR principles and standards?	
<b>2</b>	Is there broadly and deeply felt moral outrage?	
<b>3</b>	Will our escalated engagement change paradigm/discourse?	
<b>4</b>	Will our escalated engagement build power/momentum	
<b>5</b>	Do we have the power to win (policy win)? Factors include: capacity, politics, influence with decision-makers	
<b>6</b>	Have we already committed ourselves to this issue and to a potential escalation strategy?	
<b>7</b>	Will the issue lead to human rights retrogression?	
<b>8</b>	Will our escalated engagement advance the long-term vision for all our campaigns in a better way than potential other actions?	
<b>9</b>	Will our escalated engagement increase our credibility?	
<b>10</b>	Will this issue set a policy precedent?	
<b>Summar</b>	<b>Will the benefit of winning be greater than the cost of</b>	

<b>y</b>	<b>losing?</b>	
----------	----------------	--