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Highlights from Last Night

Six degrees of Carol Lavoie Schuster

Do the Most Hipster Thing Possible - Move to Des Moines
## Agenda for Today’s CI Funder COP Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Thursday, February 1st Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00am</td>
<td>Introductions and Warm Up Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:15am</td>
<td>Resilience and Sustaining Momentum (part 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:30am</td>
<td>Networking Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:30am</td>
<td>Resilience and Sustaining Momentum (part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45am-12:30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-2:30pm</td>
<td>Fund for Shared Insight: Funder Openness Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00pm</td>
<td>Wrap Up and Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:30pm</td>
<td>Meeting Adjourned: Open Time/Informal Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-6:00pm</td>
<td>Optional GEO Happy Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional GEO Happy Hour  
*Boveda, 2350 M Street, NW, Washington DC 20037*
Goals of the Collective Impact Funder Community of Practice

- **Networking and building relationships** with other funders of collective impact

- **Learning about the strategies and nuances for funders engaging in collective impact**, and how to most effectively engage in and support collective impact

- **Improving the practice of grantmakers** as funders and partners in collective impact
Since Mid-2014, the CI Funder COP Has Offered Meetings and Peer Learning Calls on Topics Such as Community Engagement, Equity, Funder Alignment, and Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2014</td>
<td>30+ COP participants join first large group learning call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2015</td>
<td>Second in-person COP meeting (DC); ~50 orgs now in the COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Second annual CI Convening (New Orleans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2016</td>
<td>Fourth in-person COP meeting (DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2016</td>
<td>Fifth in-person COP meeting (Chicago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Fourth annual CI Convening (Boston)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>COP launches at first annual CI Convening (Aspen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2014</td>
<td>40 attendees at first in-person COP meeting (Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2015</td>
<td>Third in-person COP meeting (Chicago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Third annual CI Convening (Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2017</td>
<td>Sixth in-person COP meeting (DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2017</td>
<td>Seventh in-person COP meeting (Chicago)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Collective impact efforts tend to transpire over five phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components for Success</th>
<th>Phase I Assess Readiness</th>
<th>Phase II Initiate Action</th>
<th>Phase III Organize for Impact</th>
<th>Phase IV Begin Implementation</th>
<th>Phase V Sustain Action and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Convene community leaders</td>
<td>Identify champions and form cross-sector Steering Committee “SC” to guide the effort</td>
<td>Determine initial workgroups and plan backbone organization</td>
<td>Launch work groups “WGs” and select backbone organization</td>
<td>Building out the backbone organization; evolve WGs to meet emergent strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Hold dialogue about issue, community context, and available resources</td>
<td>Map the landscape and use data to make case</td>
<td>Create common agenda, clear problem definition, population level goal</td>
<td>Develop Blueprint for Implementation; identify quick wins</td>
<td>Refine strategies; mobilize for quick wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Determine community readiness; Create a community engagement plan</td>
<td>Begin outreach to community leaders</td>
<td>Incorporate community voice - gain community perspective and input around issue</td>
<td>Engage community more broadly and build public will</td>
<td>Continue engagement and conduct advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation And Improvement</td>
<td>Determine if there is consensus/urgency to move forward</td>
<td>Analyze baseline data to ID key issues and gaps</td>
<td>Develop high level shared metrics and/or strategies at SC level</td>
<td>Establish shared measures (indicators and approach) at SC and WG levels</td>
<td>Collect, track, and report progress (process to learn and improve)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To sustain momentum, we must shift from a “lifecycle” to an “ecocycle” view of collaboration

Living systems have four phases

Renewal

Conservation

Development

Creative Destruction

Development

- Entrepreneurial period of high energy and new ideas
- Trial and error learning
- Resources are spread over a variety of projects or activities

Maturity/Conservation

- In-depth planning
- Allocating resources to predictably successful activities
- Streamlining operations for efficiency
- Moving to this phase is the aim of traditional management thinking

Letting go of activities that are too rigid, not variable enough, or not responsive to current needs
• Freeing resources and creating the conditions for new ideas
• Crucial phase – creation requires destruction

Renewal/Exploration

- Creating connections, mobilizing resources and skills to create the next generation of effective ideas

Each phase has associated “traps” where systems can become stuck

**Scarcity trap** – Lack of compelling ideas and credibility, underdeveloped decision-making processes, energy spread too thinly

**Rigidity trap** – Fear of uncertainty, lack of exit rules, pressure to continue by entrenched constituency, fear of failure

**Parasitic trap** – Challenges with growth or sustainability of projects; dependence on startup pool of resources

**Chronic disaster trap** – Inability to let go of the past, weak trust, difficulty agreeing on a shared vision

Insights from experienced backbone leaders about how they have sustained funding for collective impact

• “Knowing **how to speak to different types of funders** is really important. Some funders want to hear the ‘**collective**’ **side of collective impact**, such as how partnerships are forming. But, others want to hear the ‘**impact**’ side, such as what are you accomplishing and your return on investment.”
  – Gabrielle Guillaume

• “The chief sustainability challenge is having consistent, long term funding commitments. This is not a 2 or 3-year problem, and the **investment needs to match the type of change you are seeking.**”
  – Chekemma Fulmore-Townsend

• “**Demonstrate your effectiveness** to the degree you can, based on the data you have. This is important for both partners and funders…**Diversify your funding portfolio** as much as possible. If you have limited funding and a primary funding source goes away, it puts the entire initiative at risk.”
  – Cheryl Moder

Source: Experienced Backbone Leaders Interview Series, August 2016
Any questions about these sustainability concepts?
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Venture Philanthropy Partners (VPP) 1.0: Uncoordinated Youth Outcomes
(VPP) 1.0: Output Measurement

- Tracked the number of youth served by each investment – with details on their demographic characteristics.
- Expected reporting on youth outcomes, but did not have overarching vision of what was to be reported.
  - Each nonprofit defined their own outcomes.
  - VPP’s collective vision was ‘more youth achieve positive outcomes’.
VPP 2.0: youthCONNECT and Common Outcomes Framework
## Common Outcomes Framework

| Percent of students absent from school 10 or more days per year |
| Percent of students with a completed college readiness plan |
| Percent of students with a completed career readiness plan |
| Percent of students on track for grade |
| Percent of students with a high school diploma |
| Percent of students with a GED |
| Percent of students with a completed FAFSA |
| Percent of students with a completed college application |
| Percent of students with specified hard/soft job skills |
| Percent of youth with work experience |
| Percent of youth with positive adult relationships |
| Percent of youth avoiding negative peer relationships |
| Percent of youth avoiding physical fighting, cigarettes, alcohol, & other drugs |
| Percent of youth with appropriate attitudes toward unprotected sex |
| Percent of sexually active youth practicing safe sex |

### Outcome:
Youth attain a postsecondary credential, OR retain gainful employment

| Percent of students who enroll in college or other postsecondary program for a second year |
| Percent of students who enroll in college or other postsecondary program |

### Outcome:
Youth sustain healthy behaviors

- Interim Indicators
- Indicators
- Outcomes

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(VPP) 2.0: Common Outcomes Framework

• Identified six high performing nonprofit organizations that served youth.

• Worked collaboratively to develop theory of change and identify outcomes and indicators that could measure progress.

• Challenges:
  • Each nonprofit only worked on some indicators/outcomes, and there was not an easily identifiable ‘path’ for outcome achievement.
  • The nonprofits worked with different youth at different ages in different geographic areas with different risk/need levels.
VPP 3.0: Ready for Work and School-Based Collective Impact

[Diagram showing various logos and text indicating partnerships and initiatives related to education and workforce preparation.]
VPP 3.0: Ready for Work Indicators

- School Attendance Data
- Behavior / Discipline Data
- Grades / GPA
- Math and Reading Proficiency / Standardized Tests
  - Grade Promotion Rates [9th to 10th, 10th to 11th, 11th to 12th]
  - College Credits and Industry Certifications Earned
  - TSA Passage Rates
- High School Graduation Rates
- College Enrollment Rates
VPP 3.0: Sources of Data

Central Data System (Data Aggregator)

Child Trends (VPP Evaluation Partner) To Analyze Data and Prepare Reports

Dosage and outcome data available for all students at the three RFW high schools

Suitland HS
- Administrative Data
- School Survey Data
- Partner Data (Student Level)

Oxon Hill HS
- Administrative Data
- School Survey Data
- Partner Data (Student Level)

High Point HS
- Administrative Data
- School Survey Data
- Partner Data (Student Level)
VPP 3.0: Attempting to Get to Impact Causation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ready for Work High Schools (Treatment)</th>
<th>TNI High Schools (Comparison 1)</th>
<th>Remaining PGCPS High Schools (Comparison 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitland HS</td>
<td>Bladensburg HS</td>
<td>Bowie HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxon Hill HS</td>
<td>Central HS</td>
<td>Flowers HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point HS</td>
<td>Crossland HS</td>
<td>Dr. Henry Wise HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DuVal HS</td>
<td>E. Roosevelt HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairmont Heights HS</td>
<td>F. Douglass HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern HS</td>
<td>Friendly HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parkdale HS</td>
<td>Gwynn Park HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potomac HS</td>
<td>Largo HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laurel HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surrattsville HS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Our Mission

To increase college readiness, participation and completion in Michigan, particularly among low-income students, first generation college-going students, and students of color.
College is POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

MCAN uses the term "college" to refer to the attainment of valuable postsecondary credentials beyond high school, including professional/technical certificates and academic degrees.
College is a Necessity

Postsecondary education is a prerequisite to success in a knowledge-based economy. Everyone must pursue and complete a postsecondary credential or degree beyond high school.
College is for Everyone

The postsecondary education attainment rates among low-income students and students of color are significantly lower than those of other students. MCAN is committed to closing these gaps.
College is a Public Good

Postsecondary educational opportunity and attainment are critical to a just and equitable society, strong economy, and healthy communities.
Our Goal

Increase the percentage of Michigan residents with degrees or postsecondary certificates to 60 percent by 2025.
MCAN’s Approach

1. EQUITY FOCUSED
   - COLLEGE-GOING CULTURE
     - Invest
     - Build Capacity

2. PATHWAYS AND TRANSITIONS
   - Convene
   - Advocate

3. COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY
   - Develop Partnerships
   - Disseminate Data And Research

4. ATTAINMENT ORIENTED
   - DATA DRIVEN
   - STUDENT CENTRIC

GOAL 2025
Working Across Multiple Systems

- State
- Regions/Communities
- Education Systems
  - Higher Education
  - K12
  - Workforce
- Practitioners
Introduction to Local College Access Networks
LCAN Development

- **MCAN’s Primary Strategy**
  - Support the creation, expansion, and sustainability of high-quality, community-based college access strategic alliances
  - Technical assistance and seed funding
  - 31 LCANs currently across the state
  - LCANs that are supported by MCAN use Collective Impact framework
LCANs: Network vs. Program

- **Coordinate** all the assets, programs, services, and resources currently in place that lower the barriers preventing students (particularly low-income and first-generation) from pursuing postsecondary educational opportunities

- **Integrate** college access initiatives at the community level among all service providers

- **Increase effectiveness and efficiency** of current assets

- **Correct** areas of gap and areas of duplication

- **Leverage** new resources to fill gaps
Reflections from Community Leaders
Our Journey

- **2009**: First LCAN awarded
- **2011**: Kania and Kramer Collective Impact article published in SSIR.
- **2012**: MCAN receives a grant from Lumina Foundation to create the LCAN framework based on communities utilizing a Collective Impact approach.
- **2013**: MCAN publishes our first LCAN Guidebook, “A community guide for increasing ed attainment through the lens of CI. A managing director is hired.
- **2014**: Technical Assistance/Coaching Strategy is solidified
- **2015**: Second edition of the LCAN Guidebook published.
- **2016**: First edition of the LCAN Benchmarks published.
- **2017**: Turning point for collaboratives around CI and non-CI
Key Factors to Collective Impact Sustainability

1. Leadership Competence
2. Effective Collaboration
3. Understanding the Community
4. Demonstrating Results
5. Strategic Funding
6. Staff Involvement and Integration
7. Community Responsivity

Source: Tamarack Institute
Activities that contribute to high-quality CI initiatives are the responsibility of leaders and include:

- clearly developing and articulating a common vision and objectives;
- performing regular needs assessments;
- ongoing planning, adaptation, and evaluation;
- securing funding, fiscal management;
- supporting and supervising staff; and providing staff training.

Source: Tamarack Institute
Sustainability Factor #2: Effective Collaboration

Involves identifying relevant stakeholders who actively support program goals and who have clearly identified roles and responsibilities.

- Collaborative efforts build a broad base of support in the community and of key stakeholders for program implementation, success, and sustainability.

Source: Tamarack Institute
Sustainability Factor #3: Understanding the Community

Entails having knowledge of community needs and resources; having respect for community members, and involving key community members in programs. Particular considerations include:

- socioeconomic and political considerations;
- community participation in programs;
- honoring community values and cultural relevance;
- cultivating key community leader support; and
- utilizing indigenous staff.

Source: Tamarack Institute
Sustainability Factor #4: Demonstrating Results

Evaluating process and outcomes using acceptable research methods and informing stakeholders of the results of those evaluations is critical.

- Evaluation must assess the intervention and subsequent program modifications focusing on measurable results.
- Evaluation findings can then be used to leverage current successes for establishing future funding.

Source: Tamarack Institute
Sustainability Factor #5: Strategic Funding

Includes having plans and resources in place to support current and prospective program requirements.

- Intentional planning for continued funding includes an analysis of short-term and long-term funding needs;
- developing a range of financing options; and
- recognizing that sustainability is enhanced when there is diversity in funding streams.

Source: Tamarack Institute
Inclusion of committed, qualified staff in the design, implementation, evaluation and decision making develops a culture that values broad-based participation in working toward program sustainability and success.

• Supporting program goals occurs more readily when staff are important components in the organization and make the organization their own.

Source: Tamarack Institute
Sustainability Factor #7: Community Responsivity

The ability of a CI initiative to adapt to meet changes in community needs is critical.

- Although CI Initiatives may maintain their overall goals, strategies may need change to address evolving issues and contexts.
- An important consideration in programs is the ability of the initiative to be modified to continually meet changing community needs and resources.

Source: Tamarack Institute
Sustaining Collective Impact: Self-Reflection, Small Group, and Large Group Discussion

- Fill out the reflection worksheet on your own (10 min)
- Discuss at your tables (10 min)
- Break into small groups to discuss these sustainability topics in greater detail (10 min per topic; 30 min total)
  - Leadership
  - Demonstrating Results
  - Strategic Funding

Source: Tamarack Institute
Lunch
Informal peer discussions;
Re-convene at 12:30
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IV. Wrap Up and Next Steps
What do we mean when we say “funder openness”?

**Funder openness** is the process by which funders…

- Share their goals and strategies
- Share how they make decisions and measure progress
- Listen and engage in dialogue with others
- Make space for co-creation that builds greater buy-in in the community
- Act on feedback they hear from grantees and from the community
- Share what they themselves have learned
- Promote sharing between funders and grantees (funder-to-funder, grantee-to-grantee, funder-to-grantee)

*Funder openness is focused both externally and internally: sharing externally what funders are learning from engaging in dialogue with others, and changing actions and culture internally through continuous learning*

Source: Adapted from the Fund for Shared Insight’s “Increasing Foundation Openness” RFP
Openness in the context of collective impact is proactively engaging in all parts of the openness “loop” identified below:

- **Funder**
  - Transparency about funder decision making processes, progress, and lessons learned

- **Beneficiaries**
  - Feedback from beneficiaries and grantees

- **Grantees**
  - Organizational learning
About the Fund for Shared Insight and openness grantees

- Collaborative effort among funders that pools financial and other resources to make grants to improve philanthropy

- Emerged from a belief that foundations will be more effective and make an even bigger difference in the world if they are more open – if they share what they are learning and are open to what others want to share with them, including grantees and the people they seek to help

- In July 2016, Shared Insight provided grant funding to 10 national organizations to increase funder openness. FSG is among the Shared Insight grantees, as part of its field-building partnership with the Aspen Institute on the Collective Impact Forum
The Collective Impact Forum’s funder openness project includes an “Action Learning Lab” and knowledge sharing with other funders in our network.

We are sharing learning from the Action Learning core group with a broader audience of funders, including the COP and other funders in our network.
Four private foundations, three United Ways, and one community foundation participated in the Action Learning Lab.
Objectives for the Action Learning Lab

- **Improving openness knowledge:** Improve understanding of community engagement, continuous learning, and other topics related to funder openness that the Collective Impact Funder Community of Practice (COP) has been discussing.

- **Advancing openness practice:** Identify a practical action learning project that you will work on throughout the 12-month Action Learning Lab, bringing unique value to your organization, grantees, and other collective impact partners.

- **Deepening peer relationships:** Build relationships with other funders who are investing in collective impact and are seeking to advance their openness practices.

- **Sharing insights with the field more broadly:** Sharing lessons learned from the Action Learning Lab with the CI Funder COP, attendees of the annual field-wide Collective Impact Convening, and other funders in the Collective Impact Forum’s and FSG’s network.
Key activities of the Action Learning Lab


- **Five group calls** to provide peer support and go deeper on openness topics (e.g., transparency, building trust)

- **Survey of grantees and partners (November 2016)** asking about importance and effectiveness each funder’s openness practices

- **Pursue an “action learning project”** in their community
  - Opportunity to experiment with new practices (or changes to existing practices) that address one or two funder openness practices
  - Develop an action learning project that is ideally within the context of collective impact investment(s)
  - Find ways to incorporate the action learning project into ongoing work (i.e., not limited to a one-time community meeting)
At the beginning of the Action Learning Lab (Fall 2016), funder responses spanned a wide spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Openness Practices: as of Fall 2016</strong></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Weighted Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Learning:</strong> My organization seeks to gain insight from its own experience, the experience of others, and to modify the way it functions according to such insight.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback Loops:</strong> My organization regularly hears directly from collective impact grantees, community partners, and the people that we seek to help. We rapidly close feedback loops to explain how feedback has helped shape the direction of collective impact initiative(s) we support.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency:</strong> My organization proactively and accessibly shares internal processes, goals, and strategies, including successes and challenges related to our contributions to collective impact initiatives. We have a track record of clear communication of grant decision making criteria and how I plan to evaluate collective impact grantees’ progress.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity:</strong> My organization promotes justice, impartiality, and fairness within the procedures, processes, and distribution of resources in grantmaking and our broader engagement related to our collective impact work. We understand the underlying or root causes of outcome disparities in my community.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement:</strong> My organization authentically engages grantees and those with lived experience to truly co-own and develop solutions together in collective impact.</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Diamonds" /></td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: September 2016 Post-Meeting Survey of Action Learning Lab Participants; n =12 total respondents to this survey question. Each diamond represents one response. Weighted average calculated by giving 1 point to strongly disagree – and up to 5 points for strongly agree – and then dividing the total weighted sum by 12 respondents.
At the end of the Action Learning Lab (Fall 2017), funders had advanced their openness practices on all fronts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness Practices: as of Fall 2017</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Weighted Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Learning:</strong> My organization seeks to gain insight from its own experience, the experience of others, and to modify the way it functions according to such insight.</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback Loops:</strong> My organization regularly hears directly from collective impact grantees, community partners, and the people that we seek to help. We rapidly close feedback loops to explain how feedback has helped shape the direction of collective impact initiative(s) we support.</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency:</strong> My organization proactively and accessibly shares internal processes, goals, and strategies, including successes and challenges related to our contributions to collective impact initiatives. We have a track record of clear communication of grant decision making criteria and how I plan to evaluate collective impact grantees’ progress.</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity:</strong> My organization promotes justice, impartiality, and fairness within the procedures, processes, and distribution of resources in grantmaking and our broader engagement related to our collective impact work. We understand the underlying or root causes of outcome disparities in my community.</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td><strong>4.18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement:</strong> My organization authentically engages grantees and those with lived experience to truly co-own and develop solutions together in collective impact.</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td>![Diamonds]</td>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: September 2017 Post-Meeting Survey of Action Learning Lab Participants; n =11 total respondents to this survey question. Each diamond represents one response. Weighted average calculated by giving 1 point to strongly disagree – and up to 5 points for strongly agree – and then dividing the total weighted sum by 12 respondents.

An Initiative of FSG and Aspen Institute Forum for Community Solutions
Several Themes Emerged from the Action Learning Projects

- **Building Trust:** Effective communication requires building (or strengthening) relationships and trust among funders, grantees, and community members.

- **Listening Before Acting:** Before changing openness practices, funders must first *listen* to what grantees and community members need the most.

- **Increasing Transparency:** Increasing transparency requires time and effort, comfort with risk-taking, and a genuine sense of responsibility by funders.

- **Building the Capacity for Community Engagement:** Funders recognize the need for authentic community engagement, but different approaches require intentional capacity building for funders, grantees, and community members.

- **Sustaining Openness Practices:** Funders should embed their openness practices into what they do on an ongoing basis to avoid “snapping back” to old habits.
# Building Trust

## Challenges

- **Time commitment** of trust-building
- **Preconceived notions about roles** of funders, grantees, and community
- Overcoming **power dynamics** and historical barriers
- **Ambiguity** in process of change
- Preference for **status quo**

## Working Well

- Let **communities lead**
- Ask for feedback and model **active listening**
- Clarify and name the funder’s role
- Strengthen buy-in by honoring **words with actions**

## Tools and Resources to Use in the Future

- **Trust Is Essential to Changemaking; Funders Must Take the First Step:** This Exponent Philanthropy blog shares examples of what creates trust, how funders can open up authentic conversations with grantees, and steps for inviting open-ended conversations with grantees.
- **Trust-Based Philanthropy:** Consider what it looks like to embed trust in a funding approach. This report offers a helpful framework for trust-based philanthropy.
- **Building Trust with Your Community:** There are both passive and active ways to build trust as a foundation. Fund the operations, overhead, and professional development needs of grantees. Utilize multiple avenues for building trust.
**Listening Before Acting**

### Challenges

- **Required time** and organization
- Creating the **right environment** for input
- Accessing **under-heard voices**
- Giving up some **agenda-setting power** to the public

### Working Well

- Pursue a **variety of feedback channels**
- Rely on **existing grantee relationships**
- **Incentivize feedback**
- Demonstrate that **community needs will actually inform funder priorities**

### Tools and Resources to Use in the Future

- *Hearing from Those We Seek to Help*: Important to recognize that the nonprofit organizations funders serve have access to a wealth of beneficiary feedback.
- *Perceptual Feedback: What’s It All About?*: Consider not only behavioral feedback like attendance at programs, but also perceptual feedback (e.g., feelings, experiences).
- *What are listening tours, and are there examples of foundations that have conducted them?*: This GIH resource provides listening tour examples, and offers tips for visiting service areas to hear community stakeholders’ concerns and suggestions.
### Increasing Transparency

#### Challenges

- **Ensuring equal access** to internal processes and strategies to all potential grantees
- **Opening up** to potential criticism
- **Pushback** from more traditional foundation leadership
- Discerning **how much is too much** transparency

#### Working Well

- Increase visibility in community through **partnerships**
- Invest time in conversations with existing grantees
- **Admit** when the answer isn’t known
- Close **feedback loops** with regularity through newsletters and other communications

#### Tools and Resources to Use in the Future

- **Foundation Transparency: Game Over?**: This blog describes what 990 forms mean for funders, and encourages funders to consider how to strategically communicate through them.
- **Sharing What Matters**: CEP’s report on transparency gives concrete advice on sharing grantmaking processes, goals, and strategies.
- **Glasspockets’ Transparency Tools**: This collection of resources are popular transparency resources for funders. Keep up with the conversation on funder transparency on Glasspockets’ **Transparency Talk** blog.
### Challenges

- Ensuring a **representative sample** of community voices
- **Over-tapping** community members
- **Giving up control as a funder** and letting the community set the table
- **Getting rid of jargon** in conversations

### Working Well

- **Let form follow function** by agreeing on the purpose of engaging the community before deciding on actions
- Think of community members as **producers of results**, not “advisors” to consult occasionally
- Track progress of building public will to **learn and adapt over time**

### Tools and Resources to Use in the Future

- **Asset-Based Community Development Institute Toolkit**: overview of asset-based community development as well as concrete tools for asset mapping and facilitation.
- Paul Schmitz’s **Community Engagement Toolkit**: guidance for planning community engagement to be more purposeful, equitable, transparent, and strategic.
- GEO’s blog series on **Putting Grantees at the Center of Philanthropy**
- **Community Heart & Soul**: a values-based strategy-setting approach for rural communities and small towns
- **Photovoice**: an approach for engaging youth and other under-represented voices
Sustaining Openness Practices

**Challenges**

- Seeking solutions for complex environments
- Old habits die hard
- Leadership turnover and loss of institutional knowledge

**Working Well**

- Be intentional and vulnerable
- Building inter-personal relationships through 1:1 dialogue
- Under-promise and over-deliver
- Co-create MOU regarding expectations for foundation and partners

**Tools and Resources to Use in the Future**

- *Grantee and Applicant Perception Reports*: CEP’s Grantee Perception Report provides funders with candid feedback and insights based on responses to an online grantee survey. In addition, CEP’s Applicant Perception Report provides a separate, shorter survey that gathers feedback from a funder’s declined applicants.

- *Existing Peer Learning Opportunities*: Establish peer learning among local funders (e.g., monthly or quarterly meetings) to discuss how your funder peers are advancing their openness practices with grantees and the community. In addition, consider engaging with existing learning networks through philanthropy membership organizations.
Poll Anywhere and Group Discussion

- Which of the **challenges** resonates most with you?
- Which of the **working well** suggestions resonates most with you?

*Discuss each point above for each theme. We’ll come together to vote on Poll Anywhere and discuss as a large group after each theme.*
Plan for Sharing Findings

Target Audience

- With your CI Funder COP colleagues
- With your co-workers and other funder colleagues
- With a wider audience of funders elsewhere

Media Formats / Channels

- Final report (16-20 pages in a professionally designed PDF format) with challenges, successes, resources, and deep dive case studies
- Blog(s) from Action Learning Lab participants as a follow-up to the final report
- Featured concurrent session at 2018 Collective Impact Convening on April 5
- Webinar in May 2018 for CI Forum’s funder audience, with other practitioners also open to attend

What are your reactions to the audience and formats/channels?
I. Introduction and Warm Up Activity

II. Resilience and Sustaining Momentum

III. Fund for Shared Insight: Funder Openness Report

IV. Wrap Up and Next Steps
COP Participants Value Peer Relationship Building, Expanded Knowledge, and Dedicated Time for Reflection

What are the **greatest benefits** to you and your organization from participating in the CI Funder COP?

**Expanded Peer Relationships**
- “The greatest benefit has been the community created, which has been rich with relationship building.” – United Way
- “The best parts have been building relationships with individuals from other organizations.” – Community Foundation

**Deeper Knowledge about CI**
- “The COP showed me that others were doing things similar that I could learn from. We are using (knowledge from the COP) to move forward and take examples from others’ experience and recast them.” – Health Conversion Foundation

**Dedicated Time Away**
- “(Action Learning Lab and COP meetings) are a very special time for us. That chunk of committed time provides us the space to really go deep and strategize.” – Private Foundation
- “(I value) having time away to stop and think about things. It’s helpful to step back and think more deeply.” – Health Conversion Foundation

Source: Interviews with current and former COP members, June and July 2017.
Future COP Discussions Need a Revised Format, More Recent Trends, More How-To, and More Advanced Topics

**What are 1-2 ways that the COP could provide more value in the future?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refreshed Format of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“We can’t go through another year of the same format. We’ve got to mix it up a bit.” – Private Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Discussion on Latest Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“How do you connect all these frameworks and topics together: community engagement, equity, RBL, and CI?” – Public Funder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Practical, How-To Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The biggest thing for me right now would be discussion of best practices of HOW it was done…What has been successful and not successful for how we fund CI initiatives?” – United Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Content for Advanced Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“While we were in early stages of our collective work, the COP calls were more useful. Now it (would be) more useful to be engaged with funders who have been funding mature collectives and confronting similar issues.” – Corporate Funder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews with current and former COP members, June and July 2017.
## Overall COP Feedback Remains Positive, and COP Participants Describe Changes in Their Practice Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Metrics</th>
<th>As of July 2015</th>
<th>As of July 2016</th>
<th>As of July 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of COP members</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average attendance at Fall and Winter <em>in-person meetings</em>¹</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average attendance for <em>large-group webinars</em>²</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The COP has influenced my <em>understanding</em> of CI</td>
<td>96% somewhat or significantly</td>
<td>95% somewhat or significantly</td>
<td>100% somewhat or significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The COP has influenced my <em>practice</em> of CI</td>
<td>96% somewhat or significantly</td>
<td>90% somewhat or significantly</td>
<td>100% somewhat or significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of my COP participation, I am investing more resources in CI infrastructure (e.g., backbone staff)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of my COP participation, I have changed the way I engage with grantees as partners in the CI process</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would <em>recommend</em> the COP to a friend or colleague³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8.0 / 10</td>
<td>7.3 / 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2015, 2016, and 2017 CI Funder COP summer surveys. ¹) Average attendance from Fall and Winter meetings. ²) Does not include smaller peer learning calls (just includes larger webinars). ³) We started asking this “recommend” question for the first time in 2016. Weighted average mean for 2016 and 2017 calculated for responses ranging from 1=Not at all likely to recommend to 10=very likely to recommend.
While Feedback from COP Members Is Mostly Positive, COP Membership and Engagement Has Slowed Recently

COP Engagement Data Points

- In early 2017 there were early 50 COP members, by summer 2017 that was 43, and now we have 35 COP members as of February 2018. The reason for the decline is two-fold:
  - Fewer new members joining in 2017 compared to previous years
  - Higher rates of funders not renewing their membership: Most common reasons for not renewing are that their priorities have shifted, they have tightened their PD/travel budgets, or they just didn’t take advantage of the membership enough to make it worth their continued engagement

- Turnout for the Sept. 2017 in-person meeting (25 people) and the Feb. 2018 in-person meeting (25 people) are down from the 35-person avg. attendance in prior years
Given the COP Feedback and Engagement Trends, We Want Your Feedback on Future Options for the COP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Option</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smaller deep-dive funder peer learning group</td>
<td>• Builds on the success of the first action learning cohort, allowing a new group of ~10 funders with 2 reps per organization to go deep on a particular topic (e.g., equity) over a 12-18 month period, with insights generated for the field at the end</td>
<td>• Would require a funder to underwrite some (or all) of the cost of staff time and funder travel costs for 2-3 meetings over 12-18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., Action Learning Lab 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Might also require a participation fee from funders, which could deter price-sensitive funders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Larger group that meets once in person per year, and 4 times virtually | • Could take advantage of annual spring convening to continue having a funder pre-conference dialogue  
• Reduces travel costs and time commitment throughout the year | • Hosting only one in-person meeting per year (for a larger group of 75-100 funder pre-conference attendees) would not provide the same depth of relational connection |
| Group is strictly virtual with 6 learning calls per year | • Easier access point (i.e., no membership fee or travel costs) for smaller funders who wouldn’t otherwise be able to participate | • Going solely virtual would lose the in-person relationship building and knowledge-sharing benefits                                  |

What is your reaction to these options?
You Are Welcome to Stay in This Room for Continued Networking, and Join Us at the GEO Happy Hour at 4:30pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Thursday, February 1st Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00am</td>
<td>Introductions and Warm Up Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:15am</td>
<td>Resilience and Sustaining Momentum (part 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:30am</td>
<td>Networking Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:30am</td>
<td>Resilience and Sustaining Momentum (part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45am-12:30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-2:30pm</td>
<td>Fund for Shared Insight: Funder Openness Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00pm</td>
<td>Wrap Up and Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:30pm</td>
<td>Meeting Adjourned: Open Time/Informal Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-6:00pm</td>
<td>Optional GEO Happy Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Optional GEO Happy Hour*
*Boveda, 2350 M Street, NW, Washington DC 20037*