

Meeting Subject:	LFI Steering Committee Meeting #4		
Meeting Agenda:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context Setting • Emerging Interview Insights • Strategic Paths Discussion • Next Steps and Close-Out 		
Date:	Monday, June 27 th (Option 1) and Tuesday, June 28 th (Option 2)	Time:	11:30AM-1:00PM EST
Meeting Purpose:	To think through funding and governance implications of leaning in on different sets of community activities		
Meeting Facilitator(s):	Rhonda Evans (MIBD), Bridget Brennan (MIBD), Elisha Desmangles (MIBD), Marianna Campbell (MIBD), Jenny Hoang (MIBD)		
Attendees	Quentin Wilson, Brad Dudding, Lou Erste, Britt Lake, Andrew Niklaus, Kathy Park, Christine Robinson, Debra Natenshon, A. Toni Young, Art Taylor		

- The fourth LFI Steering Committee meeting was held on June 27 and June 28 (two options for joining were provided to provide scheduling flexibility).

Context Setting

- As discussed in previous meetings, there has been a consistent call to clarify the LAC’s mission and integrate equity into the work of the community. The current LFI effort, facilitated by the Monitor Institute by Deloitte, is focused primarily on the path to sustainability for the community (funding and governance). The LFI effort will continue to hold an equity lens throughout the process through September. Post-September, some of the key LFI implementation activities for the Minimal Viable Plan will likely include:
 - Onboard transition planning working group
 - Identify key human capital, process, and technology issues inherent in the MVP
 - Undergo negotiations (if necessary)
 - Manage the process of integration
- In order to address some of the questions that have arisen in this process, the community will likely need to *establish structures to review equity in the Community*, and possibly conduct an LAC Mission Review to refine the mission to align with the MVP and equity principles of the Community.

Emerging Interview Insights

- Steering Committee members discussed the emerging insights that have come up during seven interviews conducted with key stakeholders so far, particularly insights surrounding the LAC’s value proposition, funder priorities, membership organization structures, and potential future partners. Key insights include:
 - LAC Value Proposition
 - Cross-sector breadth and quality of participants “represents what we want the sector to be”
 - Provides “Philanthropy 301,” which others do not

- Outcome equity micro-community doing deep work relevant to broader sector practice
 - Have been more internally focused, but over time may be easier to sustain with action focus
 - Should be able to come together to solve big challenges
- Funders in general...
 - Will want to better understand the gap the LAC is filling
 - Are oriented to action
 - Prefer not to fund initiatives built by other funders
 - May be interested in the depth and breadth of expertise across domains within the Community
 - May provide transition funding for a clear long-term vision
 - Would want 1-3 total seed funders
- Some membership groups...
 - Have both individual and organizational members
 - Have exclusive membership models but provide events to non-members for an additional revenue stream
 - Leverage members to support internal work
 - Charge members based upon size and type of organizations
- The term “social sector” needs some clarification when we use it. It is likely made up of the private sector with ESG funding, nonprofits, community organizations, philanthropy, and government. When you think of outcomes, there are none that nonprofit or government achieves on its own – it’s really an intersectoral challenge.
- The social sector are people and institutions focused on providing social value to people so that they have what they need to meet their needs and enrich their lives.
- It would be interesting for the LAC to come together to solve one ‘big challenge.’
- Any organization considering integrating LEAP into their own programming will want a couple years of seed funding to support transition/develop transition plan. How does this mesh with what research shows about fundings not wanting to fund initiatives built by other funders?
- Interviewees mentioned that a funder may be willing to be part of a group of funders, but most likely don’t want to fully fund something on their own that was built by someone else.
- It’s important to recognize that there is a small cadre of funders that would be engaged in funding this at a national level; likely only 6-7 potential funders.
- The LEAP challenge is a mindset shift: change happens when organizations and funders become convinced that organizational mission and performance are inextricably linked – and act accordingly. How do you close the gap and then act?

Paths Discussion

- Based on desk research and interviews, the Monitor Institute team started to shape three broad avenues for exploration for the Steering Committee to consider – grounded in the current LAC activities as well as Community aspirations – that have implications for the level of funding that the community would need to raise post 2023 and the feasibility of different funding mechanisms and governance options. Each path takes existing elements of the Community and sketches the implications for leaning in strongly in one distinct direction. The paths should be understood as a means to generate conversation around the potential scale of the Community’s

ambition and what this means for our choices for how to create a sustainable, self-governed Community moving forward.

- As such, they should be understood as “productively inaccurate” conversation anchors, rather than strict choices. The final MVP will inevitably include elements of any or all of these paths, as well as new considerations that emerge from our discussions together.
- Steering Committee members then discussed the potential options that are emerging for the LAC’s future, including becoming a peer learning community for senior leadership, focusing on knowledge development and dissemination, and/or becoming an action-oriented sector change agent. The strategic paths options align with stated function of LAC in the Strategy for Change document, which is to: (1) strengthen community (2) develop content to build the field, and (3) influence the field.
- Steering Committee members in the 6/27 meeting mentioned that Path 1 is most similar to the current state, but they were excited about potentially bringing in elements of Path 3 while pursuing Path 1. Many agreed that Path 3 couldn’t happen without first successfully pursuing Paths 1 and 2, and/or that Path 3 would also need to involve 1 and 2.
- Steering Committee members in the 6/28 meeting felt that Path 1 is a good place to start, given that it is the closest path to the current state. They were particularly interested in potentially using Path 1 to raise funds to build out Path 2 so that the LAC doesn’t just remain a knowledge developer, but also a knowledge disseminator that can influence change in how the sector thinks about high-performance. Members mentioned that the Community should focus on external-facing action-oriented activities that can help improve the sector.
- Steering Committee members mentioned that there are presently equity challenges in Path 1, given its focus on senior leadership. Members discussed the need to expand the focus of Path 1 to include younger leaders in general, and BIPOC leaders more specifically. Members also discussed different membership fee structures to ensure that the path is as equitable as possible.
- There was also some discussion on the need to understand funder priorities as the LAC thinks about its value proposition vis-a-vis funders when trying to determine whether funders would be interested in funding the future of the LAC.

Additional Information Needed

- Steering Committee requested the following information for the next round of research:
 - How the different funding models compare to the current state cost estimates
 - Different schema in terms of membership organizations and what membership dues could look like
 - Activities that the LAC would implement as a membership organization and/or activities that would remain from the current state
 - Elements of Path 2 and 3 that should be pursued in order to implement Path 1 effectively