

<b>Meeting Subject:</b>	<b>LAC Townhall</b>		
<b>Meeting Agenda:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions and Framing</li> <li>• What the Steering Committee has learned</li> <li>• What this means for the path forward</li> <li>• Next Steps</li> </ul>		
<b>Date:</b>	Wednesday, September 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2022	<b>Time:</b>	2:00-3:00 PM ET
<b>Meeting Purpose:</b>	To update the entire LAC on the LFI process and Steering Committee's progress, get the LAC's feedback on the path forward based on what the Steering Committee has learned, and discuss how ambassadors can engage in the path forward for the LFI		
<b>Meeting Facilitator(s):</b>	Rhonda Evans (MIbD)		

### **Introductions and Framing**

- The Monitor Institute by Deloitte (MIbD) team walked the group through introductions of the team and the agenda for the Townhall. The meeting covered a status update on the LFI process and Steering Committee's findings to date as well as a discussion on the path forward.
- MIbD reviewed the purpose of the LFI, guardrails for the process, and an overview of the timeline.

### **What the Steering Committee has learned**

- The MIbD team shared the work that has been completed to-date, including gathering survey responses, facilitating in-depth interviews and focus groups with ambassadors, analyzing cost and operational data, conducting research on analogue organizations, and forming and holding sessions with a 19-member Steering Committee.
- The MIbD team then reviewed the potential funding and governance options that the Steering Committee explored, such as membership organization and grants, partner alignment, and having a group of funders fund the community, amongst other options.
- An LAC member asked if there has been any indication of support from funders thus far in the process. The MIbD noted that the objectives of the funder focus groups was to gather funders' input on what they see being funded in the field, but a specific funding ask was not made during those conversations. Going forward, the Steering Committee and working groups will start to narrow down the list of interested funder organizations and make an explicit ask to those organizations.
- An LAC member noted that research on nonprofit academic centers shows that the successful nonprofit academic centers are the ones that have obtained endowment funding, and the ones that have relied on earned revenue have struggled/dissolved.

### **What this means for the path forward**

- The MIbD team noted that we are at a pivot point in the LFI process, where we have an understanding of what's likely most viable:
  - A partner to house the community is an option worth exploring further, given the infrastructure and cost-sharing benefits potentially available to the LAC

- A mixed funding model is emerging as a potentially viable approach; multiple funding streams could include partner transition funding, grant funding from multiple funders, and some membership dues
- Potential funders may want to fund different aspects of the LAC, including net new activities (e.g., incorporating equity into the Performance Imperative, facilitating equity-focused leadership trainings, etc.)
- An LAC member asked what the value of the community would be going forward and if the vision and impact of the organization have been clarified. The MIbD team noted that there are components of the community (e.g., online community, cross-sector representation, peer learning from seasoned leaders in the field) that were highlighted by ambassadors as being of high value. The Steering Committee is currently working on a draft to clarify the current state value proposition and plans to share it with the community in October. Additionally, there could be some degree of openness on what the value proposition could be in the future as the LFI team potentially explores net new value propositions that are of interest to funders.
- On the topic of pursuing partner organizations interested in housing the LAC, one LAC member asked if there is a definition of what constitutes a good fit with the community and if the Steering Committee has identified criteria to evaluate potential partners. The MIbD team noted that designing criteria for evaluating partners is part of the work going forward. The MIbD then asked for the group's input on any criteria that comes to mind that the Steering Committee should consider. Initial thoughts on the criteria included:
  - Geographic focus
  - Budget / financial capacity
  - Mission and purpose alignment
- The MIbD team shared the proposed governance structure for the LFI process through 2023, which includes three working groups to answer key outstanding questions related to the value proposition, fundraising, and partnership.
- An LAC member expressed that group processes like this one can sometimes lead to the lowest common denominator if not everyone agrees on the path forward and asked how the team will ensure that the decision-making process is equitable. The MIbD team noted that this is an important consideration for the community to hold collectively and to carry back to the Steering Committee.
- Another LAC member mentioned that it is important to start with the 'why' (i.e., the value proposition) before landing on a home for the LAC. Additionally, if there is a potential partner/funder that is interested in the LAC then that could also define what the 'why' is going to be.
- On the topic of potential partner organizations to consider, one LAC member suggested reaching out to Elizabeth Boris (Urban Institute), and Dan Cardinali or Dr. Akilah Watkins (Independent Sector). Another LAC member mentioned InterAction (which is more internationally focused) as a potential partner organization that came to mind.
- MIbD thanked the group for their time and insights and welcomed community members to reach out to Rhonda Evans with further thoughts, at [revans@deloitte.com](mailto:revans@deloitte.com).