

Meeting Subject:	LFI Steering Committee Meeting #6		
Meeting Agenda:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context Setting • Membership Pulse Check Results • Funder Focus Group Insights • Discussion on Path Forward • Next Steps 		
Date:	Thursday, August 18 th (option 1) and Monday, August 23 rd (option 2)	Time:	4:00PM-5:30PM EST
Meeting Purpose:	To discuss takeaways from the membership model pulse check and ongoing funder focus groups as well as align on an approach for the path forward.		
Meeting Facilitator(s):	Dana O'Donovan (MIbD), Rhonda Evans (MIbD), Elisha Desmangles (MIbD), Manan Mehta (MIbD), Jenny Hoang (MIbD)		
Attendees	Erika Van Buren, Lou Erste, Omar Butler, Amy Morgenstern, Debra Natenshon, Kathy Park, Doug Bauer, Shelley Metzenbaum, Andrew Niklaus, Quentin Wilson		

Membership Pulse Check Results

- The purpose of the membership model pulse check was to hear from the community and gather perspectives on whether a membership fee is a feasible option as a funding mechanism for the LEAP Ambassadors Community (LAC)
- There is no expectation that membership fees would generate the total amount of funding needed to sustain the LAC, but it could be part of the funding mix
- The structure of the survey can be broken down into 4 main questions:
 - Organizational domain (e.g., consultant, funder, nonprofit delivery/advocacy, etc.)
 - Are you part of an organization that pays for individual professional memberships on employees' behalf?
 - Willingness to pay yearly membership dues
 - How much would you or your org be willing to pay in yearly membership dues?
- We received 110 responses to the Pulse Check and the data is largely representative of the broader LAC from a domain perspective
- Of the 62% of respondents who said that their org would likely not pay membership dues on their behalf, 30% said they would be willing to pay individual membership dues, 18% said they would not be willing to pay dues, and 52% said they were unsure
 - From a domain perspective, those who work in Nonprofit Delivery/Advocacy demonstrated a higher price sensitivity to membership dues relative to other groups
 - Of the respondents who said they would be willing to pay membership dues, the majority of respondents felt that the lower end of the range for yearly membership dues (\$100-\$499) seems most feasible
- Of the 38% of respondents who said that their org would likely pay membership dues on their behalf, 66% said their org would be willing to pay membership dues for them to remain part of the LAC, 5% said their org would not be willing to pay dues for them to remain part of the LAC, and 29% said they were unsure
 - The range for yearly membership dues paid by org varies widely across domains

- The group then discussed insights from the open-answer response to the pulse check through which respondents shared that willingness to pay yearly dues is highly dependent on fee amount and benefits received, that there is lack clarity on ROI in the community and a desire for more tangible benefits, and that there is interest in a sliding scale membership fee structure that may enable a more equitable approach to membership

Funder Focus Group Insights

- In thinking about funding options for the LAC, it has become clear that, in order to sustain the LAC, there is a need to source grant funding
- The Monitor Institute by Deloitte (MIbD) team, in close partnership with Ambassadors and Steering Committee members Doug Bauer and John Brothers, have facilitated an initial round of focus groups with ambassadors who are part of funding organizations; the purpose of these conversations was to gather input on what it will take to fund the LAC in the future
- Key insights from this initial round of focus groups (with Chiku Bernardi, Wayne Jones, Tiziano Tazzi, Meridith Polin, and Darrin McKeever) included:
 - \$400k-\$650k seems reasonable to fund the community, but difficult to attain without a partnership strategy
 - Recommendation is not to create a new organization, but rather, align with another entity
 - RFP idea re-emerged as something to consider when thinking about partner alliance (benefits of RFP process: help ‘test the waters’ for unlikely potential partners; can include questions about how potential partners would think about funding, including bridge funding; could provide LAC with infrastructure support from partner organization).
- The MIbD team has scheduled a second round of focus groups that are focused more specifically on infrastructure funders. These focus groups are currently scheduled to occur on 8/22 and 8/24.
- Steering Committee members reviewed and confirmed a list of invitees for the second round of focus groups and did not have any additions to the list provided by the MIbD team
- The group also discussed a plan to contact ambassadors who work with potential partner organizations; several Steering Committee members raised their hands to contact those individuals and set up a partner-focused conversation

Discussion on Path Forward

- The group then discussed the path forward based on the initial questions that we set out to answer, the work that has been done to-date as part of the LFI process, and what we’ve learned with regard to funding mechanisms, value proposition, and governance structures
 - In response to the key learnings from the LFI process to-date, Steering Committee members emphasized the importance of focus groups to get several funders in a room and to ask the question more explicitly of which additional funders should be engaged.
 - Another member noted that there are only a handful of infrastructure funders, so it is critical determine if the LEAP value proposition is one that appeals to those infrastructure funders.

- Based on what we've learned so far, continued efforts to lay the groundwork for the LAC to become a sustainable, self-governed entity are needed. The MIbD team has put together an approach, a suggested structure, and a timeline for getting there by 1/1/2024. This includes an ongoing role for the steering committee, additional working groups, and a roadmap for working group members to follow.
- The work and approach moving forward include:
 - Conducting additional outreach to find an aligned partner and/or choose a fiduciary sponsor
 - Doing additional value prop work to support fundraising and next generation of community, with a specific focus on equity
 - Making the initial decision on the role that membership fees could play as a source of future funding
 - Standing up a committee to fundraise
 - Broadening the inclusion of participants through working groups to further increase participation and develop self-governance structures
- Steering Committee members agreed with this approach and also highlighted that the work around clarifying the LAC value proposition needs to happen first, given that it informs the other pieces of the approach. In thinking about potential net new value propositions (e.g., implementation coaching and training services, equity-focused leadership development) that may appeal to the next generation of the community as well as potential funders, Steering Committee members agreed that the value proposition should first be grounded in what the community is currently providing.
- On the role of the Steering Committee moving forward, the MIbD team shared that the Steering Committee would act as a body that oversees the work and tracks progress towards a sustainable, self-governed entity. The assumption is that 1-2 LFI Steering Committee members would also sit on each of the working groups.
 - Several Steering Committee members shared interest in staying engaged, but also shared the need to get a sense for what needs to happen and the associated time commitment.
 - The MIbD team will be sending out draft implementation plans for the different committees so that individual members can determine where and how best to lean in.
 - The MIbD team also noted that the Steering Committee could enlist new folks to join if helpful to have different skills/capabilities on the committee and that the committee could also be a smaller group going forward if there is a need to coordinate more frequently.
- The proposed working groups to continue the LFI process and answer key outstanding questions related to funding and governance include:
 - Fundraising working group
 - Partnership working group
 - Value Proposition working group
- Several Steering committee members raised their hands to sit on the Value Proposition committee and one member volunteered to sit on the Partnership committee.
 - Among those that volunteered for the Value Proposition committee, members shared a strong interest in immediately starting the work to clarify the value proposition and to

create a draft one-pager of benefits which could help guide the other working groups. Members also discussed allowing others in the community the ability to weigh in on the draft one-pager through an offline process (e.g., Google doc).

- One committee member raised the idea that the value proposition development should be a balance between a ground up sourcing of value that could be informative to funders (i.e., funding what is needed in the field) and what may be attractive to prospective funders.
 - One member asserted the importance of clarifying the value proposition, especially as the LAC considers partner alignment as a potential path forward. Another member mentioned that the current state value proposition could be used during an RFP process, which could then also include an invitation for respondents to come up with net-new value propositions.
- Immediate Next Steps for the Steering Committee include:
 - Confirm ongoing Steering Committee to shepherd the continuation of this process
 - Determine what to put forward to the LAC
 - Gauge community interest in participating in working groups
 - Identify additional support needs
 - The group discussed that there will likely need to be a higher frequency of Steering Committee meetings over the next 6 weeks, given that the MIBD team engagement is set to conclude on September 30th.