

**New Mexico Association of Grantmakers
Strategic Planning Board Retreat
Tuesday, June 5, 2007
8:30-4:00
Sunrise Springs Inn & Spa**

DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

- **The five key goals and top-ranking objectives for NMAG for the next three years are:**
 - *Identify and Take Action on Specific Issues*
 - *Identify annual initiatives for impactful grantmaking*
 - *Influence Public Policy Toward Systemic Change*
 - *Increase and Diversify Membership*
 - *Double the membership in 5 years – target non NM grantmakers*
 - *Enhance Structure and Leadership*
 - *Develop plan to accomplish budget*
 - *Serve as a Resource Center for NGOs and Grantmakers*
 - *Create an informational website for grantseekers, grantmakers and legislators*
 - *Incubate nonprofit resource center for foundations*

 - **The Strategic Planning Committee (Susan, Terry, Blair and Rick) will work with the notes from the retreat and flesh out the plan further**

 - **Steps for completing the strategic plan:**
 - **Strategic Planning Committee will create a goals and objectives framework and circulate by email**
 - **Create action plan with goals – facilitated at Sept BOD**
 - **Change the Sept 6 meeting to 2-5pm?**

 - **Website follows the strategic plan content to figure out budget**

 - **The Conference Planning Committee will decide about NGO involvement and process for selecting key issues for the conference**
-

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Attending: Ben Maddox, Chair (J. F Maddox Foundation); Billie Blair (Santa Fe Community Foundation); Sandy Brickner (Brickner Advised Fund); Susan Cantor (NMAG staff); Catherine Conran (PNM Resources Foundation); Elizabeth Crittenden-Palacios (Taos Community Foundation); Gay Dillingham (Livingry Foundation); Ann Hattis (Bank of America Foundation); Blair Naylor (Cudd Foundation); Terry Odendahl (NMAG); Lisa Oppenheimer (Oppenheimer Brothers Foundation); Sherry Thompson (Thaw Charitable Trust); and Rick Abeles (Abeles Foundation).

Regrets: Phillip Howell; Lynn Hathaway.

Facilitator: Toby Herzlich

Underwriters: Cudd Foundation, The Frost Foundation, and the Santa Fe Community Foundation

Purpose and Outcomes

The Board and staff of the New Mexico Association of Grantmakers met for a full day retreat to initiate a strategic planning process. This effort of collective strategic thinking and planning is intended to:

- surface big questions
- clarify purpose and direction
- reach agreement on priorities
- assess capacity and determine how the staff can serve the organization

The purpose of this retreat was to clarify purpose, vision and goals of the organization. Overarching questions for the process would be:

- Are you achieving what you want to achieve toward your mission of “increasing effectiveness and impact of organized philanthropy throughout the region”?
- Does there need to be a course correction?

Board members surfaced key question that they felt should drive the planning process:

- How to deal with growth? And how to deal with technology statewide?
- How to address the larger questions of philanthropy in NM? What kind of policy influence can/should we have?
- How to create less fragmentation and more rationality in philanthropy?
- What does NMAG want to be when it grows up?
- How do we streamline the organization so each gets what they need?
- How do we increase effectiveness, impact and amount of philanthropy in NM? What is the role of staff?
- What should be our relationship with nonprofits – especially NGO New Mexico?
- What’s our vision for growth and building membership?
- Who are we and what do we do? What is our scope geographically? (provide blueprints that can be used statewide)
- What is our real strength?

Human Spectrum Exercise

By giving polarized choices to the participants, they were asked to stand to one side or the other on a question (or somewhere in-between). The bullets below synthesize the comments that were shared from each perspective in the spectrum:

Q: Should NMAG be primarily A) a professional network of only grantmakers or as B) a collaborative partnership with NGOs? (A/B)

- *A - We have a lot of work to do before we can be effective collaborators. We need more knowledge from other organizations, not nonprofits, and from colleagues.*
- *B - Collaboration is an opportunity for grantmakers to be helpful – a general lack of leadership in nonprofits.*
- *B- Collaboration would increase effectiveness with NGOs*
- *A- there is some discomfort with funders telling nonprofits what to do (with funds)*
- *A/B – In principal as a general feeling I think it could be an internal professional network of only grantmakers and at times invite in NGOs. There are so many NGOs we could get overwhelmed.*

Q: Should NMAG provide A) support and education toward identifying collaborative funding opportunities or B) support and education to assist in individual funding? (A/B)

- *A – foundations can exist without us, our purpose is to see what we can do with grantmakers*
- *B - Some of us our isolated by our mission, but we can always benefit from education*
- *A/B - There should be education for both*
- *A/B – since NMAG already advises informally is the question to formalize this? What is the added cost to provide this service?*

Q: Should NMAG be a truly A) statewide organization (member/geographic) or B) be northern New Mexico focused (member/geographic)? (A)

- *A/B - It's difficult to decide until we know what we are providing*
- *A - We are trapped in thinking that to be state wide we have to provide services statewide*
- *A - First the decision to be statewide or not has to be made, then the programs can be determined*
- *A - Capacity is an issue – we have to be realistic*
- *A - The most effective programs to legislate are those that are statewide*
- *The funding is centralized, but the need is statewide. We need to bring statewide education to the centralized funders.*

Q: Would A) slow or no growth (of program activities and budget) be preferable to B) fast growth (of program activities and budget)? (A/B)

- *A/B - It would be smart to be like Think NM and focus on A this year and then B next year*
- *A/B - We need to grow our membership*
- *A/B- I would want to measure a plan presented by Terry – match capabilities against what the Board could provide/raise via funding.*

[This question bogged down by the assumption that more membership equals more dollars.]

Q: Is there A) a willingness to raise or generate more funds or B) an unwillingness to raise or generate more funds? (A/B)

- *A/B - Would be more comfortable answering this question once we determine the scope*
- *B - Hard to justify what I get out of it if I fund it*
- *A/B - To legislate we need a broader membership*
- *A/B – the “elephant” question is whether more membership equals more funds – same as previous question*

Q: Should the focus be A) on external community and regional needs or on B) internal grantmaker needs? (A)

- *A - To get the right funds to right places we need to know the community needs*
- *A/B – aren't these fairly intertwined? Communicating to grantmakers the bigger state picture would make for more effective coordinated community grantmaking.*

Q: Do you want to be influencing public policy A) more or B) less? (A)

- *B - Our foundation (PNM) won't be involved in that.*
- *A - Permanent change is systemic change and that comes from public policy*
- *A - We just need to be careful about not being political*
- *A - We have to be like Think NM in that way*
- *A – Involved*

Q: Is it preferable to be A) a dedicated force for social change or B) a social group for funders? (A/B)

- *A - There has been a move in the past two years from the social group to the force for social change*
- *A/B - NMAG has mostly been a social group, but the leadership is already a force for social change*
- *A - Social change is weighted towards influencing public policy*
- *A - The Roswell group is a more social group and we can bring them along – bring them to Santa Fe*
- *A - There seems to be an evolutionary process*
- *A/B - I would hate to see NMAG move all the way to being advocates for social change when we serve so many more purposes – it is dangerous as we move across the state*
- *A – The latter sounds like a country club without a compass...*
- *A/B - We keep talking about X,Y,Z coming to Santa Fe. A very important part of social networking is going to places where the political, social and charitable points of view are different from our own.*
- *A - There could be program tracks developed around the necessary evolution from social networker to force for social change.*

Human Spectrum Summary:

- The group is flexible and open to the grey areas
- Reflects the variety of personal and organizational opinions
- There is more interest in public policy

- There is an evolution of the organization – moving toward having a broader impact without losing the smaller newer members as they do their work and develop skills
- The people here represent the needs of their own organizations, reflecting the general membership and there is a broad spectrum of types of funders here (less so geographically)

Self Assessment on Statement of Purpose

The NMAG statement of purpose was shared with the group and Board members were asked to rate each of the seven elements on a scale of 1-10, relating to how the organization is doing in fulfilling this outcome (1= poorly; 10= excellently).

Discussion was lively and pointed toward many areas in which NMAG is doing well in reaching its purpose and some in which the organization is not doing well. These ideas are detailed in the appendix. Discussion also made it clear that a conference planning session is needed (details of this discussion are also in the appendix).

The evolving purpose of NMAG was summarized by the group as:

- ❖ Educating Grantmakers
- ❖ Facilitating collaborations by bringing in multiple entities to affect policy change
- ❖ Creating statewide impact through focused programs in northern NM and then distributing practices widely (increasing technology use)
- ❖ Deepening education around subject areas
- ❖ Developing Philanthropy

Capacity SWOT

The group conducted a quick “SWOT Analysis,” identifying internal strengths and weaknesses of the organization as well as external opportunities and threats. These are summarized in the following table:

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of President – understands public policy, philanthropy, works with nonprofits and grantmakers • Susan – creates an open environment, is organized, responsive, is a good administrator and program person • NMAG has a history of quality programs • Talented and smart people in the membership • The name carries weight as a professional association • Capital/people • Membership has a diverse base of interests, focus, types and ages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff size • Need capital to address staff size • Budgeting – we aim low and then raise funds on demand - it’s unrealistic • Lack of plan and clear definition • BOD unwilling to solicit membership and funds – BOD engagement not clearly defined • [Membership is] spread out geographically • NMAG is in Santa Fe – considered elitist • Infrastructure systems are lacking and the funds are also lacking • Name has low profile – marketing need

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is camaraderie and civility among the members • We are in Santa Fe, which is a desirable destination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially disconnected from membership • Over programming
<p style="text-align: center;">OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Attorney General who regulates this sector – opportunity to educate him • Intel – Cerrelink – possible technology partners/donors • Growth in foundations • Incubator for NGO NM in 2008 – in NMAG’s interest for nonprofits to be strong • Big issues mean big problems and lots of opportunities • More grantmakers who are not members • NM is in the limelight – leverage the high profile – Richardson campaign attracting attention • Energy alternative state • Very poor and very wealthy • Citizen legislature – influence-able 	<p style="text-align: center;">THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education curve for technology – danger of investing resources in technology • Getting to spread with goals and funds – or too focused • Elimination of estate tax • Scope of NP in NM detrimental to philanthropy • Death of NGO NM • Apathy of membership (low survey response) • Lack of leadership – not member driven – leadership deficiency • Scarcity mentality in NM • Discrepancy in unequal influence among groups

Our Shared Vision for NMAG 2007-2010

Board members were asked to think individually and then discuss what they would like to see in place for NMAG by 2010. Ideas were discussed and grouped into thematic goals, shown in bold type. The individual ideas were prioritized through dot voting [numbers in parentheses are the number of dots voted; asterisk indicates it is considered an immediate need].

Enhance Structure and Leadership	Increase and Diversify Membership	Serve as a Resource Center for NGOs and Grantmakers	Identify and Take Action on Specific Issues	Influence Public Policy Toward Systemic Change
<p>Development plan to accomplish budget (5)*</p> <p>Welcoming engaged members (4)*</p> <p>Professional staff & leadership retention (4)</p> <p>Board development plan (2)*</p> <p>Fiscally sound proactive & responsible budgeting (2)*</p> <p>Increase budget by ?? per year for 5 years</p>	<p>Double membership in 5 years – target non NM grantmakers (6)</p> <p>Recognized & influential membership organizations (3)</p> <p>Membership growth in diversity, geography, generationally (1)</p> <p>Larger, diversified membership</p>	<p>Informational website for grantmakers, grant seekers & legislators (7)*</p> <p>Incubate NP resource center for foundations (6)</p> <p>Fostering the emergence of NGO NM as collaborative partner (2)*</p> <p>Research clearinghouse (2)</p> <p>Strong resources for NGOs (1)</p> <p>Technology statewide</p>	<p>Identify annual initiative for impactful grantmaking (8)*</p> <p>Limited number of programs directed to cutting edge philanthropic trends(4)</p> <p>Accomplishing one thing statewide collectively (4)*</p> <p>Strategic funding collaboratives (2)</p> <p>Collaborative funding successes</p> <p>Affinity reporting and programming</p> <p>Annual in depth focus</p> <p>Blueprints for achieving effective grantmaking successes</p>	<p>Be a public policy voice (7)*</p> <p>Information exchange with policy makers (2)</p> <p>Attorney General works with NMAG</p> <p>Identify our relevancy politically</p> <p>Influence systematic change...be a viable, critical partner</p> <p>Facilitate partnerships between public, private and gov't entities</p>

The group discussed the results of the visioning, and had several comments:

- It is exciting to see the cohesion of the group and the similarity of vision.
- These are big goals
- How do we find an overarching topic that will address all of the issues?
- It is important to get the structure in place first in order to focus on an issue and speak to policy makers and increase membership.

Top Ranking Dot vote:

- Identify annual initiatives for impactful grantmaking (8)
- Be a public policy voice (7)
- Informational website for grantseekers, grantmakers and legislators (7)
- Double the membership in 5 years – target non NM grantmakers (6)
- Incubate nonprofit resource center for foundations (6)

Top Ranking Immediate Need vote:

- Be a public policy voice (3)
- Identify annual initiatives for impactful grantmaking (3)
- Develop plan to accomplish budget (3)

Annual Focus Topic Discussion

Board members had an extensive discussion about the development of an annual focus for the NMAG conference, raising several key points:

- The first one must be a sure success
- In the first year, we should focus on becoming the resource center, then move to the annual topic. We get the clout first and then move to spreading the word.
- There should be a process at the conference to identify issues that we would educate about in the resource center. Membership input is needed. Strategy for '07 conference is to surface lots of issues for resource center.
- Use membership and conference to identify issues in Arts, Health, Environment, Education, Economic Development, Children & Youth, Spirituality & Values
- The criteria should be that it is a statewide problem
- Membership wants to be engaged and know what's going on in NM in depth
 - E.g., take drug abuse and see how each granting category is affected by it

Next Steps

- Strategic Planning Committee is Susan, Terry, Blair and Rick
- Conference Planning Committee decides about NGO involvement and process for selecting key issues
- How to complete the strategic plan:
 - Strategic Planning Committee to create a goals and objectives framework and circulate by email
 - Create action plan with goals – facilitated at Sept BOD
 - Change the Sept 6 meeting to 2-5pm?
- Website follows the strategic plan content to figure out budget
- Budget needs to be realistic and include existing needs for technology in '08

- Current staffing isn't sufficient to create a website – use a RAG as a model and hire a consultant to price it / build it
- 1) get house in order, 2) build a website, 3) become a resource

Appendix

Details on discussion of NMAG “Statement of Purpose:”

What are we doing well?

- #2 – we changed the question to two parts 1) locally and 2) nationally – we are doing well nationally (i.e. Pablo Eisenberg)
- We scored alerting emerging issues and philanthropy higher, but not community needs
- #1 we rated high as participants and it has some kind of ripple effect that spawns communication
- #7 we scored well on initiation but not on facilitation and leadership
- #6 improving cooperation and communication – some felt the venue is provided but not much come out of the events – kept coming back to the yearly thing – even using the website for putting into in. Terry reminded the group that NMAG is ahead of other regional associations in the nation and is providing guidance to other states.
- NMAG is coming up with ways to get grantmakers and grantseekers together and then creating a model to export it
- NMAG built a lot of relationships and trust in the past 5 years

Where are we not doing well?

- #5 we are not promoting public policies and maybe we should be
- We should only get involved in policies where philanthropy plays a role, not just anything the government is interested in legislating
- We could bring in an area of need and show the various applications (nonprofit programs from around the state?)
- Better partnership opportunities between public sector and private foundations
- Nothing is an isolated issue – we can focus and the topic will still be interesting to other funders – a case study
- We could also look at it from the perspective of when the government pulls back, philanthropy steps in – and see where there will be a need to develop funding. Identify public policy that suggests the private arena is picking up pieces that the government has dropped.
- If you were to focus to pull people in on a topic do you feel that would be the kind of impact on public policy you are looking for?
- It’s corporate too – private, government, philanthropic – it effects more than just public policy. The hunger collaborative for example, over time the State will take responsibility. We don’t want to be relieving the government of its responsibility.
- Terry said she didn’t see herself as a lobbyist, but doing work before the legislative session to inform
- Broadening the definition of public policy – involve a wide range of people to dialogue and hope there is a public policy change
- In an indirect way, a step toward changing public policy is by doing philanthropic study
- Research is not on the list (mission?) – but “research to impact public policy” is an idea

- #4 – encourage the development of philanthropy (strike “new”) – not sure if this is one of the goals – growing young philanthropists? Cultivations? Getting existing members to give more? Getting new types? Difficult to know what #4 meant.
- Central clearing house – more information gathered on needs to give to grantmakers in NM, philanthropists can take it and put their resources toward that. NMAG as a really informed resource. Become a deep resource by researching what’s going on.
- Identify statewide needs in a specific area – take the central issue and create a framework for a grantmaker to apply their resources to that issue locally
- #4 also might refer to not only building up from within, but bringing it into NM from outside.
- If we researched immigration and disseminated it statewide people will be moved philanthropically and go to the website to see who is working on it locally – it would be more productive
- Acknowledging we are a border state – bring in other members – see how immigration affects hunger, healthy, education, etc.
- “Inspiring from your seat”
- Encouraging the culture of giving is a huge topic – how to address it? (Potlatch in the Pacific NW – no hoarding – no one in need and no one with too much)
- The Santa Fe Community Foundation worked with the City on a Philanthropy Day for kids and it was wonderful – the class would visit nonprofits, vote to support one, hold bake sales and get a bank to match its donation – the mayor awarded a big check – this might be something to do statewide. (the reality of the teacher’s burdens came up) PIE had supported this and it was quite labor intensive for the teachers.
- To support it without organizing it – like corporations that encourage their employees to give.
- Terry said that NMAG is just beginning to become involved in National Philanthropy week, which is this week.
- Most people don’t know what philanthropy is – the word needs to be demystified. Many people think philanthropy is for rich people – it scares them or makes them think it is highbrow even though the statistics show the lower income populations give more.
- #3 Decision making could be made easier by having online discussion, expanding the website and using listserv – to touch everyone across the state, technology is really the only way to do it.
- The blog idea was rejected from experience, but telecasting is an option.

Discussion led to the understanding that a conference planning session was needed:

- The idea of an annual conference focused on one area each year came up to potentially create a platform for collaboration
- A concern was voiced about how to create relationships between grantseekers and grantmakers without favoritism – Toby used the Get Out the Vote example where 65 people and 40 funders had an activist speak about what they’d learned by only talking about other’s work.
- A topic-focused conference would allow for more information to be disseminated without directly creating policy and possibly getting more member participation

- Would the grantmakers and grantseekers choose the topic?
- The conference members would do it the year before, possibly determining topic 3 years out
- There would be more impact with more focus
- Members would be drawn to topics that interest them