



COLLABORATION PROJECT

THE NONPROFIT CENTERS | NETWORK

national
youth
transitions
center

Because
the Future
Needs Everyone

WWW.NONPROFITCENTERS.ORG/CPROJECT

*Copyright © 2016 by Third Sector New England, Inc.
on behalf of the Nonprofit Centers Network. All rights reserved.*

*The Nonprofit Centers Network
1536 Wynkoop St, Suite 103
Denver, CO 80202
www.nonprofitcenters.org
info@nonprofitcenters.org*

**national
youth
transitions
center**

The Nonprofit Centers Network would like to thank the National Youth Transitions Center for its generous support of The Collaboration Project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background on HSC Foundation and NCN	Page 4
Executive Summary.....	Page 5
Rationale for the Collaboration Project	Page 7
Methodology	Page 7
Defining the Problem.....	Page 9
Prototypes.....	Page 12
Practice Standards and Steps for Replication	Page 15
Case Studies	Page 18
Conclusion & Recommendations.....	Page 21
Appendix	Page 22

ABOUT THE NONPROFIT CENTERS NETWORK

The Nonprofit Centers Network (NCN) is the premiere learning community for nonprofit resource sharing. We are a peer-sourced network of 170 members throughout North America. We share best practices around mission-driven shared space and shared services. We believe nonprofit resource sharing makes nonprofits more effective and more efficient in achieving their goals. We make it easier for nonprofits to create, maintain and replicate shared space centers and shared service entities through trainings, conferences, online resources (tools and templates), networking and consulting. We are based in Denver, CO, the home to the largest concentration of nonprofit shared space centers in the United States.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL YOUTH TRANSITIONS CENTER

Developed by The HSC Foundation, the National Youth Transitions Center (NYTC) exists because of a fundamental conviction: The Future Needs Everyone. It thrives because it brings together individuals and organizations that share a commitment to youth and young people with disabilities, and as a result, the Center is both a physical structure and the embodiment of a mission.

The NYTC serves as the nerve center for the Youth Transitions Collaborative, whose more than 45 member organizations work together to help young people find self-directed paths to adulthood and employment. The Center brings together the resources of these organizations to provide transitions-related services, research, evaluation, best practices, public policy guidance and innovative projects.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Collaboration Project was a peer learning community designed to establish practice standards for nonprofit collaboration in shared space centers. NCN facilitated a cohort of 23 centers throughout the US and Canada to address frustration around achieving meaningful outcomes from the organizations who are tenants/members of the centers. This nine-month process sought to define, measure and evaluate nonprofit collaboration in a rapid learning process through individual and group exercises.

The cohort was able to progress as a group and individual members were able to advance the work in their centers as a result of this project. The group developed a definition of collaboration for shared space centers, as well as examples of how different levels of engagement could be applied to different types of centers.

They shared their plans and outcomes for the prototypes they tried in their centers to improve collaboration among tenant/members. Together, they also determined practice standards that can be used by existing or new centers to replicate their results.

Definition of Collaboration: Two or more tenants that work together, informally or formally, toward a common, mutually beneficial goal.

The lessons learned fall broadly into three themes: setting expectations, meeting tenant/members where they are and getting collaboration right. The cohort was able to build upon research around general nonprofit collaboration to develop solutions specific to collaboration in shared space.

Theme	Problem	Solution
Setting Expectations	Lack of clarity about shared space center's goals for collaboration	Clarify your intent around collaboration. Communicate expectations and jointly determine how to achieve goals. Recognize the need for ongoing communication.
Meeting Tenants Where They Are	Tenants don't have time for collaboration	Use tools and approaches that are not time intensive or that maximize any time available.
	Tenants don't have shared goals/missions aren't aligned	Find mission alignment through get-to-know-you activities, asset mapping and deeper understanding of individuals and organizations.
	Tenants unaware of other tenants	Tap multiple channels for dissemination of information and build relationships with all staff (not just Executive Directors).
Getting Collaboration Right	Collaboration is not deep enough	Assess the types of relationships tenant/members have; work on building tighter relationships and trust before expecting deeper, programmatic collaboration. Anticipate leadership changes among tenant/members.
	Collaboration isn't happening organically	Play to self-interest. Recognize the advantages and disadvantages of both center-led collaboration and organically-occurring collaboration. Encourage each as appropriate to your needs/situation.
	Unable to track outcomes	Create a Collaboration Plan to set goals and measure outcomes.
	No skin in the game	Consider the impact of governance structures and financial investment on participation in collaboration. Adjust as necessary.

The use of prototypes allowed the cohort to rapidly develop a toolkit of activities, agendas, interview questions and surveys that can be replicated in other centers, as well as in other situations. The cohort developed a number of different prototypes that can be replicated in other centers, mainly falling into two categories: individual approaches and group approaches. Prototypes with individual approaches included one-on-one interviews with tenants, asset-mapping of organizational and individual goals and skills that could be shared. Individual approaches to collaboration relied heavily on center staff to make connections among tenants. The other prototype strategy was a group approach, which involved a range of tactics but with a common thread of gathering tenant/members together in some way (for a training, to work jointly on a project, or to participate in a Collaboration Kick-Off event). Tenants largely made their own connections with other tenants in the group approach and it was often less time-intensive for center staff.

As a group, the cohort identified different criteria that could affect the ability of a center to adopt a robust collaboration strategy, including:

- Different types of centers (theme, one-stop, multi-sector) may have different hurdles and timelines for getting to collaboration.
- The resources available to support collaboration will either speed up or slow down its collaboration efforts, however even in a resource-constrained environment much can be accomplished by using appropriate tools.

Different approaches to cultivating collaboration were seen to have different costs and benefits. The cohort identified that center-staff-driven efforts may be less organic but if curated well, could yield deeper and more impactful change for the community. They may also be more successful for centers that want to demonstrate the impact of collaboration for fundraising purposes. On the other hand, there is much to be gained from tenant/member-led collaboration in terms of encouraging initiatives from the ground-up and reducing center-staff involvement; however, there may be a trade-off in terms of tracking results and pushing for deeper programmatic collaboration. The cohort concluded that each type of collaboration has a role and it is up to center operators to use these approaches appropriately.

The practice standards the cohort advanced were:

1. Intent - Know what you want to accomplish as a shared space operator.
2. Resources - Make sure you have the resources you need to achieve your goals.
3. Use a variety of channels to build a culture of collaboration.
4. Clearly communicate your expectations with your tenants/members.
5. If you want to be able to track the impact of collaboration, work with your tenant/members to set clear, measurable goals.
6. Model the collaboration you desire.
7. Build on self-interest.
8. Leverage the network of other shared space providers to learn from their successes and failures.

The final point is around intentionality. It is the goal of this project to provide a guide to nonprofit shared space centers regardless of where they fall in the continuum of collaboration. However, having a Collaboration Plan or a clear set of definitions and expectations around collaboration is a top recommendation. This is most important for those who wish to demonstrate the impact of collaboration but is helpful for both tenant/members and center operators in any situation.

INTRODUCTION

Ninety-five percent of nonprofit centers state that collaboration is part of the reason they exist; however, many nonprofit center managers are unsatisfied with the results they are seeing in their spaces.

As a point of reference, throughout **The Collaboration Project**, there were a number of different terms used to refer to common elements:

- Tenants, partners, members, neighbors – occupants of a shared space center
- Center operators, shared space practitioners – those who run nonprofit shared space centers
- Center director, animator, community manager, center staff, center executive director, community catalyzer, community development coordinator – staff members of nonprofit shared space centers or those responsible for the operation of a center.



RATIONALE / WHY LOCATION-BASED COLLABORATION IS UNIQUE

NCN began **The Collaboration Project** in response to network members who requested more in-depth resources around collaboration in shared space: how to define, plan for, measure and evaluate collaboration.

Most resources for building collaboration focus on a single issue area of collaboration: multiple partners coming together around one shared goal (such as increasing reading scores or making cities more walkable). In shared spaces, the potential for collaboration is more dynamic. Tenant/members may work together in one configuration on an issue area (for example, developing a joint volunteer program, but a different configuration (with some overlap) could work together on another collaboration (such as a joint financing project or an outreach program). The potential for many different types of collaboration is enormous.


The above graphic shows a center with eight tenants working together on four different collaborations.

NCN wanted to provide a forum so that shared space operators could develop practice standards to address the complexity of collaboration in shared space. Center operators told us they wanted to demonstrate impact through high-quality, location-based collaboration among their tenants and member communities.



METHODOLOGY

The Collaboration Project was organized around a program outline (see Appendix) that established goals and a methodology for participating in this work. Projects were selected through an application process to ensure that cohort members were similar in terms of their ability to be active participants in the project. Twenty-three organizations originally signed up to participate, however due to staff changes, three organizations withdrew in the fall of 2015. The cohort was diverse geographically, with representation from throughout the U.S. and Canada. The centers were representative of the Network as a whole with about one-third one-stop community hubs that provide direct services, one-third focused on a common theme and one-third were multi-sector centers, consistent with NCN's overall understanding of the field.



The original methodology was modified along the way and is outlined below. There were eight video conference calls between September 2015 and June 2016. Cohort members completed homework assignments between calls and as a final exercise they reviewed another organization's homework assignments and provided feedback either in writing or by phone. The agendas for the first three meetings and all six homework assignments are included in the appendix.

Date	Activity (Video Conference Topic)	Assignments
June 2015	Kick Off of Collaboration Project at the 2015 Building Opportunities, Vancouver	
July 2015	Final Selection of Cohort	
September 2, 2015	Topic: Intro, Readings, Baseline Observations (Define the Problem)	Collaboration Observations and Expectations
September 30, 2015	Topic: Developing a Shared Definition of Collaboration	Work with a Partner on Common Definition of Collaboration
October 28, 2015	Topic: Final Definition and Introduction of Prototype Ideas	Tenant Interviews
December 2, 2015	Topic: Prototype Review	My Prototype
February 10, 2016	Topic: Challenges & Successes (Midpoint Check-In)	
March 9, 2016	Topic: Prototype Outcomes, Lessons Learned	Prototype Results
April 6, 2016	Topic: Indicators of Success from Prototypes	Peer Review of Prototypes
May	Drafting of Report	
June 1, 2016	Topic: Review/Approval of Report	
July – Aug 2016	Dissemination of Report	

DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Throughout **The Collaboration Project**, definitions proved to be a challenge. In order to identify the problem(s) that **The Collaboration Project** endeavored to solve, one of the first tasks for the cohort was to identify the gap between what they expected around collaboration and what was actually happening (the instances of collaboration they could observe). Articulating the gap helped to crystalize the purpose of the work described in this report.

Expectation Gaps

For Center Operators

- Lack of engagement; apathy among tenants around collaboration.
- Tenants like the idea of collaboration but don't make unilateral efforts to engage with others.
- Want collaboration to be "organic" rather than imposed by operator.
- Want to see large-scale program collaboration (joining forces on a campaign that encompasses both of their missions).
- Want to be able to track collaborations, collect data, and demonstrate impact.
- Difficult to balance the needs and expectations of small vs large tenants around collaboration.
- Difficult to be "landlord – rule enforcer" and be seen as a neutral facilitator of collaboration.
- Original agreements around collaboration may have been formalized, but over time proved unrealistic or were never implemented.

In addition, center operators interviewed tenants/members to find out why they were or were not participating in collaborative activities with other tenants. Those tenant/members who were identified as not meeting expectations around collaboration reported the following:

Expectation Gaps

What Tenant/Members Said:

- We are too busy to collaborate.
- Our goals are to reduce costs, not collaborate.
- We are collaborating – we just had coffee with another tenant.
- You communicate via email but we don't want all of our employees to get bogged down in email from the Center so they aren't on the list.
- Haven't taken the time to consider other organizations, because it requires more time and effort to think outside the box.
- We are here part-time and not always on the days identified for an activity.
- We have been waiting for opportunities to collaborate to be created. It is why we joined the Center.

WHAT DOES “COLLABORATION” MEAN?

The cohort developed two best practices, early on, that are foundational to the rest of this report. First, the group agreed upon a definition of collaboration. And, secondly, a way to group centers that are in similar stages of catalyzing collaboration.

The first accomplishment of **The Collaboration Project** cohort was a definition of collaboration which built upon academic readings on various spectrums of collaboration (see Appendix for Bibliography). Cohort members applied the academic findings to their own real-world situations and settled on the following definition of collaboration:

Cohort members recognized that the definition did not reflect the full range of ways collaboration is exhibited in shared space. The group devised a scale for different levels of engagement, each of which could be called collaboration. It was important to delineate the various levels of collaboration to assist practitioners in understanding and better communicating their expectations around collaboration.

Spectrum of Collaboration

Level of Engagement:	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Networking	Coordinating & Cooperating	Collective Impact & Risk Sharing
What it Looks Like:	Make Introductions	Make Modest Behavior Changes such as Sharing Resources or Joint Programming	Measure Outcomes of Joint Effort with Shared Risks & Rewards while Enhancing Another's Capacity
By Center Type:			
One-Stop	Community Lunch	Cross-Referrals	Measure Impact in a Single Community/ Population/Issue area
Theme	Happy Hours	ED Topic Roundtables	Collaboration Fund Metrics
Multi-Sector	Gallery Openings	Joint Volunteer Recruitment	Measurable Capacity Building of Community Resources

A “Low” level of engagement would be networking, and an example would be a low-risk, low-behavior change interaction like meeting for coffee, or meeting someone at a happy hour or gallery opening. This level of collaboration is more centered on building relationships and creating a positive culture in a center.

A “Medium” level of engagement would involve some modest behavior changes and would be less focused on social interactions but involve the coordination of program activities (such as offering joint volunteer recruitment programs or facilitating an Executive Director roundtable) or cooperation (such as cross-referrals).


A “High” level of engagement was defined as Collective Impact and Risk Sharing. This is deep collaboration that requires more formal decision-making structures, but also strives to have meaningful impact. The cohort defined this as an effort that achieves the following:

- Has a system or plan to measure outcomes
- Shares risks and rewards among the partners
- Each partner strives to enhance the other partner's capacity
- Has a positive impact on the community

It is important to be looking for behavior change when evaluating collaborative efforts; what are we doing differently/better together that we wouldn't otherwise do alone? How do these behavior changes result in better outcomes for the community?

WORKING GROUPS

The cohort broke down into three general stages with regard to collaboration in their centers: relationship builders, dot connectors and impact trackers. The assumption was that centers in similar stages would benefit from a more focused conversation. The groupings allowed centers to interact with peers while developing their prototypes to allow for accelerated learning.



We found it helpful to group cohort members according to these categories to focus on building tools and approaches that were tailored to their situation.

1. Relationship Builders – working on building connections among tenants
2. Dot Connectors – working on deepening connections among tenants
3. Impact Trackers – working on evaluating existing higher-order engagement among tenants

These initial findings laid the groundwork for cohort members to develop their prototypes and test strategies for building collaboration in their centers. They discussed doing similar prototypes for each category, but in the end each center developed a prototype appropriate for their level of resources and particular situation.

PROTOTYPES


Fifteen members of the cohort created a prototype in their center. The goal was to rapidly implement a small-scale experiment that could be documented and replicated in other centers or taken to scale.

The cohort members decided on their prototypes in December 2015 and reported on their findings in March 2016.

Impact Tracker: “The key questions I want to answer in my prototype are: description of the types of the collaborations that are taking place, an understanding of the benefit to the organization, and an understanding of the benefit to the community.”

The approaches cohort members took for their prototypes, fell into three types of strategies and are detailed specifically in the Appendix (to be added):

- Individual – The center director/ staff contacted individuals directly who work in the center to gather information on their organization and their personal needs and goals. This enabled very precise asset mapping to connect organizations and individuals who might collaborate together.
- Group – The center director/ staff held some type of event or program that brought together all tenants/ members with a single focus. They included:
 - *Collaboration Kick-off events – an extended meeting to build relationships among staff from different organizations; mutually determine expectations around collaboration and how it is defined;” map out the needs of the end-users (clients) of the facility and how collaboration could better meet their needs.*
 - *Evaluation – one center engaged its members in an evaluation project to measure the impact of collaboration on their collective work. By involving everyone in the center, they strengthened their culture while producing an impact report that everyone contributed to.*
 - *Issue Areas – several centers focused their prototypes on creating a training series for Executive Directors and other staff to attend. The goal was to provide enrichment on issue areas as a way to engage staff and build collaboration.*
 - *Funding Pools – several centers developed or augmented funding pools to incentivize collaboration. Providing financial support for the work involved in developing collaboration and asking recipients to report on what worked/didn't work offers insight into: (a) better understanding what types of collaboration are desirable; (b) how to better articulate what “funders” are looking for; and (c) how to develop systems to measure results attributable to the collaboration.*
- Communication – Two prototypes used different approaches around communication. One developed a newsletter to be distributed to all tenant/ members to increase awareness of each organization’s activities. The other developed a video that documented a collaboration among partners who hadn't traditionally worked together.



Relationship Builder: “We will send out an online survey to all tenants. The survey will gauge how well the tenants know each other as well as give them an opportunity to list any talents/skills that would be useful in a collaborative project. After the survey is completed, tenants will be invited to attend a building-wide brainstorming session that will give them the opportunity to learn more about each other, how their missions/goals intersect, and develop possible collaboration ideas. After this event, the same survey that was sent out before the event will be sent out again to gauge the success of the event.”

Results

The prototypes succeeded in rapidly testing a wide variety of experiments on how to build collaboration in shared spaces. The cohort members were able to borrow tools that others had developed and apply them in their own centers. A summary of all the prototypes is included in the Appendix.

The greatest outcome of the prototypes was a better understanding of which tools may be appropriate at which times. The cohort realized that most of the prototypes they developed involved a substantial time commitment of staff and tenant/members. They identified ways to streamline the processes or the sequences to achieve time savings. For instance, some of the centers who used an “individual” approach with interviews of tenant/members felt that given limited time resources, they might have been more effective doing a “group” approach and using an individual approach when staff resources were more plentiful. The life cycle stage of the center will play a big role in deciding when to use which approach.

Some centers were able to make the case with local funders for more resources to support their work by demonstrating the outcomes from the prototype. One center in the Impact Tracker category was encouraged by a local funder to focus on evaluation, which resulted in a prototype that provided additional evidence of the benefits the center provided. This center was able to use the outcomes as the basis for support for additional staffing, resource banks to better track tenant/member assets, and support for joint programs like shared interns.

Also, the prototypes yielded practical tools which are included in the Appendix of this report. Cohort members were generous in sharing agendas, interview questions, evaluation questions and fun activities to build a collaborative culture. They identified the importance of applying the right tool at the right time for maximum utility. For instance, group events like Collaboration Kick-Offs might be more efficient for a new center or one that is trying to engage tenant/members for the first time. Once that foundation is laid, a more personalized or individual approach will yield the best information to make connections among tenants and foster deeper program collaboration.

It should be noted that we tried to learn from those groups who did not complete prototypes to inform how we might re-engineer the process: however, most of the centers who dropped out did not provide any feedback.

The feedback we received was that center staff did not have the time to participate.

Dot Connector: “The tenants that agreed to focus on certain areas of interest are taking the initiative by scheduling meetings to coordinate efforts and develop strategies. Communication in general has increased. There is more willingness to proactively engage the other organizations with ideas and opportunities.”

BEHAVIOR CHANGES

Cohort members were asked how their behavior changed as a result of the prototype.

- I have been releasing more responsibility to tenants to drive initiatives. I have been facilitating and coaching as opportunities arise.
- I am making more of conscious effort to weave together collaborations now that I have more flexibility in the criteria.
- I have found that I need to be more mindful to include collaboration in our discussions and allow others to take the lead on initiatives that are of interest to them.
- I find that I am a bit more relaxed and less impatient with the concept of collaboration...it does not only rest with me but with everyone who is a part of our shared space.
- I am trying to be more intentional about how we incentivize and track collaboration.

The biggest surprise cohort members reported was the openness of tenant/members to their plans for building collaboration. This is encouraging for others who want to replicate the prototypes:

- I was surprised by the quickness of staff from other organizations to "get it"; for them to respond with such eagerness around joint planning. I honestly thought it was going to take much longer.
- I've been most surprised that what was mentioned in almost every interview was a strong desire to connect meaningfully with other tenants, yet folks are hesitant to knock on their neighbors' doors unless there's a facilitator driving that interaction, or groups don't even know that organizations working on the same issues they're working on exist just down the hall.

LIMITATIONS

The drawbacks of the prototypes was the limited time frame. In retrospect, NCN staff should have helped cohort members focus their prototypes on much smaller scale undertakings that could be accomplished within the timeframe. For instance, interviewing just 3-4 tenant/members for asset mapping rather than all tenants. This would have resulted in more prototype completions. At least five cohort members dropped out of **The Collaboration Project** because they felt they could not complete the prototype phase.

Also, NCN staff should have more strongly encouraged more cohort members to use baseline surveys or other measures at the beginning of the prototypes. This could have been repeated at the end of the prototype period to estimate changes in behavior and/or changes in approaches to collaboration.

PRACTICE STANDARDS

The goal of **The Collaboration Project** was to develop practice standards for building collaboration in shared space. The cohort's collective lessons learned yielded the following best practices:

- **Intent.** Know what you want to accomplish as a shared space operator. Why is it important to you that your tenant/members collaborate? Is there a board, funding or evaluation imperative?
- **Clearly communicate your expectations with your tenants/members.** Not just once, but continuously. Get buy-in and work together to define what you mean by collaboration (you can use our definition as a starting point). Build a common culture when on-boarding individual staff members and organizations and use collaboration as a filter when selecting partners for your space.
- **Resources.** Make sure you have the resources you need to achieve your goals. Fostering collaboration is time-intensive. There is a need for a champion, but also a recognition of their role as a catalyst; set up your tenant/members for success so they can assume a dominant role in leading collaboration. Apply your resources appropriately for your collaboration level – group events in the early stages and more individualized approaches when your center is more mature.
- **Use a variety of channels to build a culture of collaboration.** Change doesn't happen overnight. Hold a variety of events, at different times. Do in-person activities as well as passive communications like bulletin boards and newsletters, to reach everyone where they are. Talk to tenant/members. Your job is relationships. Find out why certain organizations or individuals aren't participating in programs and consider altering your approach.
- **Build on self-interest because everyone is busy.** Curate meaningful connections in your center by knowing the individuals and organizations in the space and what their motivations and goals are. Find out what agencies need from shared action. Support nascent collaborations with tools to move forward (short agreements, conflict resolution policies etc).
- **Model the collaboration you desire.** Think about the decision-making structure your center embodies – do you share governance in an authentic way? Even the terminology “tenants” or “members” implies different power structures.
- **If you want to be able to track the impact of collaboration, work with your tenant/members to set clear, measurable goals.** Create a Collaboration Plan. Do a baseline survey, support them with regular check-ins and follow-up with a final survey.
- **Leverage the network of other shared space providers to learn from their successes and failures.** One size does not fit all in terms of building collaboration in shared space – tailor what you observe to fit your needs.

STEPS FOR REPLICATION

Based on the 15 prototypes, the cohort was able to generate a great deal of practical tools and advice for others wanting to build collaboration. These recommendations are intended to serve as a road map for those wishing to replicate (or improve upon) the approaches used in **The Collaboration Project**.

1. Set Expectations – Know Your Intent

The first step the cohort identified was to create concrete expectations. As one cohort member stated: “Lack of expectations and direction can make participants nervous to invest time and resources.” There was consensus around involving tenant/members from the start and educating them on the spectrum of collaboration. As one cohort member said, “The word collaboration itself can seem daunting.”

Although many centers in the cohort had moved away from the Memorandum of Understanding they had originally used to memorialize their collaboration goals, others felt it was important to have a written document that outlines expectations around collaboration. The key is that if you have such a document, it needs to be updated periodically and modified to meet the needs of the center and its tenant/members.

2. Meet Tenants Where They Are

In order for collaboration to flourish, the cohort learned the importance of understanding the community in which you are working. In some cases, the center operators had misperceptions of tenant actions, goals and motivations. Also, center operators need to acknowledge the rationales for engaging in collaborations and recognize that meaningful collaborations are more often motivated by self-interest rather than altruism.

The cohort identified characteristics that may contribute to, or detract from, tenant interest in collaboration. They should be used to think about what approaches would work best in a center.

- Tenure in shared space
- Organization size
- Organization age (stage in its lifecycle)
- Staff age, gender
- Extrovert/introvert personalities
- Presence (frequency) in shared space
- Design considerations (open space vs closed office suites)
- Focus on being in shared space solely to save money

3. Fine Tune Your Approach to Collaboration

This report lays out 15 unique approaches to building collaboration in shared space. Centers serious about cultivating collaboration among their tenants should create Collaboration Plans that detail what their goals are, what level of collaboration they seek among their tenant/members, how they plan to achieve the goals and who is accountable for success. Also, this provides a platform for measurement of the types of collaboration they desire and the outcomes that result.

The cohort members identified the continuum of approaches, ranging from focusing on the creation of an environment that fosters organic collaboration (emanates up from tenant/members) to a more directed approach where center operators facilitate collaboration to a greater degree

(play matchmaker and support collaborative work). Center operators need to understand what motivates their collaboration goals and which approach will best support them. It is not an either/or conundrum but a question of when and how each approach works best.

“As a mature shared space center, I see benefits to both sides: collaboration facilitated by Centre staff and natural collaboration amongst tenants. When Collaboration is driven (not just expected to happen naturally) the result is better, longer, and less expensive. My advice for new centers would be that collaboration does not have to be either/or, but that it can be both.”

Those replicating **The Collaboration Project** could use individual, group, or communication strategies, or create their own approach. Cohort members were acutely attuned to the “people” responsible for collaboration in shared space. They suggested

job descriptions for Community Engagement Manager/Community Animator should clarify whether the role facilitates collaborative projects between tenants or facilitates a collaborative culture for tenants to enter into collaboration amongst themselves. They also reflected that nonprofits may not allocate sufficient time to be invested in this work but instead add property management responsibilities that make it difficult to do either job well. Collaboration Plans should match the resources that are available on an ongoing basis.

The cohort noted that the key to success in the long term is to have a succession strategy that anticipates leadership changes within tenant organizations and how expectations of collaboration will be passed down.

The goal of **The Collaboration Project** cohort is that these ideas will be applied in many other centers to grow this body of work further.

CASE STUDIES

Jessie Ball duPont Center – Relationship Builder



Jessie Ball duPont Center – Relationship Builder

The Jessie Ball duPont Center (JBdC) opened in mid-2015, shortly before **The Collaboration Project** began. The center is housed in an architecturally significant building in downtown Jacksonville, FL that was the city's former library. JBdC has fourteen nonprofit tenants and approximately 120,000 square feet.

The three main goals of the center are:

- To provide affordable office space to nonprofits and decrease tenant occupancy costs, especially through the use of environmentally sustainable building practices
- To promote nonprofit collaboration
- To raise the profile of nonprofits in the Jacksonville area

JBdC joined **The Collaboration Project** as one of the newest centers in the cohort. Since the tenants had only recently moved in, JBdC was able to put what they learned in the Collaboration Project to use immediately to build a new community-oriented culture. They began at the low end of the spectrum of collaboration, seeking to build relationships among staff of the various tenants.

Prototype

JBdC designed its prototype by first surveying all employees who worked in the building. An electronic survey was sent to 230 staff and 100 responses were received. The goal was to gauge how well people in the building knew each other and what skills or talents they would be willing to contribute to collaborations within the center. The survey asked respondents to only share information that could be made public.

Based on the survey results, a Facilitation Team was formed composed of JBdC staff and self-identified volunteer representatives from various tenants. This group of 7 met twice to develop activities to catalyze collaboration in the center. They planned three activities within a one-hour gathering, each tied to a specific goal and lasting about 15-20 minutes:

Scavenger Hunt - The goal was for staff to get to know each other by finding items among their collective possessions (wallets, phones, business cards, etc.)

Discussion Breakout - The goal was to find out what people enjoyed doing and what their interests were. This was accomplished by posting flip-chart paper in four corners of a room and asking each person to move to one of the four areas: Health, Fine Arts/Music, Technology, and Interpersonal. Each group choose the top 3 activity ideas around that topic for further exploration.

Family Feud - The goal for this activity was for staff to learn about different organizations in a fun way.

The results of the prototype events were the formation of two committees: Health and Music/Art. Each committee now works on specific goals and the JBdC staff supports them with logistical support.

Thoreau Center – Dot Connector



Tides Thoreau Center houses 75 nonprofits and social enterprises, including art galleries and a café, in a decommissioned military hospital in San Francisco's Presidio National Park. Tides, the master lease holder and largest tenant on the 150,000 square foot campus, is a nonprofit that exists to accelerate the pace of social change by working with innovative partners to solve society's toughest problems. Tides secured a 55-year lease in 1995, investing significant financial resources in renovating the twelve buildings and creating one of the nation's first dedicated nonprofit centers.

The challenge facing the Tides Thoreau Center when it joined **The Collaboration Project** was that although it had been operational for 20 years, tenants were not meaningfully collaborating. This was due in part to the sprawling nature of the campus (lots of access points meant that people could come and go from their respective ends of campus without ever seeing any new faces), as well as a dormant community charter that had not been enforced or updated in many years. There was strong intra-engagement within some of the larger tenants on campus; with strong organizational cultures in their own right, they'd plan games on the lawn or host their own happy hours. But, when it came to all-campus activities or inter-engagement across tenants, it was always the same few tenants showing up.

Prototype

Tides Thoreau Center's prototype focused on an individualized approach to build a thorough understanding of all tenants/staff as a foundation for deeper collaboration.

The process involved Tides' staff interviewing as many of the 75 tenants' staff as possible with a standard set of questions. After collecting information on both what community members loved and disliked about being on the campus, as well as what resources they'd be willing to share with other tenants (ranging from leading lunchtime walks to providing professional trainings on graphic facilitation), Tides created an asset map. The map made it easy to connect organizations to launch shared programming, like a now-monthly meditation series by two mindfulness-focused tenants, and to build communities of practice that now meet quarterly to share best practices or workshop individual organization's concerns.

The prototype also revealed other information: there was marked interest in collaborating with other tenants, but uncertainty on how best to communicate with neighbors, as well as ambiguity around who at Tides to ask when tenants had ideas for events or additional amenities, like making the campus a drop-off location for a local CSA. The Community Catalyzer role, a new position created by Tides, was key to addressing both of these. Firstly, it created a single point of contact for tenants to share ideas, address concerns, or receive support regarding creating opportunities for engaging or collaborating with neighbors. Secondly, the question on how best to encourage tenants' communication was solved by the development of a listserv, which the Community Catalyzer moderates for quality and relevance of posts. With now over 300 subscribers, the listserv is now the primary communication tool for tenants to advertise events, post job openings, or share best practices. This prototype has also led to a notable shift from Tides being the only organizer of campus programming to now tenants leading many of the engagements. Over time Tides expects deeper collaborations to grow, both because community members are empowered to communicate directly with one another and because the community itself is building its own culture of engagement and participation through the decentralized ownership of campus happenings.

Tides' staff shared that one of its lessons learned is to be intentional regarding the terminology with which tenants are addressed. Using the word "tenants" emphasizes the power dynamic between those who own/operate the space and those who rent the space, versus using the term "community member" or "neighbor" to emphasize a cooperative and equal role in setting the campus' culture.

North County Hub – Impact Tracker



North County Hub – Impact Tracker

The North County Hub was started by The Leichtag Foundation, which is committed to a vibrant Jewish life, advancing self-sufficiency and stimulating social entrepreneurship in coastal North San Diego County and Jerusalem.

The Foundation was planning on sun-setting in 2025, but after an intensive evaluation, determined that there was a strong need for a “place” in the community, both for individuals and organizations. The North County Hub was formed to provide space for organizations to collaborate and to link their work to the Coastal Roots Farm, also located on the site secured by the Foundation.

The North County Hub opened in 2013, has 13,000 square feet and 25 tenants. Tenants have access to meetings space, a kitchen facility, wi-fi, printing, and professional development opportunities. Tenets in the Hub are focused on one of the following for areas: self-sufficiency, vibrant Jewish life, arts/culture, and agriculture/environment.

Prototype

The North County Hub's prototype was designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative data about the collaborations that occur through a micro-grant program. Tenant organizations are eligible for up to \$1,500/year of funding for collaborative programming.

The Hub was interested in the types of collaborations that are taking place, an understanding of the benefit to the organization, and an understanding of the benefit to the community. The Hub's goal was to promote more effective partnerships by learning the measures of success. They set a goal of seeing six “High Level – Collective Impact” collaborations through the prototype.

In order to accomplish this, the micro-grant criteria was revised (expanding parameters so that more organizations are encouraged and eligible to apply) and circulated. One result was that the Hub changed the parameters of the micro-grant program to encourage innovative and cross-sector collaboration. Initially, the micro-grant program was focused on the intersection of Jewish engagement and agriculture. The micro-grant program, as revised in the prototype, included programming across four sectors: self-sufficiency, arts and culture, Jewish life, and agriculture/environment. The criteria was expanded to programs happening at other locations, rather than just collaborations occurring among Hub members, in order to spark creativity and to utilize neighborhood resources.

The North County Hub has used **The Collaboration Project** prototype to isolate the components of successful collaborations. It helped them clarify their goals around collaboration and be better able to communicate their expectations. In turn, the recipients of the micro-grants were able to develop collaborations that matched the goals better and use the funds more effectively. The Hub's use of funds through its micro-grant program to incentivize collaboration offers a quick study of how organizations can refine their goals around collaboration.

CONCLUSION

The Collaboration Project originated as a peer-learning community devoted to developing practice standards around nonprofit collaboration in shared space. It was started to respond to members of the Nonprofit Centers Network who were concerned that they had few resources around defining, measuring or evaluating nonprofit collaboration.

As a cohort of shared space operators, the group shared their experiences, mistakes and successes and jointly worked to advance our knowledge of how to build impactful collaborations among nonprofits. The group developed many tools and approaches that can be replicated in shared spaces, and also in the wider nonprofit community.

Shared spaces are laboratories for collaboration. By modeling best practices, nonprofit shared space centers can become “weavers” of greater community impact by fostering collaborative environments and nurturing deeper programmatic collaborations. We hope this report lays the groundwork for many successful nonprofit collaborations in the future.

APPENDIX

1. Program Outline
2. Participant List
3. Assignments
4. Prototype Summary
5. Toolkit for Collaboration in One Hour
6. Cohort Member Shared Resources
7. Bibliography

PROGRAM OUTLINE

July 3, 2015

The Nonprofit Centers Network connects over 170 shared spaces throughout the U.S. and Canada to share best practices. One of the most requested topics among our members for more in-depth resources is around collaboration in shared space: how to define, plan for, measure and evaluate it. Shared space operators want to be able to demonstrate impact through high-quality, location-based collaboration among tenants and their member communities. NCN has created a peer-to-peer “community of practice” to explore the topic of collaboration in shared space.

Goal: Establish practice standards for collaboration in shared spaces

Method: 23 NCN members have committed to a year-long project to develop practice standards around collaboration in shared space.

Details: Initial face-to-face meeting at Vancouver conference followed by up to 8 group video conferences throughout fiscal year 2016 (July 2015 – June 2016).

1. Review literature and establish shared definition(s) of collaboration using examples from the cohort’s existing programs.
2. Develop and test results-oriented prototypes for collaboration in their own centers (perhaps as a small scale experiment that could be rolled out internally, as well as replicated externally by others).
3. Track challenges, successes, observations, course-corrections and decision-making processes to further discern practice standards for successful and meaningful collaboration in shared space.
4. Share lessons learned with group; identify which prototype(s) are most successful and why.
5. Derive indicators of collaboration success in shared space.
6. Agree upon recommended metrics for evaluating the quality of collaboration.
7. Produce recommended core principles for rolling out collaboration prototypes that have measurable impacts.

Selection Criteria: Shared space centers will be selected into the Collaboration Project Cohort based on the following:

- NCN member in good standing
- Operational for at least six months
- Financially stable (organization maintains stable tenant base and is not in financial distress)
- Ability to pay \$100 participation fee
- Ability to commit consistent staff participation in conference calls
- Ability to complete required work: preparatory readings, homework assignments, reporting.
- Ability to roll out prototype within own center, test assumptions and provide input to wider peer group

Benefits of Participation:

- Selected organizations participate in ground-breaking project on collaboration that can have implications for the wider field of practice
- Participating organizations will be cited in publishable report that will be distributed across North America

- Organizations receive support and guided assistance to roll out new collaboration strategies
- Organizations gain a new and trusted community of practice on which to draw in the future

Curriculum/Timeline:

June 2015	Kick Off of Collaboration Project at the 2015 Building Opportunities, Vancouver
July 2015	Final Selection of Cohort
August 2015	Topic: Ground Rules & Baseline Observations (Define the Problem)
September 2015	Topic: Developing a Shared Definition of Collaboration
October 2015	Topic: Current Strategies – What's Working/What's Not and Why
November 2015	Topic: Prototype Review
February 2016	Topic: Challenges & Successes
March 2016	Topic: Lessons Learned
April 2016	Topic: Indicators of Success
May 2016	Topic: Recommended Metrics and Roll-Out of Prototypes
June 2016	Work with Cohort Concludes
July – Aug 2016	Drafting of Report
Fall 2016	Dissemination of Report

Final Deliverable: NCN will produce a report for public distribution that summarizes the process, the participants, the prototypes tested and the results. It will outline standards of practice for others to replicate successful collaboration that demonstrates a measurable impact in the community.






Budget: NCN is seeking philanthropic support for the Collaboration Project but as of this writing, NCN is absorbing all costs except those covered by the \$100 participation fee. The estimated project budget is \$24,000.

Background on The Nonprofit Centers: NCN is a membership-based community of nonprofit and philanthropic leaders and professionals from the financial, real estate, and public sectors dedicated to sharing their knowledge and networks for creating and operating quality nonprofit workspace. The Nonprofit Centers Network is a project of Third Sector New England with headquarters in Denver, Colorado. NCN's main activities are:















- training professionals to manage complex real estate projects;
- developing tools and resources for nonprofits drawing on first-hand peer experience;
- providing tailored consulting to projects on a fee for service basis; and convening the largest North American conference of nonprofit real estate practitioners biennially.

Contact Information: Lara Jakubowski at 720-836-1187 or lara@nonprofitcenters.org.

PARTICIPANT LIST

Name of Center	Contact Name	Location	Website	Type of Center	Square Footage	Tenants	Year Created
 Centre for Social Innovation	Shona Fulcher	Toronto, ON	http://socialinnovation.ca/	Multi-sector	100,000	800	2004
 Chicago Literacy Center	Alison Hanold	Chicago, IL	http://chicagoliteracyalliance.org/	Theme	27,000	89	2015
 CommunityWise Resource Centre	Erin Mcfarlane	Calgary, AB	http://communitywise.net/	Multi-sector	14,000	33	1979
 Community Services Association: Chester Le Community Corner	Evan Muller-Cheng	Toronto, ON	www.agincourtcommunityservices.com	Service	5,000	itinerants	2013
 acsa 40 Association: Dorset Park Community Hub	Laura Harper	Toronto, ON	www.agincourtcommunityservices.com	Service	10,000	10	2014 (ACSA 1974)
 CT Nonprofit Center	Karen Maciorowski	Hartford, CT	http://www.ctnonprofits.org/about/CTNonprofitCenter	Multi-sector	86,000	16	2014
 cultureworks Greater Philadelphia	Zachary Liffon	Philadelphia, PA	http://www.cultureworksphila.org/	Theme	5,000	160	2010
 Deschutes Children's Foundation	Kim McNameer	Bend, OR	http://www.deschuteschildrensfoundation.org/	Service	7,100 - 17,575	10-Sep	1990-2009
 (c(space) for Healthy Kentucky	Mary Jo Shircliffe	Louisville, KY	http://www.cspace-ky.org/	Multi-sector	28,000	8	2013
 Fundacion Banco Popular	Zaira Vallenilla	San Juan, Puerto Rico	http://www.fundacionbanco-popular.org/	Multi-sector	17,527	10	2014
 HNS Life Center	Dustin Barrington	Loveland, CO	http://honservice.org/	Service	62,000	11	2014

PARTICIPANT LIST CONT.

	Name of Center	Contact Name	Location	Website	Type of Center	Square Footage	Tenants	Year Created
	Jessie Ball DuPont Center	Issis Alvarez	Jacksonville, FL	http://www.dupontcenter.org/	Multi-sector	120,000	12	2015
	Leichtag Foundation	Jenny Camhi	Encinitas, CA	http://www.leichtag.org/	Theme	13,000	11	2013
	Skyview Terrace Nonprofit Center	Shelley Hamilton	San Rafael, CA	http://marinspace.org/	Multi-sector	14,400	7	1989
	Matrix Human Services	Ken Brown	Detroit, MI	http://www.matrixhumanservices.org/	Service	60,000	46	1997
	Midland Shared Spaces	Vicki Jay	Midland, TX	https://midlandss.org/	Multi-sector	41,748	15	2014
	National Performance Network/Visual Artists Network	Stephanie Atkins	New Orleans, LA	http://npnweb.org/ae1024/	Theme	7,000	4	2014
	New Path Foundation	James Thomson	Orilla, ON	http://thecommonroof.ca/	Service	36,000	16	2011
	Nonprofit Village	Tom Colling	Rockville, MD	http://www.thenonprofitvillage.org/	Multi-sector	11,000	16	2009
	Posner Center for International Development	Brandi Stanley	Denver, CO	http://posnercenter.org/	Theme	25,000	60	2013
	Saskatoon Community Service Village Inc	Jodie Senkiw	Saskatoon, SK	http://www.villagesaskatoon.com/	Service	30,000	6	2001
	Third Sector New England	Leah McNeill	Boston, MA	http://nonprofitcenterboston.org/	Multi-sector	110,000	28	2004
	Thoreau Center for Sustainability	Saul Ettlín	San Francisco, CA	http://www.thoreau.org/	Multi-sector	150,000	83	1996
	Together Center	Pam Mauk	Redmond, WA	http://www.togethercenter.org/	Service	35,000	20	1993

ASSIGNMENT #1

Name:

Organization:

Email:

1. Observe activities in your shared space over the next 6-8 weeks with a focus on collaboration. Try to be a neutral observer and not bring past experience to the task. Use the following space to jot down what you observe of tenants/partners in the space. What surprises you?

-
2. Do you have a current definition of collaboration that you use in your space? How do you communicate to tenant/partners your expectations around collaboration? If you already use a system to measure success around collaboration, please outline it here.

-
3. In what ways has collaboration in your center not met expectations? What isn't happening that you hoped would happen?

-
4. At our first video conference, we will establish norms for participating in The Collaboration Project. What would you like to see included in those ground rules/expectations?

ASSIGNMENT #2

1. *Read the attached article(s) on collaboration.*
2. *Contact your assigned partner by phone or email.*

Your Name/Organization:

1. What is your organization's definition of collaboration? Some of you included it in your HW#1, but please repeat here.
-

2. What is your partner's definition of collaboration?
-

3. After your discussion, what is your "ideal" definition of collaboration? Did it change?
-

4. What did your discussion prompt you to think about? Any questions you'd like to bring to the cohort?

ASSIGNMENT #3

“Why”

Your Name/Organization:

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

Choose a tenant who is **not** meeting your goals for collaboration at your center and ask the following question:

Choose a tenant who is meeting your goals for collaboration at your center. Ask the same questions:

What do you think about the level of nonprofit collaboration here at our center?

Why do you think tenants collaborate? Or why not?

Why does your organization participate at the level you do?

What are your goals for collaboration as a tenant here?

What could we do differently to get more involvement in nonprofit collaboration goals?

ASSIGNMENT #3 CONT.

“Why”

Your Name/Organization:

My Idea for a Prototype:

Behaviors I would like to change in my center:

To test my idea, I would ask Who, to do What, When and How?

Resources, Information & Decisions I would need to move this idea forward:

How I would measure success:

I would like others in the Collaboration Project to test my idea in their centers Yes No

I don't know yet what I would prototype in my Center but I'd like to work with others to develop something we can all try. Yes No

ASSIGNMENT #4

My Prototype

Your Name/Organization:

1. My Prototype Title:

2. The specific changes that I expect to see in my center after my prototype is complete:

3. To be even more specific, using the definition of Collaboration we came up with as a group, I expect to see the following types of collaboration as a result of my prototype:

Level of Engagement:	LOW or "Networking"	MEDIUM or "Coordination"	HIGH or "Collective Impact"
# of examples resulting:			

4. To prepare for my prototype, I'm taking the following planning steps (please include internal approvals needed, communications plans, logistics, etc):

a.

b.

c.

5. The person(s) who will do the work of coordinating the prototype is/are:

ASSIGNMENT #4 CONT.

My Prototype

Your Name/Organization:

1. The tenants/partners who will participate in the prototype are (organization name and individuals):
-

2. The way I'm going to implement my prototype (the activity I'm going to do) is:
-

3. The materials/equipment I'll need are:
-

4. My key dates and deadlines are:

ASSIGNMENT #5

Prototype Results

Your Name/Organization:

1. Please summarize your prototype (what actually happened versus what was planned):

2. What behavior changes among TENANTS/MEMBERS/PARTNERS have you observed as a result of your prototype?

3. If you can categorize any behavior changes according to our definitions of collaboration, please indicate below. Be as specific as possible!

Level of Engagement:	LOW or "Networking"	MEDIUM or "Coordination"	HIGH or "Collective Impact"
----------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

4. Has YOUR behavior changed in any way as a result of the prototype? Please describe.

5. What surprises happened during your prototype? Please describe anything that went differently than expected.

6. Please list any tools or materials you used in your prototype (interview questions, agendas, ice breaker activities, surveys, announcements) that you would be willing to share with others.

ASSIGNMENT #5 CONT.

Lapsed Prototypes

Your Name/Organization:

1. What were the challenges to completing a prototype?

2. If TIME was an issue, what took precedence?

3. How would you describe the support you received from your organization (supervisor, board, staff, etc) to do this work?

4. What would you have done differently?

5. How could The Collaboration Project (and NCN) have supported you better?

6. Please share any other insights you have about this experience.

ASSIGNMENT #6

Peer Reflection

Please review the homework of your partner. It may or may not include all items depending on what your partner was able to complete. Reflect on their journey since August as an organization and an individual. Reach out to your partner if you have questions.

Name of Reviewer:

Organization Reviewed:

1. What are three highlights or insights of the Organization/Prototype you reviewed that you think should be shared widely?

2. Did you notice any connections to your/your organization's experience? Please elaborate.

3. What advice or suggestions would you be willing to offer the organization you reviewed for their next steps?

4. Any other comments?


5. Based on this exercise and everything you have learned to-date about collaboration in shared space, what best practices would you recommend to a new shared space operator who wants to catalyze collaboration among their tenants?

1.

2.

3.

PROTOTYPE SUMMARY



Relationship Builders

ACSA: Chester Le Community Corner
 Foundation for Health Kentucky
 Jessie Ball DuPont Center
 Matrix Human Services

Prototype

Communication – Video
 Communication – Newsletter
 Group – Kick Off
 Group – Funding Pools

Dot Connectors

ACSA: Dorset Park Community Hub
 HNS Life Center
 Midland Shared Spaces
 New Path Foundation
 Nonprofit Village
 Thoreau Center

Group – Kick Off
 Group – Kick Off
 Individual – Interviews
 Group – Issue Areas
 Individual – Asset Mapping
 Individual – Asset Mapping

Impact Trackers

CommunityWise Resource Centre
 North County Hub/Leichtag Foundation
 Posner Center for International Dev
 Saskatoon Community Service Village
 Together Center

Group – Evaluation
 Group – Funding Pools
 Group – Funding Pools
 Group – Issues Areas
 Group - Interviews

TOOLKIT FOR COLLABORATION IN ONE HOUR

- ➔ Bring speakers to the meeting – brings something of value to tenants and prompts discussion
- ➔ Everyone goes around the table and answers the four following questions:
 1. You get the best of me when _____
 2. You get the worst of me when _____
 3. What I need from you: _____
 4. What you can count on me for: _____
- ➔ Speed dating – divide the group into two groups and set up the room so folks can talk in pairs. Rotate at regular intervals so everyone gets a chance to talk to each other. Give guided questions or allow the conversation to be free-form. Could use a combination of questions so that “social” time equals about 25% and business about 75%.
- ➔ Go around the room and have everyone give their elevator speech.
- ➔ Play a “Family Feud” type game and have teams guess each other’s missions, programs etc.
- ➔ Have the group “workshop” or solve a common problem or case study. The problem can be suggested by a tenant or a generic one.
- ➔ Match individuals according to organizational alignment, job function or personal interests – let them build relationships and trust for future collaboration.
- ➔ Use the hour to have tenants voice their needs and how they would like to engage in collaboration.
- ➔ Form a leadership group to give tenants a voice in future decision-making.
- ➔ Schedule 4 15 minute meet & greets with tenants

COHORT MEMBER SHARED RESOURCES

Together Center:

The Collaboration Project & Access to Services

Feb 8, 2016 rev

Together Center will interview Executive Directors and Front Line Managers to identify ways that together we can better meet our mutual goals to help people find the services they need. Together Center will identify potential additions to the model to advance collaborative work that benefits community needs and furthers agency goals.

Referrals: At Together Center Association meeting in January, the area of referrals was brought up as one of interest to agencies. One newer agency wanted information on how to referral. Another wanted more clients that were children, and asked for those referrals. This is an area that overlaps with agency goals.

- What can you tell me about referrals and your agencies, and your suggestions in regard to referrals: how referrals might be increased or information shared?

At our March 25 breakfast we hope to present stories from the campus, including

- Why staff work here at Together Center (what is your story?) and/or
- How clients benefit from Together Center and your work?
- Would you be available for film or for quick couple sentences AT our event

Is collaboration among Together Center members helpful (or would be helpful) for enabling you to achieve the goals of your organization?

- What would collaborative success look like for you?
- What should be added?

Would other involvement/engagement by agencies increase benefits?

- What would that look like?
- What is the role of Together Center staff, if any, in encouraging helpful collaboration among members?
- Why do you think members (including you/your organization) collaborate? Or, why not?

Are there tactics Together Center might use to better promote both your agency's work and the Center?

- How do we collectively get the word out so people know resources are here/
- May I take your Photo?

North County Hub Micro Grant Program

The Leichtag Foundation would like to encourage more creative and strategic collaborations between Hub organizations.

The purpose of the micro grant is to incentivize and inspire collaborative programming on the Leichtag property, E3 cluster partners (ie: San Diego Botanic Gardens, Farm Lab, Heritage Museum), and other agricultural based locations. There is a preference for programs that integrate creative Jewish engagement with food, farm and social justice related work.

Micro grants will be awarded within the range of \$150 - \$1500, depending on the scale of the project, the number of organizations collaborating and the potential impact.

Eligibility:

Core members of the North County Hub are eligible to apply for Micro Grants at this time. Volunteer leaders involved with your organizations that want to host small scale programs for their peer groups (Moishe House without Walls Hosts, Hillel student leaders, Shalom Baby families etc.) will be eligible for grants of \$150-\$350, and can only be submitted after being vetted by a staff member from a core member organization.

Each organization is eligible for up to \$1500 in total for the program year, which would include any grants made to volunteers associated with your organization. If two or more organizations submit an idea for a larger scale program with a budget over \$1500, each organization may use their funds towards the budget. This should be indicated in the micro grant application. These requests will be processed and paid as grants to your organizations.

Criteria:

- Strong preference is given to projects that include creative, cross sector collaborations (ie: Farming, Jewish Life, Arts/Culture, Self-Sufficiency, Refugee Services, Israeli Connections, etc.)
- Programmatic ideas related to the agricultural festivals of Passover, Shavuot, Sukkot and Tu b'shevat are strongly encourage. Creative Shabbat experiences are also strongly encouraged, including Havdalah. Hub organizations should consider programs during the weeklong festival of Sukkot as eligible for this mini grant opportunity
- Strong preference will be given for projects that entail a collaboration with another Hub organization. Additional collaborations with non-Hub organizations are eligible as well, but a Hub organization MUST be the lead partner.
- Proposals from Hub organization volunteers do not necessarily need to have the same level of collaboration (though that would be welcome!) and are eligible for \$150-\$350 per event. Core Hub members should reach out to their volunteer

leaders to solicit programmatic ideas and work with them to complete the online proposal. It is expected that all proposals submitted have been vetted by that particular Hub organization staff (ie: MHWOW host proposal has been reviewed by MH staff).

Process and Timeline:

- All proposals should be submitted through our online system:
- Proposals will be accepted on a rolling basis, but please submit requests at least 8 weeks prior to the event/program date. In addition to filling out the micro grant application, please also fill out an event request worksheet if your program is happening onsite so that the date/logistical needs for your event are reserved.
- You will receive a response within one week of your submission. If your program is happening on site, please reach out to Leichtag Events Manager a minimum of 30 days prior to your event to ensure all logistical needs/details are discussed.

Evaluation

There will be a micro grant post event report that is to be submitted by each organization within 1 week of the event. Hub Manager will provide each organization with a link to the report at the completion of the event.

JBdC Tenant Collaboration Brainstorm Session

Facilitation Team Meeting

Pre-Event:

- Communicate with tenants that we will need at least 4-5 reps from each organization present
- Communicate with tenants that they should bring their phones, wallets, and business cards to the event
- Reach out to tenant organizations to donate money (\$20) to buy prizes
- Reach out to surrounding businesses to donate gift cards/prizes
- Casa Dora, Super Food, Chomp Chomp, Hyatt (starbucks), Burrito Gallery, Indochine

Registration:

- Attendees will be assigned to a table with individuals from other organizations.
- Attendees will be instructed to create a family/team name with the other individuals at their table and decorate their table tent with that family/team name.
- Build personal relationships by meeting new people and knowing what organization they work for: Facilitated by FM
- 15 minutes

Scavenger Hunt:

Teams will be told different items they must find at their table and the first team to get all/most items wins.

Identifying skills and talents to improve the experience of working in the building: Facilitated by KW

- 25 minutes
- Room will breakout into four corners based on areas of interest: individuals interested in specific area get together and come up with one idea to present to the rest of the group.

4 areas of interest:

- Fine arts/ Music
- Health Wellness/ Cooking/ Gardening
- Interpersonal (skills development)
- Finance/ Technology
- Provide individuals with comment cards so all ideas are heard

**Expand understanding of what each organization does and how they do it:
Facilitated by BJ**

- 15 minutes
- Family Feud: Organizational informational
- Use family names created at beginning of event

JBdC Tenant Collaboration Brainstorm Session Facilitation Team Meeting Continued...

JBdC Collaboration Brainstorming Session

- 4-4:05 (5 minutes): Introduction
- 4:05-4:17 (12 minutes): Build personal relationship
- Scavenger Hunt led by FM with First Coast YMCA
4:17-4:40 (23 minutes): Identify skills and talents
- Breakout session led by KW from Delores Barr Weaver Policy Center
4:40-4:55 (15 minutes): Expand understanding of tenant missions
- Family feud game led by BJ from Big Brothers Big Sisters of Northeast Florida
4:55-5 (5 minutes): Wrap up and next steps

JBdC Activity Planning Form

Name:
Goal:
Time Frame:
Materials needed:
Room set up:
Facilitation Team member names:
Outline: (no more than 10 min increments)

Time	Step	Person	Instructions



Memorandum of Understanding Between

AWC, Inc. And EWI

This Memorandum of Understanding is drafted by Nonprofit Village for the purpose of clarifying and documenting the parties' intentions to collaborate. It is entered into on March _, 2016.

Whereas:

1. AWC, Inc. and EWI are Nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporations that wish to partner with each other to share information, resources and to conduct a joint event.
2. AWC agrees to develop for and share with EWI criteria for referring individuals to its services. EWI agrees to refer individuals to AWC, according to these criteria.
3. EWI agrees to develop for and share with AWC criteria for referring individuals to its services. AWC agrees to refer individuals to EWI, according to these criteria.
4. AWC and EWI agree to develop and host an event, the purpose of which will be to expose clients of AWC to EWI's entrepreneurship training. The event will take place by August 2016.
5. AWC and EWI agree to market the aforementioned event by including notices in newsletters, on their website and in other media as appropriate.
6. This Memorandum does not constitute a legally binding agreement.

The above terms are hereby accepted and agreed. The parties note that Nonprofit Village is committed to assisting in facilitating this collaboration generally and the above mentioned event particularly, including by, but not limited to hosting the event or securing a venue at which it can be hosted, and advertising the event in its social media and communications.

Executive Director
AWC, Inc.

Date

Program Manager
EWI

Date

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GEO Funders. *What Are the Different Ways to Collaborate?* Washington, DC: Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, Print

Himmelman, Arthur T. *Collaboration for a Change: Definitions, Decision-making models, Roles, and Collaboration Process Guide*. Minneapolis: Himmelman Consulting, 2002. Print.

Long, Ryan. *The Collaboration Project*. University of Colorado at Denver, School of Public Affairs, 2015.

MacIntosh, John and Lois Savage. *The Myths and Reality of Nonprofit Collaboration: Observations From Six Years in the Trenches*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Social Innovations Journal. 2015. Print.

Neuhoff, Alex, Katie Smith Milway, Reilly Kiernan, and Josh Grehan. *Making Sense of Nonprofit Collaborations*. Boston: The Bridgespan Group and The Lodestar Foundation, 2014. Print.

