Community Foundation Collaborations

Passing Fad or Promising Practice?
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Definition: Collaboration

Collaborative working describes joint working by two or more charities in order to fulfil their purposes, whilst remaining as separate organisations.

This may relate to any aspect of the charities’ operational activity, including administration, fundraising, profile enhancement, resource sharing and streamlining of costs and service delivery.

Source: Charity Commission, UK
Definition: Merger

The merger of charities means two or more separate charities coming together to form one organisation. In such cases, either a new charity is formed to carry on the work or take on the assets of the original charities, or one charity assumes control of another. Trustees must act in accordance with the powers in their charity’s governing document or those given to them by law to make sure that any merger is legally sound.

Source: Charity Commission, UK

“There aren’t many examples (of mergers) out there because it hasn’t really been done...The issues ...raised are pretty much the same whether the community foundation is in Cape Town, Liverpool, Oklahoma City or Sofia.” Dorothy Reynolds, C S Mott Foundation (in conversation), October 2009
The call for collaborative solutions is embraced. Academy members note that the shift in problem-solving from government to the private sector requires a shift in thinking towards collaboration.

Community foundations are uniquely positioned to facilitate these arrangements with outside entities and among themselves. Communities will become stronger by moving past the question, ‘Who is responsible?’ to answer, ‘How do we do it together?’

Robert H Martin, New Promise: The Transatlantic View, commenting on One the Brink of New Promise on behalf of the Transatlantic Community Foundation Network, 2009
Why Collaborate?

What are you doing to save time?
CF Collaboration
Concepts & Rationales

• Universal coverage and access
• Cost effectiveness
• Economies of scale
• Leveraging resources
• Peer learning
• Greater impact
• Increased visibility

Run DMC & Aerosmith performing ‘Walk this Way’ – A great collaboration.
CF Collaboration Types

- Community funds / affiliates
- Regional community foundations
- Technology
- Investment management
- Strategic partnerships / programs
- Shared administration/operational activities

A collaboration that didn’t create the greatest song?!?
Collaboration Benefits

• Cost benefits
• Improvement to the quality of service
• Ability to reach more diverse group of beneficiaries
• Ability to gain access to expertise and talent, none could afford alone
• Greater impact to beneficiaries
• Ability to unlock funding due to joint expertise or resources

Community Foundation Collaborations in the UK
Collaboration Examples in the UK

• Outsourcing functions, such as finance, IT and payroll services
• Sharing resources, such as training
• Co-locating and sharing offices and resources
• Formal partnerships in which resources are pooled to secure staff or services that none could afford on their own
• Joint projects or programmes for aspects of service delivery

What are the opportunities in working collaboratively with other CFs?

- 36.4% Greater Social Impact in Grant-Making
- 45.5% Cost Efficiencies in Running Costs
- 90.9% Pooled Expertise
- 54.5% Greater Funding and Donor Opportunities
- 36.4% Improved Donor Services
- 45.5% Improved Community Leadership Role

Survey: 14 out of 58 senior community foundation staff surveyed during November 2009 to March 2010 - 79% of respondents were CEOs. Survey achieved a 24% response rate from the UK Network.
What are the risks involved in working collaboratively with other CFs?

- 60% Loss of Local Focus
- 20% Greater Running Costs
- 30% Damage to Own Reputation
- 40% Leadership Issues
- 30% Complicated Governance
- 20% Poor Communication Issues
- 60% People or Personality Issues
- 30% Unwillingness from own CF
- 40% Unwillingness from other CFs
Community Foundation Collaborations in Canada

Content Source: Community Foundations for Canada 2011
Canadian Collaboration Examples

1. **Programs and Services:**
   Vital Signs, OLTA, Lake Winnipeg Watershed, NB Poverty Reduction; Marketing and Communications

2. **Administration/operation/infrastructure:**
   administrative hub, shared financial management, management agreement, joint professional development; website

3. **Community Funds:**
   within and outside service areas

“Most partnerships between community foundations are focused on either programs and services, or administration and infrastructure.”

Community Foundation Strategic Alliances: Partnering for Impact and Sustainability, Community Foundations of Canada
CFC ‘Better Together’
Study Findings (a)

Regional Alliances can:

- Reduced operational costs
- Increase organisational capacity
- Increase assets
- Improve accountability
- Leverage funds, resources and knowledge
- Strengthen regional voice and policy presence
- Unite philanthropy on a regional level
CFC ‘Better Together’
Study Findings (b)

Successful alliances can:

• Help the CF field-at-large increase its ability and capacity for philanthropy building (71%)

• Help build public trust and credibility for the sector (59%)

• Help philanthropy come together on other issues (49%)
Community Foundation
Collaboration Practicalities
Collaboration Considerations: Strategic

- Arrangements which **value each party’s independence**
- **Compatible activities** and organisational structures
- **Clear definition** of, and accounting for, what each relevant CF is responsible and liable for
- Agreements which are proportionate to the relative risks and complexity of the collaboration
- **Termination clause** in any formal contract
- The collaboration furthers each CF’s objectives and business plan
- It is appropriate use of CF’s funds?
- Type of agreement – contract, service level agreement, memoranda of understanding

Collaboration Considerations: Practical

Expectations for how partners will work together; define values, rules, relationships and responsibilities.

• **Important for guiding activities**; critical reference when problems arise

• Should be clear, sufficiently detailed, complete

• Some principals will be generic around working together; some will be specific around project work

• Everyone must be able to commit
Factors for Success

• Shared vision or similar aims/philosophy
• Financial support
• Full co-operative working/openness and desire between parties
• Boards that can collaborate and not feel one is superior to the other
• Strong leadership; the role of the Board and Chief Executive
• Positive people and their attitude - changes in staff personnel and the timing of those changes can make all the difference.
• Good communication and consultation –”bullying” is not the way
• Insight into each others’ organisations and detailed preparation

Factors for Failure

• No shared vision or philosophy
• Too much bureaucracy
• **Strong leadership**: the role of the Board and Chief Executive
• No consultation and poor communication
• Complicated paper-work / financial problems
• Clash of functions or leadership
• Overbearing for small charities
• **Financial cost and unforeseen costs**
• Lack of interest
• Fear of charity’s loss of identity
• Charity Commission will raise objectives

In Order To Succeed

You must stick to your mission and vision...

I regret nothing.
UK Case Study

Case Study:
Lancashire – Merseyside Model

Background:
- Grant making in Merseyside since 1999 and in Lancashire since 2003
- CFM established in 1999 as registered charity
- CFL established in 2007 as a registered charity
- Restructure implemented in January 2010 to create one staff team
- Cross-Board working group established in January 2010
Case Study: Lancashire – Merseyside Model

There are two key aspects to try and identify through the measures:

1. That the overheads of the “whole” are less than the overheads of the two units operated separately.

2. That the activity level (donor base and grant programme) of the “whole” is greater than the activity level of the two units operated separately.
Case Study: Lancashire – Merseyside Model

Measurements of Successful Collaboration:

1. Chief Executive Deployment
2. Staff Optimisation/ Deployment
3. Donor Activity (Base Level and Growth)
4. Grants Activity (Base Level and Growth)

See ‘Case Study’ Handout for more details.
Questions?
UK Charity Commission Articles and Toolkits via www.charitycommission.gov.uk:
- RS 4a - Collaborative working and mergers (2003)
- CC34 - Collaborative Working and Mergers (2009)
- Merger Toolkit (2009)

Cathy Elliott, Chief Executive,
Community Foundations for Lancashire & Merseyside, UK
W: www.cfmerseyside.org.uk / www.lancsfoundation.org.uk
E: cathy.elliott@cfmerseyside.org.uk
Useful Resources

Canada


• An Examination of Regional Collaborations, *Community Foundations of Canada* (2007)

• CFC Tips and Tools: Regional and Affiliate Community Foundations

Barbara McMillan, Director of Regional Strategies
Community Foundations for Canada
W: www.cfc-fcc.ca
E: bmcmillan@cfc-fcc.ca
You can’t force collaboration, but you can expect it - Start with people who want to collaborate.....

THANK YOU
A Collaboration Debate:
Challenges & Ethics
Julian Rathbone
Ratbone Investment Management