

# *The Eight Neighbors: A Case Study in Collaboration and Formalization*

## *Abstract*

This case demonstrates most clearly the challenges to starting and sustaining a collaborative partnership. By examining the different steps that the Eight Neighbors partnership has taken between September 2008 and August 2010, this case also highlights the potential benefits and challenges to tackling community-wide issues with an approach that involves different sectors and a diverse set of stakeholders.

## *Case*

On a muggy afternoon in August 2010, in eight office buildings across the Washington, DC area, eight leaders looked out the windows of their conference rooms, and collectively sighed. Each person was the executive director, president or CEO of an umbrella organization representing the various sectors of the Washington Metropolitan Region—business, government, philanthropy, and nonprofits. On that August afternoon, each leader paused to consider his or her individual goals, responsibilities, vision, commitments and challenges. Having weathered the acute economic crisis of 2008, each person still felt concerned about what the next few years might bring for the members that his or her organization represented and the Washington, DC Metropolitan Region at large.

Without a doubt, things were looking up, and most of the leaders credited their involvement with the Eight Neighbors partnership for helping make that possible. For the past two years, this group had worked together to search for cross-sectoral approaches to solving many of the challenges facing the region, particularly those facing the region's nonprofit organizations. Each leader was confident in their organizations and their abilities to support their members as they squarely faced these challenges. Moreover, each quickly saw many ways that Eight Neighbors could help them better achieve their own organization's goals, and help realize the cross-sectoral solutions that all believed were critical to fulfilling their larger visions for the region.

But many looming challenges still existed for each organization's members. As the economy stubbornly refused to recover fully, local governments were facing major

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

budget deficits. Nonprofit organizations were facing more battles for funding and at the same time, increasing demand for services. And the business sector was still trying to cut its losses and manage the ongoing credit fallout. Despite their different struggles, everyone was asking themselves similar questions. How much could the partnership help them support their members through these challenges? How should the partnership be structured to maximize its potential impact? In what ways could each of the leaders count on the Eight Neighbors partnership as they thought strategically about their own work for the next few years? Had the usefulness of the partnership faded, as the original reason for collaboration was no longer? They all thought back to where their organizations were in September 2008—the moment that gave rise to the Eight Neighbors partnership. The acute pain of the economic crisis was about to peak, and the first signs of problems for the region appeared when Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the region's largest corporate donors to nonprofit organizations, were placed into federal conservatorship.

### *A Sudden Loss of Funding*

The Washington DC region is unique in many respects. Its economic engine is the federal government, and is home to many corporations who do business with the federal government. Nearly 5.4 million people live across two different states and a federal district. The region also boasts a very active nonprofit sector. Organizations in each sector have tried to coordinate across the different jurisdictions and this work has given rise to strong umbrella membership organizations. However, given the degree of complexity within each sector, collaboration across sectors has historically been a challenge in this region.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were two corporations that set roots in the DC area because of their close affiliation with the federal government. As the corporations grew, they became more integrated with the local community, and rose to become the two largest corporate donors to nonprofit organizations in the region.

However, in September 2008, following the upheaval in the housing markets, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were placed into federal conservatorship in an effort to cut their losses, and mitigate the damage the two public corporations could potentially bring to the federal government. As the two corporations operated under a federal mandate, the federal government felt a responsibility to step in to help the companies avoid fiscal ruin. The Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) was given control over Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's finances in order to restructure them to ensure their fiscal soundness, as well as preserve the congressionally-chartered role that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac filled in the provision of affordable housing. This restructuring, by putting the future of

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's financial structures in question, placed in jeopardy all the funding commitments that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac had made but not yet fulfilled in 2008. At risk was \$47 million in grants to 400 nonprofits in the region.

This moment was startling for all sectors in the region. Nonprofit organizations were terrified of what the loss of funds could mean for their operations. Other private corporations and grantmakers had no idea how they could pick up the slack when they were also facing the prospect of having to cut back on giving. And government agencies were similarly bracing themselves for budget shortfalls. So the umbrella organizations of each sector, hearing the chorus of doubts, fears and frustrations among their members, snapped into action. At the initiation of Washington Regional Association of Grantmakers (WRAG), seven organizations came together to brainstorm a collaborative response. While WRAG was the professional association to which Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae belonged, and thus the most directly involved with the changes, all the organizations had been asking themselves what the conservatorship would mean for them and their members. This initial group of seven organizations included the following:

- The Center for Nonprofit Advancement, led by Glen O'Gilvie, representing local nonprofit organizations;
- The Greater Washington Board of Trade, led by James Dinegar, representing local businesses and corporations;
- Leadership Greater Washington, led by Tim Kime, representing leaders from different sectors who were focused on improving the region;
- Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, led by David Robertson, whose members are local governments and federal government representatives from the Washington Area;
- The Nonprofit Roundtable, led by Chuck Bean, representing local non-profit organizations;
- The United Way of the National Capital Area, led at the time by Angela Woods, and succeeded in 2009 by William Hanbury, and
- Washington Regional Association of Grantmakers, led by Tamara Lucas Copeland, representing foundations and corporate giving programs in the region. (Please see Attachment 1 for a more detailed description of the constituency and mission of each group)

Quickly realizing that this problem was too big for any one organization or sector to solve, this group decided to work together intensely on this issue, meeting on a weekly basis. Their objective was to convince the Conservator (the head of the FHFA) to create a way for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to honor their 2008 grant commitments.

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

Their carefully targeted approach had two main prongs—concise, consistent messaging, and a carefully planned advocacy strategy.

With so many people engaged in working to preserve existing funding levels, it was essential that the overall message not become muddled. Consequently, the seven leaders developed clear, shared language for everyone to use in discussing the situation. This language was designed to be shared among the constituencies of the member organizations as well. Included in this language was an assessment of the impact of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac on the region through their corporate giving. The members of the partnership worked together to gather stories about nonprofit organizations that would be impacted by a loss of funding from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. These messages resonated well and several pieces were written in the *Washington Post* about the situation. One notable article was published on September 14, 2008 (a week after the conservatorship plan was announced) that featured the voices of three members of the partnership and seven executive directors of nonprofit organizations in the region.

Simultaneously, the seven leaders began an advocacy campaign. A letter to the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency was written and co-signed by all seven leaders. The members also designed and implemented a legislative advocacy strategy for Congress, wherein they reached out to the local delegation from Maryland and Virginia and DC's congressional representative to share their message and educate them about the risks to the region associated with a dramatic cut in funding from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The partners in this collaboration also organized their own members to reach out to the local legislators with the same message, concentrating on two specific call-in days. This work resulted in a letter from the delegation of Congressional representatives to the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, asking him to consider the impact of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's charitable giving on the region.

Ultimately the goal of the seven members of this partnership was achieved. In late December 2008, the FHFA gave Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac permission to award their 2008 grants and in 2009 they sought proposals to continue funding nonprofit organizations in the Washington Metropolitan Area.

The leaders realized that in responding to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the group had built a strong momentum. "It could have taken months or years for some connections to have been made that were made much faster because we had a 'shared enemy.' We were a group immediately. Where some people come together and become a group over time, we were a group the minute we came into the room together," says Tamara Copeland. "This was a case of having the right people in the right crisis," adds Glen O'Gilvie. The leaders of the seven organizations considered their group as a valuable

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

asset and, since the larger economic challenges appeared to be continuing, the group could be potentially useful in the future. They realized that the ways the group could share information between sectors was very helpful. They also learned that in working together they could develop a consistent message to their various audiences. And they found that their respective memberships were very pleased to see them all working together to find the solution. "It felt like our constituents benefit from it because we're all working collectively for a solution. We are usually a very fragmented community and we were more cohesive through this," says Tim Kime.

### *The Formation of the Eight Neighbors Partnership*

Though the work with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac was not fully completed until late 2008, the seven members heard the loud and clear call for more assistance and solutions on behalf of the nonprofit sector and began responding in October 2008. While the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac campaign had a definitive, tangible goal, unfortunately the economic challenges facing nonprofit organizations had fewer simple solutions. The partners needed to decide whether to keep working together, or whether their collaboration had reached a natural close.

The group of seven who worked on the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac campaign believed strongly in the power of cross-sectoral collaborations, so they sought a way to continue the collaborative dynamic that proved successful in the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac campaigns. Their first major step was planning a three-hour long panel discussion and forum called Nonprofit 911. For this event, the seven partners brought in the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region, bringing the group to the eight partners who comprise Eight Neighbors. The organization manages funds and grants for individual donors in the area and is the largest funder of nonprofits in the region. It is run by Terri Freeman, who took the lead in working with the Eight Neighbors Partnership.

The event was held in mid-December 2008, and was billed as a convening "to develop a plan of action that redefines how the nonprofit sector operates in this new fiscal reality." The event invited Alice Rivlin, an esteemed researcher at the Brookings Institution, to talk about the economic forecast for the region. It also featured a panel discussion between four of the eight partners—Chuck Bean, Tamara Copeland, Jim Dinegar and David Robertson—who spoke about the challenges that each of their respective sectors was facing. This panel was moderated by the well-known host of a local news radio program. The largest component of the seminar, however, was an hour-long conversation between all participants. Included in the audience were nonprofit professionals, grantmakers, corporate representatives, and government officials.

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

Professionally facilitated, this conversation was intended to provide attendees from all of the region's sectors an opportunity to work together to brainstorm solutions.

Nonprofit 911 was considered a huge success by the eight leaders, drawing a crowd of 500 people who were invested in the success of the region's nonprofit sector. Jim Dinegar of the Greater Washington Board of Trade cited the united front that the event was able to present: "The event showed everyone that the leaders were together and that we know that this is a big issue not just happening to one organization." Terri Freeman was pleased with the event as well: "The message that the [nonprofit] sector and the community was hearing was very consistent and the media started to take the [nonprofit] sector seriously. Everyone there realized that the economic crisis was more serious than just the nonprofits and a couple of poor people, that [the weakening of the nonprofit sector] has impact across the board and that there was shared concern about this issue." In fact, there was significant media coverage of the message that preceded and came out of the event. News and commentary from multiple sources sent the message that the nonprofit sector was facing trouble, and that broader collaboration across the sectors would help everyone arrive at a better solution. Overall, says Chuck Bean of the Nonprofit Roundtable, "[Nonprofit 911] was like a touchstone---in one event you could hear what the region thinks we should do in this economic downturn."

Seeing a clear demand to continue their collaboration, the eight groups decided to continue working together, and sought a name to call themselves to begin formalizing the partnership. Names related to the Nonprofit 911 event, such as the Nonprofit 911 Committee, were not fitting, given the depth of field and the forward-looking perspective that the members wanted to adopt. After considering the idea of calling themselves the G8, evocative of the Group of 8 partnership between nations, they settled on something more local—Eight Neighbors. Henceforth, the eight umbrella organizations that had produced the Nonprofit 911 event would work together under the mantle of the Eight Neighbors partnership. Though a mission for the group has never been expressly defined, the purpose of the group is captured well in the follow-up report to the Nonprofit 911 seminar:

*"The magnitude and breadth of the recession and the subsequent erosion of the tax base, jobs and charitable giving continue to shine a bright light on the urgent need to pull together—for multi-headed leadership and actions that transcend all kinds of boundaries, including geographic and sector, in order to help our neighbors. So, drawing on our common vested interest in the well-being of the Washington area, Eight Neighbors committed to working together in 2008—in whatever combinations are most effective and in the best interest of the whole Washington region, especially our most vulnerable neighbors."*

## ***The Eight Neighbors Get to Work***

Following Nonprofit 911, the Eight Neighbors partnership's meetings took on a more concrete structure and tone. Though the meetings varied in frequency, ranging from every Friday afternoon when the partnership was beginning, to once every three or four weeks by August 2010, they have always been held in the offices of the Community Foundation. Additionally, all leaders cite a high level of collegiality, professional respect, and camaraderie among the group. A major contributing factor has been the willingness of the leaders themselves to attend; indeed, the eight leaders have never sent staff in their places (though on occasion, staff have been involved with some follow-up assignments). The leaders themselves take the minutes from the meetings, and leave with a set of tasks to pursue. At each meeting, all the leaders give an update about what is going on among their own constituencies, and discuss ways that the other members of the partnership could work together on supporting projects at the different organizations. After this conversation, the leaders discuss the tasks that were assigned from the previous meeting. While a departure from their usual high-level leadership work, this equal commitment from everyone is motivating to several members. "There is a sense of collegiality and camaraderie that we're all in this together. There is synergy around the collaboration, and it's actually a place where one plus one equals three or four. That is why I'm doing it and very supportive [of Eight Neighbors]," says Bill Hanbury. Glen O'Gilvie also cites the genuine respect that the leaders have for one another as critical to the success of the group, noting that such a lack of competition between leaders is rare.

For much of 2009, the work of the Eight Neighbors partnership was intended to assist the nonprofit sector of the Washington Metropolitan Area in three ways: informationsharing, collaboration between pairs of the eight partners, and promotion of charitable giving and volunteering through a coordinated giving campaign. While the information sharing and side collaboration among the partners were fruitful enterprises, the coordinated giving campaign was less successful, and caused the leaders to question some of the benefits of partnership.

## ***Information is Shared between the Eight Neighbors***

Every one of the leaders involved with Eight Neighbors felt that the partnership was an excellent way to stay informed with one another, and learn about news that was critical to its members. While the leaders had all known each other for several years, and crossed paths in several different capacities before, this was the first time that all of them were being intentional about facilitating cross-sectoral collaboration among each

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

other. Thus, in meetings, they tried to keep each other informed of the activities of their own organizations, both formally and informally.

Over the course of 2009, many of the partners conducted surveys of their constituencies to understand how the economy was impacting their practices. This information was then shared with and analyzed by all the partners. For instance, Washington Grantmakers found in a survey of their members that 48% anticipated reducing their 2009 grants budgets, and over half ultimately did. This information was helpful to Chuck Bean and Glen O’Gilvie, since they could then brainstorm ways to assist their members in addressing these cutbacks. This survey information was also useful to Terri Freeman of the Community Foundation and Bill Hanbury of the United Way of the National Capital Area. As they understood where the region’s institutional grantmakers might be cutting back, they could make decisions about how to prioritize their own funding. And for the other leaders in the partnership, though the information may not have directly influenced a decision about their own operations, the survey data helped them understand the context and environment in which their members were operating.

Additionally, the communication promoted greater alignment between organizational programs and their long-term impact. Says Bill Hanbury: “We weren’t talking to the Community Foundation or the Nonprofit Roundtable about outcomes before the Eight Neighbors came along, so, for example the Community Foundation has 700 funds that they are managing and many of those have done certain programs and know what the inputs and the outcomes are. United Way is also funding those kinds of programs. Now there are some more direct links between the two organizations to evaluate those programmatic inputs and outcomes.”

What’s more, the information sharing between groups helped broaden the network of each leader, increasing their abilities to help their members resolve issues, tackle problems, and work across sectors. “[Eight Neighbors] served as a conduit for getting you in touch with the right person. There’s a value in this,” says Tim Kime.

### ***Smaller Partnerships Develop among the Eight Neighbors***

This shared information about each organization’s needs, initiatives, challenges and opportunities suggested many different courses of action by the members of the Eight Neighbors partnership. But it often was not practical or feasible for all eight organizations to work together on a project. As a result, the information shared between the Eight Neighbors partners also led to “one-offs” or “two-offs,” where smaller partnerships would develop to tackle a particular issue or project that was most directly relevant to the work of particular organizations. Through this smaller-scale



Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

collaboration, each organization could engage on projects where it had resources and expertise, and play a less direct role in projects where it lacked expertise. This model yielded several interesting projects that might have developed outside the Eight Neighbors partnership, but probably emerged more quickly and were stronger because of the partnership. The following examples illustrate the different ways the partners worked together over the course of 2009.

The leadership of the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region was concerned about the need to support the safety net projects of the Washington Metropolitan Area, and saw a way they could address the problems the Eight Neighbors were collectively working to solve. Thus, they started the Neighbors in Need fund to provide grants to groups that were vulnerable because of increased demands for services and decreased availability of funds. The fund was managed and operated under the Community Foundation's programs, but was seeded with initial investments from local corporations, the Community Foundation's existing donors, and local foundations. The ability to reach out to these groups by talking directly with the Board of Trade and Washington Grantmakers, and the ability to connect with leaders at these groups through their involvement with Leadership Greater Washington helped the Community Foundation efficiently get in touch with the right people. Moreover, by working with the Eight Neighbors, the Community Foundation's solicitation for funding support was very compelling, since it demonstrated the Foundation's commitment to finding solutions to the region's problems on many levels.

Another initiative prompted by work at the Eight Neighbors partnership level was a meeting that was held between the local banking community and the nonprofit and grantmaking sectors. The Eight Neighbors identified a need for the nonprofit sector to understand more about their options in the face of a tightening credit market and for banks to understand how they could help improve the situation that nonprofit organizations were facing. Banks are a key part of the membership of the Greater Washington Board of Trade, so the Board of Trade arranged for several bankers to come together to meet with various leaders representing the nonprofit and grantmaking communities at the Eight Neighbors partnership. With the improved ability to link these groups, a meeting was planned and held to address this issue directly, helping to enhance collaborative ties between the banking and nonprofit communities in the region.

The Nonprofit Roundtable, in its goals for 2009, wanted to push nonprofit leaders to be visionary and rethink conventional management strategies and programming. The organization thus coordinated a series of workshops during the spring of 2009 that were called "New Ways of Working Together." The meetings were led by the Nonprofit

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

Roundtable, but the Center for Nonprofit Advancement, the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region, Leadership Greater Washington, and the United Way of the National Capital Area were also host organizers. Their engagement in this workshop series was important because in reaching out to their respective networks, a wider diversity of nonprofit and philanthropic leaders came to the event. This diversity was critical in that it provided the necessary condition to be able to develop truly new strategies for the nonprofit organizations to work together.

Another collaboration spurred by Eight Neighbors began as a benefit offered by The Center for Nonprofit Advancement to its members, entitled the Back Office in a Box program. At an Eight Neighbors meeting, the Center for Nonprofit Advancement informally mentioned the salience of the program, which facilitates an organization outsourcing its financial management tasks. The model has since been adopted by some of the other organizations themselves to help reduce their own costs. Though some side projects from the Eight Neighbors partnership have developed as a result of more intentional communication, others, like Back Office in a Box, have come about more organically.

Not all groups have engaged at a similar level in these partnerships; over the course of 2009, some of the leaders engaged in more of these offline projects than others. But the Eight Neighbors partnership deserves credit for strengthening these initiatives, even though they still may have occurred in the absence of the partnership. Tamara Copeland summarizes: "All work is built on relationships. Having that strong connection over a period of time certainly strengthened the connective tissue among the group and subsets of the group."

### ***A Coordinated Giving Campaign is Considered***

The third major way that the Eight Neighbors partnership worked together in the aftermath of the December 2008 Nonprofit 911 seminar was consideration of a coordinated giving campaign. The partners certainly were hearing from local nonprofits about the serious programmatic impacts of funding cutbacks. So in addition to helping nonprofit organizations uncover new, more efficient ways to operate and work together the partners began planning a giving campaign that would reach the entire region. The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region had shared their communications consultant with the Eight Neighbors partnership, and this project quickly engaged the consultant very deeply. However, the members of the Eight Neighbors partnership began to be concerned that they had lost their perspective on the project, the potential sustainability of the campaign, and the overall goals for the campaign.

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

Due to these concerns, this coordinated campaign never reached fruition. "We had an overly-inflated sense of our own capabilities, [thinking] that we could come up with an idea, design it, build it, sell it and raise the money and doing it all as eight individuals with no staff support, no budget, no anything," says David Robertson. Notes Chuck Bean: "We just need to use foresight about what we can do and can't do as a group of eight. We need to think about what's our value-added that's beyond any of our organizations or beyond any organization that already exists. Raising money for nonprofits is kind of the mission of the United Way and the Community Foundation, so for a group of eight of us to take it on-- to what extent are we doing their mission?"

Shortly after they agreed to abandon this idea, the discouraged partners stopped meeting on a regular basis, citing a need to get fresh perspective and rethink next steps for the partnership.

### *Taking the Eight Neighbors Partnership to its Next Stage*

Following a few months away from the partnership, the Eight Neighbors decided to reconvene as a group again in the fall of 2009. This time, instead of coming together in a purely reactive way, the group reconvened because of the value that each member placed on the partnership and the relationships that it fostered. Rather than their initial formation due to the urgency of a situation to which the partners had to respond, the group reconvened with a more pro-active perspective, through more tentative than before.

Since their decision to renew meetings, short-term, smaller partnerships continue to develop and information sharing remains an essential part of the partnership. However, the idea of a larger operational initiative remains unexplored and other campaigns and events like Nonprofit 911 remain undefined.

The members are generally content with the current status quo, and they are very committed to preserving the form and tone of the partnership, even though it can present challenges. The camaraderie, professional respect, and commitment to improving the region as a whole keeps the individuals committed to the partnership in spite of the significant absence of a defined mission statement, a governance structure, specific priorities, and an operational infrastructure. David Robertson of the Council of Governments notes the difficulty of organization that this presents: "The informality has made it difficult to organize as a team of eight. Because we have no staff, we have no structure and we have no budget, any time we want to work on a project its sweat equity or we all chip in. That's hard but on the other hand I think probably keeping it lightly formal is the better way to go at the moment." Nonetheless, other members of

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

the group believe that the informality can be helpful. "I think the fact that we are somewhat informal, very organic, and fluid and we've let what is in the air identify what we need to do—I think that's just the best way for it to be. Structure has its place and process has its place but too much of either can overtake something and it becomes something that it's not," says Terri Freeman of the Community Foundation. Tamara Copeland concurs: "I believe that the power of the group hasn't been realized, in that I think our real power rests in a true collective of the groups. Have there been partnership opportunities that have emerged through this? Yes. But as far as the power of us acting as a collective entity—that to me is where the real power lies and I think we haven't gotten there yet. But I think we're on the way."

This potential is illustrated in the ambitious growth plan developed in 2010 by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments for the year 2050 in consultation with the Eight Neighbors. Called *Region Forward*, the Council of Governments achieved buyin from all the local and county governments and municipalities that comprise its membership—a notable achievement considering the diversity of priorities across the region. As this plan developed, the organization's leader, David Robertson, frequently sought the professional advice of his fellow Eight Neighbor partners. He wanted their insight on managing substantial and diverse memberships and their similar individual leadership and management challenges. Overall, the *Region Forward* plan is an emergent focal point for the other agencies in the Eight Neighbors partnership. The Boards of Directors of the partners have endorsed the plan, except for the Board of Trade, for whom a board endorsement represents a larger commitment than it does for the other organizations. However, the Board of Trade has written a letter of support for the plan, and presently, the group is considering a way to endorse a statement of support for the plan, so that all eight groups can have an equal investment in the implementation of the plan.

### *Looking Ahead*

Across the region, each of the eight leaders cleared their heads, snapping themselves back to the present. They all recognized that in August 2010 they were presented with different kinds of challenges than they faced back in September 2008. On one hand, they were confident that the Eight Neighbors partnership had the potential to help them tackle their challenges. The leaders believed that the Eight Neighbors partnership was visionary and could foster cross-sectoral solutions to systemic problems facing the region. The leaders also enjoyed working together, sharing information, and finding support. But many questions still remained regarding the partnership's precise method to achieve their goals. Each leader was already running an organization facing difficult times, and sometimes found it hard to justify devoting precious time on a project not

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

focused on finding solutions to immediate problems, and with few tangible outcomes or measurable goals. Furthermore, the lack of governance structure and operational capabilities constrained the Eight Neighbors in significant ways. For now, the partnership's requests of the leaders were minimal and the benefits strong, but each of the eight leaders knew that these questions would have to be answered more concretely as they collectively decided the future of the Eight Neighbors partnership. They needed to think long and hard about what they wanted out of the partnership, and how to achieve it.

## ***Attachment 1***

### ***Who are The Eight Neighbors?***

#### ***Center for Nonprofit Advancement***

- Led by Glen O'Gilvie, Chief Executive Officer
- *Constituency*: Nonprofit organizations in the Washington Metropolitan Area
- *Mission*: Since 1979, the Center for Nonprofit Advancement has strengthened, promoted and represented its member nonprofit organizations throughout the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. We connect our members to the tools and resources they need to meet their missions.
- *Website*: <http://www.nonprofitadvancement.org/>

#### ***Community Foundation for the National Capital Region***

- Led by Terri Lee Freeman, President
- *Constituency*: Individual donors through funds managed on their behalf; Nonprofit organizations through grants made to support their work.
- *Mission*: The mission of The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region is to strengthen the Washington metropolitan region by encouraging and supporting effective giving and by providing leadership on critical issues in our community. We and our two regional affiliate foundations -- [The Montgomery County Community Foundation](#) and [The Prince George's Community Foundation](#) -- are part of a network of some 700 community foundations nationwide. Each is a tax-exempt, public charity made up of funds established by individuals, families, corporations and other organizations. We currently manage more than 600 donor funds whose assets total more than \$360 million.

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

- Website: <http://www.cfncr.org>

### ***Greater Washington Board of Trade***

- Led by James Dinegar, President and CEO
- *Constituency*: Corporations and businesses that are based in the Washington Metropolitan Area
- *Mission*: As the leading regional business organization, the Board of Trade addresses business concerns that span geographic boundaries. Pro-business and bipartisan, the Board of Trade convenes business, civic and government leaders to collaborate on important issues throughout the District of Columbia, Suburban Maryland and Northern Virginia.
- Website: <http://www.bot.org/>

### ***Leadership Greater Washington***

- Led by Tim Kime, President and CEO
- *Constituency*: Corporate, nonprofit, philanthropic and government leaders
- *Mission*: Leadership Greater Washington's mission is to identify and connect diverse leaders and stimulate their collaborative efforts through dynamic education and membership programs that promote dialogue, cooperation and involvement enabling area leaders to find effective solutions to regional challenges.
- Website: <http://lgwdc.org>

### ***Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments***

- Led by David Robertson, Executive Director
- *Constituency*: The local governments that comprise the Washington Metropolitan Area
- *Mission*: COG is a regional organization of Washington area local governments. COG is comprised of 21 local governments surrounding our nation's capital, plus area members of the Maryland and Virginia legislatures, the U.S. Senate, and the U.S. House of Representatives. COG provides a focus for action and develops sound regional responses to such issues as the environment, affordable housing, economic development, health and family concerns, human services, population growth, public safety, and transportation.
- Website: <http://www.mwcog.org>

### ***Nonprofit Roundtable***

Source: Electronic Hallway, Evans School, University of Washington

<https://hallway.evans.washington.edu/cases/details/eight-neighbors-case-study-collaboration-and-formalization>

- Led by Chuck Bean, Executive Director
- *Constituency*: Nonprofit organizations in the Washington Metropolitan Area
- *Mission*: The Nonprofit Roundtable works to build the strength, visibility, and influence of the nonprofit community in order to create a more just and caring community in Greater Washington. Our Members include advocacy organizations, direct service providers, grantmakers, and corporate partners all working together to solve regional problems.
- *Website*: <http://www.nonprofitroundtable.org/>

### *United Way of the National Capital Area*

- Led by Angela Woods, President and CEO until mid-2009; succeeded by William Hanbury
- *Constituency*: Nonprofit organizations in the Washington Metropolitan Area, primarily; individual donors through corporate campaigns, secondarily
- *Mission*: United Way of the National Capital Area (UWNCA) mobilizes community resources to create lasting, positive differences in our community and improve the lives of Greater Washington residents. Across eight regions, our partner agencies provide the safety net of services through your investment in our Community Impact Funds. We engage experts from the public, private and nonprofit sectors to identify the region's biggest challenges, create strategic solutions, and direct funding where it is needed most.
- *Website*: <http://www.unitedwaynca.org/>

### *Washington Regional Association of Grantmakers*

- Led by Tamara Lucas Copeland, President
- *Constituency*: Grantmaking organizations in the Washington Metropolitan Area
- *Mission*: The Washington Regional Association of Grantmakers promotes and supports effective, strategic, and efficient charitable investment in the Greater Washington region. We partner with governments and nonprofits, build strong relationships between grantmakers and grantseekers, and serve as an advocate and voice for philanthropy. **Our members** include independent foundations, community foundations, operating foundations, charitable trusts, corporate foundations and corporate giving programs.
- *Website*: <http://www.washingtongrantmakers.org/>