

“Strategic Philanthropy”

*Personal Reflections from a
New Kid on the Block*

“I was hungry and you formed a committee to investigate my hunger . . .

I was homeless and you filed a report on my plight . . .

I was sick and you held a seminar on the situation of the underprivileged . . .

You have investigated all aspects of my plight . . .

But I am still hungry, homeless and sick.”

- Anonymous

CRAMMED INTO 10 MINUTES!!!

- What we are
- How we work
- What I first thought
- What we've done
- What I now think
- What we might do next

WHAT WE ARE

- A private family foundation with active & engaged founders
- Unique features include:
 - few limits, flexibility
 - no desire for profile
 - national coverage
 - neutral & respected
 - diverse trustee ideas
 - seek to be innovative
- Funds 'precious' & suit Strategic Philanthropy

HOW WE WORK

- 5 'Programme Areas' eg *Supporting Families & Social Services* (50%)
- 25 'Strategies' eg *Parenting, Youth Development*
- 3000+ applications pa, 500+ approved (falling)

- 3 staff + consultants
- 12 Funding Managers

WHAT I FIRST THOUGHT

- 15 years in community – have big impact now
- Strat. Phil. appealed:
 - less messy one-offs
 - less reactive
 - more focused
 - impact potential
 - cause-specific
 - compelling & trendy
- Good examples to build on - Zero Waste, MTFFJ
- What if . . . ?

WHAT WE'VE DONE

- 26 Reviews to define “Tindall-shaped niche”
- More systematic grant-making & monitoring
- Move to fund coalitions & communities, not just individual programmes
- Enhanced partnerships (eg Funding Managers)
- Trustee consultation & planning workshop

A COUPLE OF EXAMPLES

- Parenting Council:
 - \$6m+ to programmes
 - policy opportunities
 - funded 7 key CEOs + research/networking
 - focus on generic issues/policy change
- Project Kaikohe:
 - self-formed coalition
 - funded through a community group
 - startup problems
 - varied TTF inputs

WHAT I NOW THINK

- Concerns re Strat Phil:
 - funder capture
 - democratic mandate?

- needs more capacity
- can devalue 'giving'
- can limit trustee 'joy'
- less social capital \$
- still unproven??
- Advantages:
 - increased proactivity
 - issues not donees
 - focus = more impact
 - systemic change
 - postman is happier
- Relevance to TTF & NZ:
 - US is different to NZ
 - Oz is like NZ (Hooper)
 - TTF 'younger', keen to use it & learn
- Be Strategic **WITH** our Philanthropy:
 - use Porter etc ideas to define our niche
 - link to trustee wishes
 - apply a mix of support mechanisms from the options we have to get best fit for each case (Blended Value)

WHAT WE MIGHT DO NEXT

- Better understand & balance what works best for:
 - our trustees
 - community/ies
 - strengths/capacity
 - applicants
 - opportunities
- Tailor 'packages' of:
 - unconditional grants
 - seed/matching grants
 - conditional donations
 - entrepreneur support
 - non-financial inputs