



Preparing Civil Society Organizations for Leadership

A report inspired by the
Office Depot Foundation
Civil Society Leadership Symposium
December 14-15, 2007
Boca Raton, Florida

Authors:
Nina Inamahoro, AccountAbility
Steve Rochlin, AccountAbility
Stephen Jordan, Business Civic Leadership Center
Mary Wong, Office Depot Foundation



Table of Contents

I.	Preface	Page 2
II.	Acronyms and Abbreviations	Page 3
III.	Executive Summary	Page 4
IV.	Report	Page 5
V.	Additional Resources	Page 17
VI.	Acknowledgements	Page 18
VII.	List of Participants	Page 19

I. Preface

As you might know, one of the focus areas included in the Office Depot Foundation's 5 X 5 Program™ of strategic priorities is "helping civil society organizations become more professional and productive." This is an ambitious goal, to be sure. In an effort to gather relevant information to guide us in planning our initiatives in this area, the Office Depot Foundation hosted our inaugural "Weekend in Boca" in December 2007, in collaboration with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Business Civic Leadership Center and AccountAbility.

The report that you are about to read provides a clear example of how we are translating the Office Depot Foundation's mission — Listen Learn Care™ — into action. We listened to concerns about the challenges facing civil society organizations and learned that there was a need for clarity and definition about issues of civil society leadership. Because we care about the civil sector, we proactively stepped forward with resources to advance the discussion.

This report captures the thoughts and insights of a highly qualified group of participants at a moment in time. However, we view this not as the end of the discussion, but rather the beginning. As a reader, you bring your own perspectives and experiences to this topic. We urge you to share your comments about the report and the ideas it contains with us. Your input will be extremely valuable as we make plans for the second "Weekend in Boca," which is tentatively scheduled for December 11-13, 2008.

We hope you will consider such questions as:

- Do you agree with this report's observations about the challenges facing civil society organizations today? Are there others that should be considered?
- Are there additional indicators of excellence for civil society organizations that are important to this discussion?
- What strategies can the Office Depot Foundation and others pursue in order to effectively promote best practices in civil society organization leadership?

To provide your feedback and ideas, please visit www.officedepotfoundation.org and click on "5 X 5 Program" for a link to an ongoing discussion about this report. We welcome your participation and look forward to your comments at any time.

Mary Wong
President
Office Depot Foundation

II. Acronyms and Abbreviations

CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
BCLC	Business Civic Leadership Center
HR	Human Resources
ODF	Office Depot Foundation
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

III. Executive Summary

On December 14-15, 2007, the Office Depot Foundation hosted a remarkably wide-ranging conversation about the current state and future of the civil society sector. In some ways, it was a coming of age story: “Why should we be described as ‘non-profits’? Something we’re not; as opposed to something we are: civil society organizations,” asked one participant. “We need to treat ourselves and expect to be treated with respect,” said another. Therefore, in this spirit, this is a report on the “Civil Society” sector, not the “Non-Profit” sector.

Civil society organizations (CSOs) face many challenges currently. Capital and funding mechanisms are a source of constant worry since the “sponsors” (the funders) are different from the “clients” (the beneficiaries). Organizational structures, funder expectations, the capacity to measure performance and to grow to scale are some of the top issues CSOs currently face.

They also have to address a wide range of sometimes-conflicting stakeholder interests. CSO stakeholders include the general public, clients, companies, government agencies, foundations, and the media, who don’t necessarily understand how CSOs work. Because CSOs are strongly associated with charity, many people assume they don’t need financial support. Alternatively, some funders impose one set of criteria, and other funders ask for other criteria, so CSOs find that they have to spend more time than they anticipated on bookkeeping.

Initial recommendations for helping the civil society sector build capacity include:

- Creating organizational tool kits and mentoring systems for new CSOs.
- Creating networking opportunities and “safe places” for CSO leaders to dialogue and learn from each other.
- Investigating ways to grow “capital markets” and information systems for CSOs and explore other mechanisms to help CSOs who find success in one community to be able to share these benefits with other communities.
- Encouraging CSOs to create stakeholder advisory groups so that they can learn from the business, government, and other sectors.
- Educating funders about the importance of funding management systems and engaging with CSOs in more ways than just financially.

This initial conversation was very exciting, and led to some great insights. All of the participants hope that this marks the beginning of a process that will strengthen the civil society sector in the years to come.

IV. Report

Introduction

“Non-Profit” organizations are growing up, and the way we as a society think about them, and the way they think about themselves, has to change.

“Non-profits” run hospitals, schools and universities, feed and shelter the homeless, take care of children and the elderly, provide relief after disasters, and provide hundreds of other essential services to our communities and way of life. And yet the label “Non-Profit” describes something they are not, as opposed to what they are — organizations that strengthen our communities and make our societies more civil and civilized. In short, let’s call them what they are — Civil Society Organizations.

Civil society organizations (CSOs) face unprecedented opportunities and risks. Increasingly CSOs deliver vital public services, serve as the new route for citizen participation in politics and policy, and increasingly provide goods and services normally delivered by for-profit companies.

Over the next 20 years analysts predict US CSOs will grow from 1.4 million organizations to 2.4 million. During this time individual donors will transfer \$1 trillion of their personal wealth to CSOs. These figures track expected growth worldwide.

Already CSOs are coming under greater scrutiny. Initiatives from across the political spectrum question the governance¹, accountability², responsibility, and responsiveness of CSOs. Both public and private sector institutions seek alternatively to collaborate and compete with CSOs. Individual donors, company executives, foundation leaders, and even the people who benefit from them, are asking more from them.

Moreover CSOs seek to deliver solutions to the most pressing challenges of the 21st century, using organizational, resourcing, and management approaches from decades past. These challenges are especially pertinent for CSOs with missions to support and improve community development. These CSOs engage along a spectrum of issues including (but not limited to) education, work force development, health, development of the arts, inspiring community services, support for the elderly, drug

1 Governance is how decisions are made. This means the interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine:

- How decisions are taken;
- How power and responsibilities are exercised;
- How stakeholders have their say in decision-making.

2 Accountability is why decisions are made. Accountability systems help an institution define the most important influences that shape decisions. Accountability defines the obligations of an institution to explain and justify its decisions and to document its understanding of the effects of its decisions. Accountability has at least three layers:

- Giving an account (transparency);
- Being held to account (compliance);
- Taking account (responsiveness to stakeholders).

treatment, civic improvement, youth development, and a host of other topics. These CSOs share a mission to support growth and development that is inclusive across income levels, racial and ethnic backgrounds, and gender.

Given how important these organizations are, the Office Depot Foundation, together with AccountAbility and the Business Civic Leadership Center of the US Chamber of Commerce, convened a community of leaders passionate about preparing to meet these challenges. The select group of approximately 45 participants (listed in Section VI) included senior executives of leading service providers, foundations, policy innovators, thought leaders, public officials, and corporate executives. The Retreat, which took place in December 2007, addressed the following questions:

1. What is the future of the Civil Sector? How must the Civil Sector evolve to meet its leadership potential?
2. How will collaborative ventures among CSOs, companies, foundations, and public bodies shape the Civil Sector? What strategy should the Sector take regarding partnerships?
3. How will CSOs need to improve their performance over the next 3-5 years? How must they enhance their governance, accountability, strategy, management, measurement, and resource base?
4. What capabilities will CSO leaders need to successfully take forward their organizations? What should leaders be accountable for?

This report summarizes the outcomes and sets an agenda that the Office Depot Foundation and its partners at AccountAbility and the BCLC believe will have promise to support CSOs. Our intent is to begin an on-going conversation among those equally concerned and committed to these issues. The Office Depot Foundation intends to put its money where its mouth is, and design an award and programs to support CSOs based on the guidance we have received. We look for partners to help us improve this first iteration of work, and partners to collaborate with us in building attention and solutions to the vital challenges of CSOs.

The work of CSOs is growing in importance. Like other OECD economies, the US finds itself in an accelerating transition from a manufacturing economy to a services economy, and from the assembly line to knowledge and information. This transition advantages those with skill sets often tied to advanced education. It advantages communities that have invested in infrastructure to nurture, attract, and grow knowledge and service industries.

As a result, data suggest that more and more citizens are being left behind. Wage gaps between the top and bottom quartiles grow further apart. Shocks, downturns, and global competition impact more harshly on communities that rely on old economy assets. CSOs represent the first responders — supporting those dislocated by change, working to help individuals to second and third chances, advocating for policies to support participatory growth, and innovative solutions at the grassroots, local, regional, and national level. For this reason, this report focuses particularly on the role of social service and development CSOs.

However, while CSOs have an urgent role to play, they are no more immune to the changing tides than anyone else. Without improving their performance, leadership and governance, their ability — and license — to do their mission will be cast into greater and greater doubt.

This report captures an important conversation that, in many ways, is just getting started.

1. How Do Civil Society Organizations Meet Expectations?

1.1 What are the performance challenges of CSOs today?

The typical CEO of a development CSO increasingly experiences a catch-22 in his or her work. Well known guidelines tell institutional and individual donors not to invest in CSOs that have high overheads. As close to 100% as possible of all grants should go directly to programs that support those in need, they say. At the same time, CSOs are criticized for not being “business-like” in their management. Where are the sophisticated information systems? What are the leadership development programs? Where is rigorous measurement? All such elements, one must note, require investment in what is typically considered “overhead” by most funders.

CSOs face an expanding, but radically changing environment for funding. Traditional funders now share time with “venture-philanthropists.” Corporate donors create strategic focus areas and ask CSOs to deliver “win-win” results. Due to budget restrictions, CSOs have difficulty retaining talented professionals and often have to rely on volunteers.

Programs are the heart of CSOs’ work. Yet the never-ending chase for funds distracts from the core work of the organization. Accountability architecture often forces CSO executives to focus on funder expectations, rather than the needs of clients and beneficiaries. These can mean that programs are designed to suit the interests of supporters rather than the people receiving the services. Measurement, learning, improvement, and innovation are often luxuries for CSOs.

1.2 How are CSOs doing in meeting these challenges?

Challenges

The success of many CSOs is hampered by a number of vulnerabilities.

The overarching vulnerability is the lack of strategic planning. As a result CSOs lack clarity in their operations and focus in their programs. Most CSOs have an overall mission to garner support along a specific cause or topic (i.e., mentoring at-risk youth, ESL tutoring to migrant residents). Although the organizations know very well what needs to be done, they struggle to understand how to position the organization over the long term, expand and deepen funding bases, pursue and develop opportunities, leverage success to achieve growth, develop and manage human resources, effectively integrate information systems, and prepare to respond to shocks that arise. In particular, the chase for resources pressures CSOs to be opportunistic rather than strategic.

Until recently CSOs have received little encouragement to adopt rigorous management principles. For example, despite growing attention on the subject, CSOs still struggle to measure performance. Few CSOs report their impact or performance indicators. The budget for monitoring and evaluation is often too small to provide a good account of performance.

Since most of their budget goes to service delivery, CSOs cannot afford to invest in knowledge acquisition and information systems.

Leadership feels forced to manage immediate crises and pressures. Leadership gears for yesterday's challenges, not tomorrow's.

Today many organizations have integrated the principles of governance and accountability to strengthen their management systems and their organizations for the long-term. On the other hand, CSOs' governance and accountability architecture is under-developed and at times an afterthought.

CSOs provide a vital role in communities — often roles that governments and for-profit organizations cannot provide. They receive their legitimacy from the communities they serve. Many participating at the Retreat agreed that is their strongest asset. Yet looking at the organizational vulnerabilities of CSOs one can argue that they have more chances to fail than to succeed. This should generate a sense of urgency. How can we help CSOs succeed by holding them accountable for what is material for their success?

Strengths

In order to succeed, CSOs not only need to address their vulnerabilities, they have to find ways to make the best use of their strengths.

CSOs are second to none in building the asset of social capital. Some CSOs have managed to build strong human networks and can efficiently mobilize a great deal of individuals very cost-efficiently. That power could be multiplied by tapping into technology innovations such as “web 2.0”¹ that are open-source and open-communications with a very wide audience.

- CSOs are flexible and adapt to crises. They can be “first-responders” in a variety of contexts that challenge community well-being.
- The passion and commitment of those behind CSOs push them to perform. It is often said that CSO leaders are expected to make miracles out of modest resources. This often makes them creative problem-solvers.
- Considering the high demand for social services, CSOs have an untapped potential to unite and collaborate with one another and with organizations from the private and public sectors.
- CSOs possess reach, reputation, and respect that are the envy of organizations with massive marketing budgets.

2. What Do CSOs Need to Meet Challenges and Opportunities?

“Give a fish, teach to fish, or reinvent the fishing industry?” (Jay Hein)

The outcomes of the Retreat coalesced on the need for a major transformation on how a CSO — and a CSO leader — defines its accountabilities.

First, participants suggested that we need to redefine and bolster the terms of accountability for CSOs. We must create the context where CSOs can confidently know what they are accountable for and to whom, and to have support in delivering on expected accountabilities. The accountability architecture must be enabling. This means tying accountability architecture to the principles of performance excellence.

Second, participants recognized that we need to reinvent how we define performance excellence for CSOs. Excellence cannot be about low overheads. It cannot be a question of “cutting-and-pasting” private sector management principles and metrics to a different sector. Excellence must draw from lessons of other sectors, but it

¹ Trend in World Wide Web technology, and web design, a second generation of web-based communities and hosted services such as social-networking sites, wikis, blogs, and folksonomies, which aim to facilitate creativity information sharing, collaboration, and sharing among users (Wikipedia).

must be defined to fit the unique contexts of CSOs. In particular, stakeholders — particularly the “clients” CSOs intend to serve — must take the lead in defining the criteria for a given CSO’s performance excellence.

The institutions that support, oversee, and regulate CSOs must adopt these terms of accountability. This will require a change process that may be, for some of these institutions, as difficult if not more so than those of CSOs.

Third, participants want to advance these terms of excellence and accountability in a coordinated and integrated manner. This means:

- Advancing a human resource capacity-building agenda for CSOs. This includes helping leaders develop the capabilities to enable the CSO to define and meet its accountabilities. It means enabling senior executives to recruit and manage paid staff to deliver on organizational accountabilities. And it means properly utilizing volunteer resources to deliver on organizational accountabilities.
- Supporting partnerships among CSOs as well as cross-sector partnerships among CSOs, business, and government that work towards development objectives.
- Developing advocacy platforms to define accountability for the CSO sector that is enabling of development outcomes.
- Working with grant-makers to back the vision in this document and modify their own guidelines.
- Tying access to resources to implementation of performance excellence, governance, and accountability mechanisms.
- Adapting these approaches to reinforce and enable a diverse array of CSOs to thrive.
- Implementing a network capacity-building agenda for CSOs. Social capital is one of the key strengths of CSOs. CSOs have to find new and better ways to strengthen networks and leverage them to push change in the cause they are championing.
- Designing an organizational capacity-building agenda for CSOs. CSO leaders should adhere to principles of good management such as good accounting, good strategic planning, fiscal responsibility and disclosure, and business planning. But they need to adhere to accountability and governance systems that are fit for purpose.

3. How Do We Define Excellence for a CSO?

What then should CSOs be accountable for? Based on the suggestions of Retreat participants, the following framework provides performance accountability criteria for CSOs. Key elements of performance accountability include:

- Leverage
- Accountability to the grassroots
- Strong networks and information systems that are “close to the ground”
- Management systems that are fit for purpose
- Performance track record
- Accountable leaders

We discuss each in turn.

3.1 Leverage Core Resources

In 2005, individuals, corporations, and foundations gave \$260 billion in charitable contributions to non-profits. (The Nonprofit Sector in Brief, p.1, 2007). Yet Retreat participants suggest that fundraising has become an end in itself.

“Too much hinges on a [CSO’s] success in raising funds. It’s almost as if the CSO is measured on its success in raising money. The more money it raises, well the better it must be performing!” — Retreat participant.

Participants stressed that it is not about the money a CSO raises but how a CSO leverages the money it raises to capitalize on strengths and correct weaknesses.

“Non-profits not only need money, they need planning support.”

“Fundraising activities should aim at those things that will most enable a CSO to deliver on its mission. Most non-profits are unrealistic in their fundraising.”

“Money for volunteer management can make or break an organization. Does a CSO have sufficient capacity to utilize and manage volunteers effectively? Most don’t.”

Leverage therefore speaks to how well a CSO is able to take resources and:

- Utilize them to procure other resources, be they financial or otherwise.
- Apply them in a way that goes beyond their own specific activities to enhance and improve the ability of others to deliver on the CSO’s mission.

In summary, we should hold CSOs accountable for how they leverage the following core resources: money, in-kind donations, strategic and professional use of volunteers, and last but not least intellectual.

3.2 Leverage Partners

CSOs increasingly rely on a wide array of partners to support their mission. Partners at the grassroots level help inform communities and individuals about the CSO. They work as informal brokers that build trust, transmit information, and direct clients to work with the CSO.

CSOs also partner with other service delivery agents. These may be individuals or organizations that possess special competencies that the CSO lacks. Or, increasingly, it includes “competitors” with similar missions that cooperate to deliver more than either could do alone.

Increasingly partners include other sectors — notably business. Together they find common goals that can be achieved only through collaboration.

How does the CSO leverage partners to achieve its mission?

3.3 Advocacy

Advocacy may appear strange to include on the list of resources to leverage. However, participants noted that even when a CSO does not engage in advocacy, it should work to leverage the efforts of others that do.

Community development CSOs can partner with advocacy CSOs that work on similar agendas to form pathways that enable delivery CSOs to obtain more resources and advance their work. Similarly, community development CSOs that deliver successful outcomes make the work of advocacy CSOs easier. Participants highlighted that there is not enough communication and leverage among these CSOs.

3.4 Leveraging Extended Networks

As noted, CSOs often possess great and insufficiently tapped strength derived from their social capital. The trust, information, advocacy, and support from extended networks can be invaluable to support CSO missions.

A CSO should be held accountable for how it builds strategies to leverage its resources in a dynamic way. One example is how does a CSO plan to leverage extended networks to secure new funding sources that enable it to manage volunteers that in turn expand its extended networks? One can divine numerous other permutations. The trick is to ensure that CSOs are conscious of the vast opportunities for leverage and take action to achieve it.

4. Accountability Matters

4.1. *Accountability to grassroots*

Participants note that it has become fashionable to call for greater accountability to clients and grassroots stakeholders. Yet CSOs often find pressure leading them to define accountabilities upwards towards major benefactors and larger stakeholders.

As one participant notes:

“[CSOs] need governance systems that incentivize them to engage with other stakeholders, particularly those at the grassroots.”

- Working with clients and grassroots stakeholders to shape strategy and activities.
- Designing governance systems that include and engage grassroots stakeholders.
- Establishing a deep connection to beneficiaries to, “listen to the demand of the communities, and develop programs with their participation.”
- Deep understanding of context on the ground.
- Ability to engage and mobilize community assets and individuals.

Participants suggest we can help CSOs by holding them accountable for:

4.2. *Fit for Purpose Management Systems*

In the words of one participant:

“[CSOs] are being held accountable more and more for having good management practices. The problem is that they are management practices that work for business, or some other organization, but not necessarily for the [CSO]. So you have a lot of wheel-spinning. You see a lot of them creating systems that they don’t really need, but a funder says they need.”

Participants suggested that CSOs need to be held accountable for management systems that fit the mission and purpose of the organization. This includes:

- Customized strategy. Does this strategy fit the mission, assets, skills, competencies, and methods of the CSO? Participants suggest that too often CSOs create strategies that apply more to a view of private sector assets rather than their own.
- Strong, engaged, governance system. Participants agree that many CSO governance systems don’t work. CSOs don’t engage governance bodies properly. And governance bodies lack understanding of how best to engage.

-
- Hiring and talent development suitable for the effort. Participants note that human resources are always the most vital asset a CSO has. Yet, most CSOs are not held accountable for reporting on the strength and development of this asset, what strategies it is employing to develop this asset, and how it is progressing. Holding the CSO accountable will serve as a powerful driver to improve employee performance and experience.
 - Performance reporting related to: financial management, mission, and reasonable and relevant evaluation and continuous improvement systems. CSOs need to improve their reporting on utilization of resources and related outcomes. This will begin to ease growing political pressure noted at the outset of this report. Participants agree that for all the talk regarding evaluation, CSOs find it a distraction from core mission delivery, and a risky proposition that could lead to loss of funding. Evaluation should become more flexible, simplified, and connected with performance improvement.
 - Performance track record — at the same time, participants agree CSOs must step up and hold themselves accountable for their track record. Do they possess evidence of impact?

4.3. Accountable Leaders

In the words of one participant, CSO leaders need to:

“Manage different constituencies equally, and not focus on one constituency (such as donors) to the neglect of another like clients. Leaders need to focus on developing programs and not on developing funds. Leaders need to distribute leadership throughout the organization. They need to engage in legacy planning and prepare other leaders to take over. Leaders need to be the keeper of the [CSO’s] vision and they need to share that vision.”

Therefore participants agreed that CSO leaders must be a microcosm for the broader accountabilities of the entire organization. Participants suggest we must hold leaders accountable for:

- Leverage: not just obtaining resources but getting new resources.
- Leveraging Board of Directors (BoD) beyond fundraising.
- Being a change agent on three levels. First, valuing change and adaptation within the CSO itself. Second, driving behavioral change among clients. And third, driving policy change.
- Engaging stakeholders and clients successfully in a common agenda to succeed.
- Achieving key development goals/objectives (not fundraising goals).

-
- Advancing the vision and mission of the CSO.
 - The sustainability of the organization.

Together, participants suggest these criteria form a framework for CSO performance accountability. We intend on creating an evaluative template that we can use to assess CSO performance excellence.

Conclusion

A powerful takeaway from the Retreat is the need to take social service and development CSOs seriously as entities in and of themselves. They can learn from the experience of the private sector, but they are not private sector entities.

They can learn from government. But they are not public sector bodies.

They can learn from those who fund them. But they will learn more from those they serve.

In the wake of these lessons, we believe it is time to hold CSOs accountable for criteria that make sense for their missions and not the missions of other kinds of organizations.

In that regard, we will experiment. The Office Depot Foundation will launch an award. Our first iteration will use these criteria to support a leading social service and development CSO.

We are going to continue this dialogue. We will launch a continuing series of retreats to advance these conversations.

We hope that this will inspire the actions of others as well because we cannot do this alone. Therefore, going forward we want your input. What can we improve? What can we learn? We will try to practice what we preach and hold ourselves accountable for helping CSOs to reach their vast potential.

V. Additional Resources

- AccountAbility, <http://www.accountability21.net/>
- Business Civic Leadership Center (BCLC), www.uschamber.com/bclc/
 - Corporate Community Investment, <http://www.uschamber.com/bclc/programs/investment/default>
 - Community Forum: Boca Raton and Delray Beach Florida, http://www.uschamber.com/bclc/programs/investment/local_boca.htm
- Forces for Good — the Six Practices of High-Impact Nonprofits, www.forcesforgood.net/
- Office Depot Foundation, <http://www.officedepotfoundation.org/>
- The Foundation Center, <http://foundationcenter.org/>
- The Nonprofit Times, <http://www.nptimes.com/>

VI. Acknowledgements

The authors of this paper would like to thank:

- The Office Depot Foundation and Mary Wong in particular for bringing such an impressive mix of Civil Society leaders and thinkers.
- Stephen Jordan for his contribution to this paper and the BCLC for its great contribution to the success of the ODF Retreat.
- The participants of the ODF Retreat for sharing their tremendous experience as CSO leaders.

VII. List of Participants

Guests

- Ms. Amy Allen, Account Manager, South Florida Business Journal
- Ms. Rita Barreto Craig, President and Founder, The Craig Group
- Ms. Elizabeth Carlson, Assistant Executive Director, National Association of Elementary School Principals
- Ms. Karin Coleman, Director of Strategic Alliances, Take Stock in Children
- Ms. Margaret Delmont-Sanchez, VP/Chief Development Officer, Hispanic Unity of Florida
- Ms. Dawn Edwards, President, AltruShare Securities
- Dr. Joseph Ferrer, President, Sunset Entertainment
- Ms. Marjorie Ferrer, Executive Director, Delray Beach Downtown Development Authority
- Ms. Rhonda Fotiades, Director of Education and Workforce Development, Victoria Chamber of Commerce
- Mr. Patrick Franklin, President and CEO, Urban League of Palm Beach County
- Mr. Dale Gregory, Executive Vice President, Cherrystone Management Consultants, Inc.
- Ms. Joni Henderson, Vice President, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
- Ms. Madye Henson, Vice President-Community Impact Development, United Way of America
- Ms. Martha Howe, Executive Vice President, Education is Freedom
- Ms. Beth Johnston, Executive Vice President, Greater Delray Beach Chamber of Commerce
- Professor Christine Letts, Associate Dean for Executive Education, Rita E. Hauser Lecturer in the Practice of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
- Ms. Leslie Lilly, Vice President for Programs, Community Foundation for Palm Beach and Martin Counties
- Mr. Scot Marken, President and CEO, Donors Forum of South Florida
- Dr. Marcus Martin, President and CEO, Education is Freedom

-
- Mr. Warren McClean, Vice President of Development, Community Reinvestment Fund
 - Mr. Troy McLellan, President and CEO, Greater Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce
 - Mr. Pat Morris, President and CEO, Hands on Miami
 - Mr. Michael Morton, Executive Director, Nourish America
 - Ms. Brenda Nachriener, Director of Corporate Partnerships, Kids In Need Foundation
 - Ms. Shari Nourick, Consultant, IEDC
 - Ms. Robin Read, President & CEO, National Foundation for Women Legislators (NFWL)
 - Mr. James Rosebush, CEO, Dekelboun Science Center
 - Ms. Colleen Schwarz, Vice President of Sales, Community Reinvestment Fund
 - Ms. Kelly Smallridge, President, Palm Beach County Business Development Board
 - Ms. Dianna Smith, Director, VolunteerMatch Solutions, VolunteerMatch
 - Ms. Wendy Spencer, CEO, Volunteer Florida
 - Dr. Suzanne Trimboth, CEO and Chief Economist, STP Partners
 - Mr. Randy Welker, Executive Director, Citrus County Economic Development Council
 - Ms. Lisa Wilson, Co-founder and COO, The Mentoring Center
 - Mr. Richard Wong, President and CEO, Gifts In Kind International

Special Attendees

- Ms. Rita Ellis, Mayor, Delray Beach
- Mr. Jeff Perlman, Former Mayor, Delray Beach
- Ms. Susan Whelchel, Deputy Mayor, City of Boca Raton
- Ms. Elisa D. Garcia C., EVP, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary, Office Depot
- Mr. Jay Hein, Deputy Assistant to the President and Director, White House Office of Faith Based and Community Initiatives

Office Depot Foundation

- Mr. Robert Brewer, Executive Committee, Office Depot Foundation
- Mr. George Bryan, Executive Committee, Office Depot Foundation
- Ms. Anne Dufour Zuckerman, Executive Committee, Office Depot Foundation
- Ms. Mary Wong, President, Office Depot Foundation
- Ms. Jessica Strazulla, Foundation Specialist, Office Depot Foundation
- Mr. Leon Rubin, Director of Communications, JKG Group

Business Civic Leadership Center

- Mr. Stephen Jordan, Senior Vice President and Executive Director, Business Civic Leadership Center
- Mr. Don Eberly, Senior Consultant, BCLC
- Mr. Ryan Streeter, Senior Consultant, BCLC
- Ms. Kathryn Traver, Director of Operations, BCLC

AccountAbility

- Mr. Steve Rochlin, Head of North America, AccountAbility
- Ms. Nina Inamahoro, Executive Assistant, AccountAbility



Office Depot Foundation
2100 Old Germantown Road
Delray Beach, Florida 33445

www.officedepotfoundation.org



This Report is printed on environmentally preferable paper sourced in accordance with Office Depot's® Environmental Paper Purchasing Policy & Vision Statement. The body pages are certified in accordance with Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) standards and contain 10% recycled content. The chain of custody for this paper has been tracked in accordance with FSC standards.