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Executive Summary

In 2009, members of Washington State’s philanthropic community collaboratively investigated how to best support the nonprofit sector during the severe economic downturn. An assessment¹ of the capacity-building resources inspired funders to act on their findings and evolved into what is now the Statewide Capacity Collaborative (SCC). The SCC has prioritized aligned and pooled investments in advocacy and policy for the sector, access to capacity building tools and resources as well as building leadership capacity. To date, the SCC has invested $180,000 in grants to support underrepresented leadership development in communities across the state. In 2015, a leadership scan of the Washington state nonprofit sector was initiated to compliment this work and support strategies for investing in the state’s leadership capacity.

Knowing that leadership can’t be classified and summarized in one neat package, the purpose of this study was to deepen the SCC’s understanding of the state’s nonprofit sector in building its leadership capacity. Our aim was to conduct an assessment—both an inventory and examples—of how best to develop and support strong nonprofit leaders across Washington State. To be clear, our aim was not to duplicate the efforts of the capacity building assessment conducted in 2009 by The Giving Practice. Rather, our aim is to build upon and complement the work that has already been done.

The methodology for this study includes a brief literature review, interviews with community leaders from eight geographic priority areas across the state, a focus group of SCC leadership grantees, a 400 person statewide survey, and “meaning-making” conversations with key stakeholders. CompassPoint’s work to increase the impact of nonprofit leaders, organizations and networks and understanding adaptive leadership was leveraged throughout this study.

The project did not reveal a single or “correct” definition of leadership. Rather, all involved acknowledged that leadership is defined differently depending upon cultural lens and situational context. In communities of color in particular, there was a higher value placed on leadership from lived, community, and cultural experience rather than from mainstream leadership (e.g., formal education or positional title). Throughout our work, we have defined leadership as “the process of working with others in order to move forward an organizational or community vision and agenda” and acknowledge that leaders can live anywhere in an organization, community or movement, regardless of title or position.

Several themes emerged from the scan that have been highlighted in prior research and align with sector-wide trends across the country.

What is still true

- *Leadership* and *management* are often conflated or confused, with leaders interpreting nonprofit, technical, executive management skills as “leadership”
- Skills and tools related to management are still sorely needed, particularly in communities of color and from Eastern Washington
- Beyond the traditional management skills needed, consumers emphasized succession planning as an essential leadership competency
- Not having enough time and limited staff capacity were cited as the two most common barriers to accessing leadership development opportunities
- Concerns about lack of adequate funding, particularly core support, continue to be a significant issue for most nonprofit leaders
- Leaders feel forced to choose between investing in core operations or leadership development

After careful consideration of the data, CompassPoint used a margin to center approach (rather than a statistical approach/majority approach) to maximize learning. What this means is we have put more weight on the qualitative data from interview and focus group conversations of leaders of color, community leaders, and rural leaders. This approach has informed several themes about what works and what should be amplified to support development in Washington State:

What is new

- **Emphasis on Relationship and Networks**
  - Participants expressed a desire for spaciousness and the ability to connect.
  - Leaders of color in particular, recommended *informal* peer networking and learning as a primary way people currently learn about leadership and receive support.
  - Developmental relationships were ranked most effective by participants.
  - Mentorship was highlighted as being extremely effective when it is done well and when it is a compliment to other forms of leadership development.
  - When asked what was needed to be a more effective leader, respondents ranked emotional intelligence and “soft skills” highest.
  - Participants cited networked leadership as a needed area of growth in their leadership.

- **Spotlight on Vertical Leadership**
  - Leaders prefer experiential and action learning, ranking it only slightly behind developmental relationships as “most effective.”
  - While planned instruction is emphasized by providers, (73%), it was ranked as the least preferred learning technique and least effective by consumers, primarily mentioned as “just another training,” and “not culturally relevant or diverse.”
• **Cultural Relevance and Responsiveness**

  o For leaders of different race, ethnicity, and cultural backgrounds, the definition of “effectiveness” of leadership development programming or services is closely related to how culturally relevant and appropriate the services are.
  o Leaders of color indicated that while there are existing programs available in Washington, they are seen as leaning toward the mainstream, lacking cultural competence or the inclusion of issues of race, power, and privilege that often come up for leaders in their work.
  o There is a perception that funders are not investing in communities of color to build their capacity, which is what prevents them from engaging in leadership development opportunities.

• **The Role of Geography**

  o For rural leaders, leadership training and support services are often not provided in the communities where they work and live and therefore, are not accessible or sustained.
  o In many regions of the state there are plural communities in one region with distinct lines drawn across race, income, and class.

**Based upon these themes, CompassPoint proposes these actionable steps:**

• Be clear about impact and what leadership development outcomes you are trying to achieve
• Next, acknowledge some essential interdependencies between management and leadership and between organizational core support and leadership development
• Instead of reinventing the wheel, leverage and invest in what is already working well (like informal peer networking and mentoring and effective programs highlighted in the report)
• Nurture the space for leaders to be together without any immediate outcome
• Amplify leadership without over scripting by investing in flexible leadership approaches
• Go directly to the communities and listen deeply
• Address the cultural relevance and responsiveness needs highlighted in this scan and begin to dismantle the structural inequities that are keeping leaders from different races, backgrounds, and communities from accessing the leadership development opportunities they need to impact social change
• While investing in what already works, also pay attention to some relevant leadership trends like vertical leadership, adaptive leadership, and network/movement leadership
• Part of this may include embracing failure and disruption as learning opportunities so leaders and programs can practice experimenting and risk-taking without fear of losing core funding

Dismantle the structural inequities that are keeping leaders from different races, backgrounds, and communities from accessing the leadership development opportunities they need to impact social change.
About This Project

Background

The Statewide Capacity Collaborative (SCC) is a group of ten funders committed to supporting and strengthening the state’s nonprofit sector. In 2009, an assessment of capacity building in Washington State inspired funders to act on their findings and those initial efforts evolved into what is now the SCC. After making aligned and shared investments in their first two priority areas (elevating the profile of the sector and delivering capacity building knowledge, tools, and resources), the SCC formed a pooled fund to invest in and learn how to best support the state’s nonprofit sector in building its leadership capacity. To date, SCC has invested $180,000 in grants to support underrepresented leadership development in communities across the state. A leadership scan of the Washington nonprofit sector was initiated to complement this work and support strategies for investing in the state’s leadership capacity. To be clear, our aim was not to duplicate the efforts of the capacity building assessment conducted in 2009 by The Giving Practice. Rather, our aim is to build upon and complement the work that has already been done.

Project Purpose & Goals

The primary purpose of this scan was to deepen SCC’s understanding of the state’s nonprofit sector in building its leadership capacity. Our aim was to conduct an assessment of how best to develop and support strong nonprofit leaders across Washington State. Specifically, the goals of the scan were to:

- Design an evaluation that effectively addresses the following critical inquiry questions:

  **Bright Spots**
  - How is effective nonprofit leadership currently defined and what does successful leadership development look like in Washington State?
  - What providers and programs exist that support building the effective leadership capacity?

  **Gaps**
  - What levels of nonprofit leadership need attention? Where are the gaps in services?

- Develop an evaluation plan, including an inquiry matrix that aligns evaluation questions with data collection activities and establishment of roles and timeframes.
- Lead data collection and conduct initial analysis, preparing summaries that SCC funders and key partners can use to inform key learning.
- Prepare final report for SCC and field that includes bright spots, learnings and recommendations for where to focus attention.
About SCC

The Statewide Capacity Collaborative (SCC) serves as a hub for a core group of grantmakers in Washington to align, collaborate, and strategize on how to best strengthen and support the capacity of nonprofits and the statewide nonprofit ecosystem. We envision a healthy and resilient nonprofit sector where individual nonprofits thrive, communities work collectively to address their needs and the sector is seen as a force for change.

About CompassPoint

CompassPoint intensifies the impact of fellow nonprofit leaders, organizations, and networks as we achieve social equity together. We believe that nonprofit organizations and leaders need relevant support that builds on their strengths, experiences, and achievements and that those individuals and organizations that invest in increasing their leadership and management capacities are better poised to achieve progress. For 40 years, CompassPoint has worked to carry out this purpose by guiding nonprofits as they become better managed, more adaptive, and achieve higher impact. With 20 staff, our practice utilizes expert consulting, coaching, facilitation, and training to support the development of nonprofit leaders and their organizations.
Our Approach: Methodology

This report and recommendations are informed by two phases of data collection and four primary data sources: a survey, interviews, a focus group and two meaning-making conversations.

Phase 1: Survey, Interviews & Focus Group

Between January and February 2015, we administered an online survey that was completed by 404 individual respondents. The majority of respondents identified as consumers of nonprofit leadership services (72%), the remaining respondents were providers of leadership services (17%), and funders of non-profit leadership services (5%). An additional 6% of respondents identified as other, including individuals who wear multiple hats (e.g., as both consumers and providers), researchers, board members, and volunteers. The survey gathered information in the following areas:

- Approaches to leadership development
- Focus and methodologies of leadership development programs
- Gaps and needs in existing skills and programs
- Barriers to participation
- Consumer and funder perspectives on effective leadership
- Consumer perspective on services

We partnered with 501 Commons and Washington Nonprofits to distribute the survey across the state via email. They emailed the survey to their respective email lists for a total reach of nearly 57,500 nonprofits, clients, board, and staff in the WA state nonprofit sector. Additionally, we emailed WA state AFP members, SCC grantees, and Pacific Northwest Initiative grantees of the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation.

Targeted efforts were made to include leaders of color and leaders who are not affiliated with an organization with direct email messages. CompassPoint contracted with Social Policy Research Associates to clean and analyze the survey results. Upon analysis of the survey results, we discovered that we heard primarily from mainstream leaders (e.g., white, female, positional leaders with Bachelor’s or Master’s degrees from Western Washington). While the gender, race/ethnicity, and education data is fairly consistent with sector demographics from the national Daring to Lead research study, the aim of this scan was to look particularly at underserved communities. Therefore (in partnership with SCC), we conducted 20 one-on-one interviews to get a better understanding of the needs for leaders of color, emerging and non-traditional leaders, and leaders that represent communities in Eastern Washington.

In July and August of 2015, we completed 19 out of 20 interviews with individuals identifying as consumers of nonprofit leadership services and leaders recommended through the survey and by funders as being effective. Interview questions* were designed to allow us to further explore key themes that emerged from the survey. Themes included: definitions of leadership, effectiveness of methodologies,

---

2 See appendix survey questions, survey sample, and a list of interviewees and focus group and meaning making participants
3 See Appendix for interview protocol
leadership needs of specific communities (regional, racial/ethnic, rural/urban), priority needs in leadership development, barriers to accessing programs and services, and priorities for funding. Participants in the surveys, interviews and focus groups were offered anonymity. Participants in the interviews and focus group were considered context experts, recommended by survey respondents, funders, and other partners as “effective leaders” in the community. To honor the expertise and time of these “effective leader” participants, SCC approved a stipend per interviewee for their time.

Regional Location & Race/Ethnicity

Survey

Interviews/ Focus Groups

- western
- eastern

Race/ Ethnicity

Survey

Interviews/ Focus Groups

- White/Anglo
- Multi-racial/multi-ethnic
- Latino/a
- Decline to respond
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- Native American
- Other

4 See Appendix for survey sample data
In June 2015, we held one focus group with SCC grantees using the ReadyTalk webinar platform. The focus group was used as another opportunity to further explore themes that emerged from the survey. Interviews and focus groups also allowed us to include more diverse racial, ethnic, and geographic voices in the data collected through the survey.

**Phase 2: Meaning-Making Conversations**

Phase II focused on convening stakeholders to discuss project findings, identify areas of resonance and surprise, and determine recommendations to inform the report. In each meaning-making conversation, CompassPoint shared the findings from Phases I and II and then facilitated group discussions by asking participants to respond to the following questions:

- What about the findings resonate with you?
- What about the findings surprise you?
- What additional questions or comments do you have?
- What recommendations for action do you have for SCC, funders, leadership providers, or nonprofit leaders? (i.e., *What would you like to see happen with these findings?*).

**Margin to Center Approach and Lessons from Culturally Specific Communities**

Traditionally, research is conducted in one way: Survey a group and go with the majority of the data. We believe this approach reinforces a Western bias of focusing on the more mainstream leaders, organizations, and communities (the center) and undermines learning from non-traditional leaders and the organizations and communities they represent (the margins). After careful consideration of the data, CompassPoint made the decision to take a margin to center approach rather than a purely statistical approach. What this means is that we have put more weight on the qualitative data and are using interview, focus group, and meaning making quotes liberally throughout this report.

There is tremendous power in how challenges are named and who names them. When the center names the challenge and the solutions, we can perpetuate oppression. Therefore, our goal in this project is to put the marginalized populations closer to the center of our analysis and amplify the voices from the margin to the center.

“Living as we did—on the edge—we developed a particular way of seeing reality. We looked from both the outside in and the inside out. We focused our attention on the center as well as the margin. We understood both. This mode of seeing reminded us of the existence of a whole universe, a main body made up of both margin and center.”

---

6 Bell Hooks, *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*, 2000
**A Community**, in this report, refers specifically to communities of color, immigrant communities, and rural communities.

**A Consumer** is someone—such as a nonprofit executive director, manager, director, or coordinator—who participates in various formal leadership development activities.

**A Provider** of leadership development services is a consultant, trainer, facilitator, or coach who works to deliver tools and frameworks to consumers. Providers could identify as individual practitioners or part of a practice organization.

**A Funder**, in this report, is an organization or individual that provides grants and resources for nonprofits to take advantage of leadership development opportunities. Funders also partner with providers to deliver nonprofit leadership services and programs.
**Management** involves the process of planning, organizing, and measuring performance and work systems to support an organization’s ability to move forward its vision and agenda. Managers (or those with positional authority) oversee the technical aspects of the organization, operations, planning, and budgeting. They keep systems stable.

**Leadership** in this report is defined as the process of working with others in order to move forward an organizational or community vision and agenda. Leaders (who do and do not hold formal authority) deal with adaptive challenges, co-creating a vision, and aligning stakeholders including staff, board, and community. They keep systems changing and adapting.

**Leading Self** includes individual development, self-awareness, and self-management.

**Leading with Others** includes team performance, developing others, social awareness, and relationship management.

**Leading with the Organization**, program, or project includes the ability to interpret and adapt to the context within a system, entity, or organization.

**Leading with the Community** is the ability to navigate within systems, often without positional power or authority.

**Leading within a Movement** is the ability to engage in boundary crossing, and engage stakeholders from different sectors, communities, and disciplines.

**Effectiveness** means the program successfully impacts the development of leadership competencies identified in the program objectives.

**Developmental Relationships** include coaching, mentoring, and peer learning.

**Planned Instruction** describes a training or course that follows a planned curriculum.

**Action Learning** is a process which involves working on real challenges, using the knowledge and skills of a small group of people combined with skilled questioning, to re-interpret old and familiar concepts and produce fresh ideas.

**Experiential Learning** is a process of learning through experience, and is more specifically defined as learning through reflection on doing. This includes apprenticeships, internships, or on-the-job learning.

**Cultural Competence** refers to the ability of organizations and individuals to work effectively in cross-cultural or multicultural interactions. Terms like culture and cultural competency can mean different things to different people. In this paper we are defining culture broadly as the beliefs, values, customs, and behaviors of a particular group of people.
Leadership Development

Over the past few decades, there has been extensive research, guided by philanthropy and capacity builders, to examine the state of leadership development in the social change sector. While the private sector allocates billions of dollars to leadership development because they understand that skilled leaders are a powerful investment, less than 1% of overall foundation giving went to leadership development between 1992 and 2011. In light of the social sector’s relatively small investment, many have asked if philanthropy is effectively tapping leadership potential. This research has primarily explored questions such as: What does success look like? What results have we seen? What is the return on our investment of time, money, and expertise?

In 2008, CompassPoint Nonprofit Services, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Meyer Foundation, and Idealist.org partnered together to research, among other topics, what type of leadership development was required to strengthen the pipeline of leaders in the social sector who were ready to assume roles of positional authority — namely executive director positions — in nonprofit organizations. Of more than 6,000 respondents from across the country, 45% said they needed to further develop technical or management skills required by the executive role. And another 27% articulated a need to further develop the ability to lead, supervise, and manage staff.

Based on Daring to Lead and other national research studies, both philanthropy and capacity builders focused their energies toward constructing programs and initiatives that focused on horizontal leadership development. Traditionally, leadership programs predicated on horizontal development have focused on transmitting new content to a leader — adding knowledge and skills.

Recently, new trends have emerged in leadership development that are based on the unique current context of movement and organization leaders, and what leaders themselves are saying they need to thrive. The context is that, more than ever, leaders are navigating a world that is increasingly complex and interdependent. Leaders are living in a world that is volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA). Leaders who are equal to the task are those who can deal with constant ambiguity, notice the key patterns amongst the noise, and look at the world through multiple stakeholder perspectives. Responding and investing in the VUCA challenges leaders are currently facing, has resulted in leadership development approaches that have leveraged vertical leadership, adaptive leadership, and network/movement leadership.

In response to this VUCA world, the more successful leadership development programs tend to blend traditional horizontal competencies with the vertical development of leaders. Vertical development refers...
to the advancement in a leader’s thinking capability. The outcome of vertical development is the ability to think in more complex, systemic, strategic, and interdependent ways. A vertically focused program places less emphasis on the transmission of content to the leader (horizontal) and more on the transformation—the mindsets, identity, and mental models— of the leader.\(^\text{10}\)

New trends have emerged in leadership development that are based on the unique current context of movement and organization leaders, and what leaders themselves are saying they need to thrive.

In order to cultivate vertical leadership development, there have been a number of programs that utilized different approaches and methodologies. For example, Blue Shield of California Foundation has invested in two leadership programs—the Clinic Leadership Institute and the Strong Field Project—that have used coaching, peer learning groups, and capstone projects to advance vertical development. One design cornerstone of each program has been a focus on adaptive leadership capacity, which is defined as the ability to adapt and thrive in the face of complex challenges and change. Another cornerstone is building a network for change. The focus on networks has increased effectiveness within individual roles and strengthened the domestic violence field as a whole.\(^\text{11}\)

Other examples include the Michigan Council of Foundations in partnership with the Michigan Nonprofit Association, which created an action learning process to transform member organizations into diverse and inclusive institutions.\(^\text{12}\) And the YMCA of the USA, which uses the experiential 70-20-10 leadership development model, 70 percent on-the-job learning (or stretch assignments), 20 percent coaching and mentoring, and 10 percent formal training. YMCA staffers and their managers write annual development plans within the 70-20-10 framework and are assigned to mentorship, coaching, and training accordingly.\(^\text{13}\) Finally, Public Allies offers 10-month apprenticeships to diverse local leaders in the communities they serve. Allies serve four days per week in a nonprofit and one day per week in training throughout the 10-month apprenticeship\(^\text{14}\). Grantmakers for Effective Organizations acknowledges these types of approaches as best practices, which embrace an ‘action learning’ or ‘learning-by-doing’ focus, supporting and creating opportunities for participants to apply acquired knowledge and skills to real challenges facing their organizations.\(^\text{15}\)

Moreover, leadership development programs are also blending horizontal and vertical development utilizing integrated approaches with different lenses. Leadership theory now distinguishes among the leadership domains that any role may require: the capacity to lead self, to lead others, to lead an organization, and to lead externally in networks and community.\(^\text{16}\) Within these domains, effective leadership development programs are creating spaces—through workshops, trainings, coaching, and organizational development support—where leaders can step out of the day-to-day and focus on the

\(^{12}\) Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (2012), Case Study: Council of Michigan Foundations Peer Action Learning Network
\(^{13}\) YMCA of the USA, Developing Strong Leaders, Cause Driven Leadership Guide (2013)
\(^{14}\) Public Allies Website (www.publicallies.org)
relationships between self-care, spaciousness, sustainability, creativity, strategy, and impact.\textsuperscript{17} Again, this approach is more evolved than simply the delivery of content, skills, and models. And to ensure that the vertical approach is advancing thinking capability in this VUCA environment, leadership development programs are increasingly engaging in difficult conversations about gender, race, class, and other social identities. Building a true sense of community and networked leadership and grappling with power, privilege, and oppression are inextricable, and lay the groundwork for collaboration among leaders, especially within a larger movement.\textsuperscript{18} The vertical approach is focused on what the individual leader needs for development of their personal capacity, identity, and ability to think in more complex, strategic and interdependent ways.\textsuperscript{19}

**The State of the Nonprofit/ Philanthropic Sector in Washington State**

In 2013, the IRS listed 34,665 Washington State organizations as exempt from federal corporate income taxes. The rise in the number of nonprofit organizations across the state over the last decade is largely due to an increase in small nonprofits. It is important to note that almost half of the nonprofit organizations are small and nascent and the fast growing segment of nonprofits is made up of organizations with budgets under $50,000. Capacity building needs for this growing segment of nonprofits will likely need to focus on infrastructure, operations, and basic management skills. Because nonprofits are not required to report on diversity numbers, the data is scarce. However, national data shows that nonprofit employees are approximately 82 percent white, 10 percent African American, five percent Hispanic/Latino, three percent other, and one percent Asian or Pacific Islander.\textsuperscript{20}

Leadership development programs are also blending horizontal and vertical development utilizing integrated approaches with different lenses. Leadership theory now distinguishes among the leadership domains that any role may require: the capacity to lead self, to lead others, to lead an organization, and to lead externally in networks and community.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid
\textsuperscript{20} Schwartz, R., Weinberg, J., *The Voice of Nonprofit Talent: Perceptions of Diversity in the Workplace*
Philanthropic Giving

Philanthropic giving in Washington is up by more than $54 million from 2010. General operating support accounted for 18% ($159 million) of total regional giving for the Pacific Northwest, a 27% increase from 2010. Dollars allocated to program-related support declined by 30% in 2012, but still comprised the greatest proportion of grants. Support for leadership development or other technical assistance supports is not broken out as an allocation category nor are other capacity building supports. In order to measure impact of any future direct investment in leadership development and capacity building supports, it would be worthwhile to have funders and grantees track and report on these numbers.

Leadership Development Capacity Needs and Services

From the survey conducted by 501 Commons in 2012, a significant majority of nonprofit leaders surveyed (77.6%) say they have utilized capacity building services in the last two years, including training, consulting, and coaching. Service needs focused on a range of topics, including technical management issues, but it is notable that the topics with the highest interest primarily fall into the leadership development categories including: leadership coaching (46%), staff training (44%), board development (43%), assistance with partnerships, collaborations and networks (42%).

Previous reports of capacity building needs in the state reiterate some of the barriers that still exist today; including lack of funding specifically allocated for general operations or capacity building; for rural communities, a lack of providers and the necessity to travel significant distances to access services; and lastly, significant variance among the diverse communities in terms of capacity needs. As is still the case, the majority of providers of capacity building supports and services are based in major metropolitan areas of the state with the highest concentration in King County. Though some smaller community foundations have and continue to offer technical capacity building support in rural areas of the state.

A 2012 report of a study conducted by The Giving Practice looked at capacity building resources available to nonprofit organizations in Washington State, one of the key essential elements needed to support a healthy nonprofit ecosystem was, “ongoing ways to surface, educate, and sustain board and executive leadership.” Some of the investments that resulted from the recommendations given in that report have been implemented and continue to be offered today include: 501 Commons/Statewide Nonprofit Resource Directory, Medina Foundation support of grantees to attend the Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute at the UW Evans School of Policy & Governance, and Social Venture Partners delivery mechanisms for core capacity building needs.

Closures of service providers in recent years could exacerbate access to services in certain parts of the state. In 2011, the Nonprofit Center in Tacoma closed. In 2010, the Seattle affiliate of the Taproot Foundation, which matches volunteer professionals with nonprofits, closed. Volunteer centers in serving Thurston, Mason, Lewis counties, and Benton and Franklin counties have closed.

21 Trends in Northwest Giving 2014, Philanthropy Northwest
22 Capacity Survey, 501 Commons, 2012
23 An Assessment of Capacity Building in Washington State: The Nonprofit Ecosystem Framework, Executive Summary, February 2012, prepared by The Giving Practice a consulting service of Philanthropy Northwest
24 Ibid
25 Ibid
26 Capacity Building Interviews & Survey Results, 2012, 501Commons
In a survey conducted by 501 Commons in 2012, and completed by nonprofit leaders in Washington State (71% executive directors), 33% of respondents expected to have a senior leadership transition in the next three years. Of the respondents, 87% of leaders agree that succession planning is necessary in the social sector. However, 72% do not have a formal succession planning policy for planned transitions and 58% do not have a formal succession plan in place.

### Funders Support of Capacity Building

Some funders are intentionally increasing general operating support with the thinking that nonprofits can then decide to use a portion of those resources to address capacity building needs as they see fit. In fact, philanthropic dollars of general operating in the Pacific Northwest has gone up since 2010 by 27%, making up 18% of all philanthropic gifts by support type. At the same time, the percentage of resources allocated to programs has decreased 30%. This may put nonprofits into a position where they have to use the increased general operating resources to supplement programs over capacity.

Funders express there are some challenges with explicitly investing in capacity building. They are not certain of the return on the investment. They are concerned with power dynamics involved in asserting capacity priorities that the grantee organization might not have identified. And finally, funders lack the ability to measure the effectiveness and sustainability of one-off investments in capacity building support and services.

As is still the case, the majority of providers of capacity building supports and services are based in major metropolitan areas of the state with the highest concentration in King County. Though some smaller community foundations have and continue to offer technical capacity building support in rural areas of the state.

---

27 Capacity Survey, 501 Commons, 2012
29 An Assessment of Capacity Building in Washington State: The Nonprofit Ecosystem Framework, Executive Summary, February 2012, prepared by The Giving Practice a consulting service of Philanthropy Northwest
Leadership Defined

The project did not reveal a single or “correct” definition of leadership, which isn’t surprising, given that more than fifteen hundred definitions of leadership currently exist.  

Leadership as a Process, Not a Position

On the whole, leadership is defined primarily as a process, rather than formal, positional authority or title (e.g., executive director or manager in a group or hierarchy). As one respondent shared, “Leadership is bringing people together, so we all work together for a common goal or a common vision.” Another defined it as “moving people into action and empowering others.” Another shared, “Leadership isn’t just about being at the table; it’s also about being able to provide a voice to people that don’t have a voice. Ensuring those voices are being heard and they’re being represented.” These comments align with the sector trend of moving away from classical, traditional leadership to more of a shared leadership model that identifies leaders by the quality of their interactions rather than their position.  

Leadership was defined very differently depending upon cultural lens, situation, or context. Respondents emphasized that true leaders can exist anywhere within a community or within any position in an organization. Examples included someone who is invested in the success of everyone in their tribe; behind the scenes; a good follower of the people; empowering families and communities to make the best decisions for themselves; someone who is “of the community.” In communities of color in particular, there was a higher value placed on leadership from lived, community, and cultural experience rather than from formal education or position, which typically define traditional leadership.  

“Traditional views of leadership that are contingent on degrees, prior job titles, English proficiency, or charisma typically ignore the strengths of immigrant and refugee staff in organizations, and results in them being overlooked for leadership positions and opportunities.”  

“When we talk about leadership, we think it’s the person that can speak the most, has charisma, and is on the frontline. But, really, there are more people that are not on the frontline, but are doing a lot of leadership development with other people, and they are doing a lot of work in the communities. I just think we need to acknowledge that. We need to acknowledge that sometimes we only see what is visible.”  

“It would be really interesting to see an organization or a system where we support the differences in leadership. I would want to figure out how to set up a system so that all leadership styles are acknowledged, respected and given credence, without having to have the Ph.D. or not having to have the title that, in some ways, can mean nothing.

---

30 The End of Leadership, Barbara Kellerman, 2012
31 See definitions on page 12
What’s Still True

The following themes surfaced in the scan that align with prior research and sector-wide trends across the country. Much has been written about these themes, so we will mention them briefly here and suggest deeper exploration for those who are interested.

Leadership and Management Confirmation

There are several instances in the scan where leadership and management were confused or conflated. In both the survey and a majority of the interviews, leaders interpreted nonprofit, technical, executive management skills as “leadership,” emphasizing topics such as fundraising, business development, financial management, and board management as necessary skills. These skills would typically fall under the category of “managing an organization,” and would be classified as skills necessary to the positional executive role of an organization.

The Need for Management Fundamentals

Skills and tools related to management are still sorely needed, particularly in communities of color, in rural communities, and in Eastern Washington. When asked which areas they wished to learn more about in order to be more effective leaders, the second most common area of need survey respondents indicated covered aspects of organizational development, including fundraising, business development, financial management, board management, messaging, building systems, and strategic planning (23%). Respondents from communities of color and from Eastern Washington were more likely to identify a need for organizational development and skills and tools related to management.

“A lot of us [in communities of color] start organizations because we see a pressing need. But then we don’t know how to create the infrastructure for our organization to sustain itself. So when funders are asking for a 990, a 36-month projective budget, an audit, a fiscal sponsorship letter… All of those are things that funders assume we all know how to do. And for a small community based organization, there’s really no place to go and get that information for free.”

Leadership Succession

Beyond the traditional management skills needed, consumers emphasized succession planning as an essential leadership competency. As indicated in the literature review, leaders agree that succession planning is necessary but do not have formal planning in place. According to BridgeSpan, many nonprofit leaders (including nonprofit boards) confront the question of leadership development only when faced with a succession crisis.32

32 Bridgespan: Nonprofit Leadership Development: What’s Your “Plan A” for Growing Future Leaders?
This is a trend sector wide, with rates of executive turnover remaining high and boards often under-prepared to support and select new executive leaders.

"Many communities of color are led by elders. These leaders will retire in a few years, leaving a gap in leadership, as there are few programs to pull potential new leaders into the field."

**Limited Resources, Self Capacity and Time**

When surveyed about what leadership programs exist, just under 400 responses were received. What isn’t new is that there are already many programs available. That the majority are located primarily in major metropolitan areas and primarily in Western Washington/King County also isn’t new. However, the scan illustrated that there are also still barriers to accessing these programs.

Not having enough time and limited staff capacity were cited as the two most common barriers to accessing leadership development opportunities. Half of consumers identified lack of time as a barrier to accessing leadership resources and 40% identified limited staff capacity as a barrier. 100% of interview and focus group respondents cited “limited resources” as a separate barrier (only 12% of survey respondents cited this as a barrier). Several respondents noted in their open ended responses, organizations that are struggling financially have a tendency to adopt a “short-term” mindset, which generates a self-reinforcing cycle of burnout, turnover, and employee dissatisfaction. This is consistent with prior state research that reiterates barriers including lack of funding for general operations or capacity building (see literature review).

Leaders of color were more likely to identify limited staff capacity as a barrier while Caucasian respondents were more likely to identify staff time and lack of priority among positional leaders. The majority of leaders stated they do not have time to sit in a meeting or training when their communities have such great need. The training becomes secondary to them.

“Many immigrant-and-refugee-led organizations face constant challenges in growing their capacity, which they need in order to fully participate in efforts to change systems. The traditional model for capacity building tends to be top-down and not driven by communities, and has not been as effective as it could be. This traditional model often offers assistance such as workshops and small grants, but the benefits are lost when organizations have little or no staffing to implement what is learned.”

“So for a leader like me, it is hard, because I work with a community that’s new to the country, that’s absolutely a needy community. They don’t have time for actual leadership, or that concept is the last to come to their mind when they cannot pay the electricity and light today, or when they cannot find somebody who understands them in the school, or when they are homeless.”

---

33 See Appendix G
Capacity/ Leadership Tension

Without exception, every single interview and focus group respondent indicated a forced choice between investing in core operations or leadership development and indicated that the majority of funders invest in either general operating or leadership development. Nonprofit leaders stressed the urgent management and community aspects that simultaneously pull on their attention on a regular basis. This may be why the second most common area of need identified by consumers in the survey covered aspects of organizational development (listed above). Several respondents noted needing help with strategic planning, including setting strategic priorities, balancing the needs of the organization and the needs of staff, and figuring out ways to “move the organization forward” given limited resources.

“Funding for capacity so that people have the time and ability to actually go and participate, that’s one barrier. Funding so they can actually pay for either staffing support when they go or resources to invest in. That’s another potential barrier.”

“I know that there are good leadership development programs, and I do not have the staff to send to those programs. Our staff is 1.5, and that’s what we have. We run the whole organization with that staff…But, also, the staff that we have do not have the time to do it.”

“There’s just so much instability. When there is instability, it is very hard to develop people, because leadership requires people to stick around. And we are in a field that is constantly having turnover, simply because the funding is so unstable. And it’s very difficult for people, especially leaders of color who have to support probably their parents and then others to just constantly try to scramble around finding funding together. If funders really want leadership to develop, then they need to create a condition where it is stable enough that the soil is not being tilled all the time. If we’re dropping seeds down, and we’re just constantly churning the soil, they cannot grow.”
What’s New

The following section lifts up the key themes from the scan, focusing on “what’s new” in what we heard from nonprofit leaders about what works and what should be amplified to support their development and that of other leaders in the sector. It also focuses on some key perceived barriers to accessing the leadership development offerings that are currently available.

Emphasis on Relationship Networks

Leaders cited developmental relationships\(^{34}\) as the most effective methodology for their leadership development, including mentors, peers, and informal networks. Survey respondents (28%) identified peer networking, partnerships, and collaboration most often as additional programs or initiatives they believe are needed in open-ended responses. Examples of this include informal peer-learning groups for sharing strategies and best practices, open forums for potential leaders to work together to identify goals and action points for their communities, book groups, and general space and time to develop deeper relationships with other leaders in the field.

“I just don't know that funders have really ever taken into consideration how important peer circles are to part of a plan. It’s always been programmatic. I don’t know that they would see that as part of capacity building.”

---

\(^{34}\) See Definitions on page 12
100% of interview and focus group respondents and 44% of leaders of color from the survey see peer networks and peer learning as “highly effective” and nearly all of those respondents emphasized informal peer networking and support system approach as a way to stay connected. Specifically, hosted informal executive director happy hours or gatherings were mentioned most frequently as being beneficial to relationship building and support for EDs in rural parts of the state and leaders of color. Several leaders mentioned that formal, funded learning groups do not always work as well as participants who are brought together by a funder or provider but not always with the same shared interest or purpose. With informal networking, groups come together organically and are often drawn together by natural affiliation, need, or to address a shared goal or challenge.

“It’s informal. It’s not like we have a plan. If I find something out, I’ll just call them and say, ‘You know, this is happening. What do you think?’ And they will just help. Or if they have a leadership program, they invite us, and we go… It’s just our relationship. And I have participated in learning groups because the funder wanted to have a learning group. And in my point of view, it works, but not that well when the funder is requiring it.”

When consumers do participate in peer networks or peer groups, a large majority feel they are very effective or effective (77%). And while a majority of funders invest resources here (75%), only 10% of consumers reported receiving funding to invest or participate in peer networks or peer learning groups over the past two years.

“I go for the space. I go for the chance to get away from the daily list of fires and things I need to be working on and things I should have done on the to-do list that doesn’t end. And I go because I can sit in a room with other people and realize I’m not alone.”

81% of providers report using developmental relationships in their leadership development offerings. Programs and informal providers recommended by respondents are listed in the appendix.

Mentorship was also highlighted by respondents as being extremely effective when it is done well and when it is a complement to other forms of leadership development. Respondents shared that mentoring facilitated connections to resources and networks, supported them to apply and incorporate learning from leadership programs, and held them accountable to goals they set for themselves. Additionally, they benefit from mentors who create connections between intergenerational leaders, support young and emerging leaders, and provide deep knowledge of community and cultural dynamics.

“I think we have seven young people of color running for office in Pierce County, and all extremely qualified. So I took it upon myself to get the mayor and the former mayor together, along with these young candidates and invited them over to get an opportunity to get to know us, ask any questions that
were on their mind because being a candidate of color is different than being just a candidate. And just offered them that opportunity. And it was so well received. And I looked around the room. And I thought, my god, if we could groom this group of leaders and not leave it to chance, how much better our community would be.”

“A lot of people in tribal communities learn better anyway face-to-face, because we’re based in oral tradition. Relationships, and seeing someone, and seeing their body language, and reading them is a very important part of the learning. To support the training and leadership development of tribal leaders in tribal communities, it really has to be based on relationship building. It has to begin with face-to-face contact. Because to begin with something else and then try to do that later, it won’t be possible to get engagement, and people won’t learn, and they won’t trust and support each other.”

When asked what was needed to be a more effective leader, respondents ranked emotional intelligence and “soft skills” highest (24%). Soft skills include interpersonal communication skills, inspiring team members, emotional intelligence, and conflict management. Many responses related to the human element of managing staff, including giving effective and direct feedback, working with individuals with different learning styles, and motivating staff to feel inspired to perform at a high level. However, other responses related to using soft skills to engage community stakeholders or to collaborate effectively.

Participants also cited “networked leadership” as an important area of growth in their leadership. Specifically in serving as individual connectors and relationship brokers to facilitate greater collaboration, knowledge flow, and innovation in communities and between organizations. Examples included bringing together leaders from disparate organizations to collaborate on policy change, groups of community members coming together monthly to work on specific projects or initiatives, or more generalized convening around common nonprofit struggles, barriers, and strategies.

“But I think so much leadership focuses on leading the organization—like managing, that kind of piece. And I think we miss out on the big hard things, that boundary-crossing and engaging the stakeholders from different sectors, if we focus too much on the organization or the program.”

“This [networked leadership] approach particularly sheds light on the leadership qualities of immigrant women, whose strengths are often in adaptive leadership skills, servant leadership, etc. …Collaborative-styled leadership is becoming more mainstream, shifting from traditional hierarchical-styled leadership systems. An emphasis on bridging perspectives and differences is becoming more valued. Collaborative network relationships and an understanding of interdependence is a means of survival in working-class, communities of color, refugee/immigrant communities.”
Spotlight on Vertical Leadership

Leaders prefer experiential and action learning, ranking it only slightly behind developmental relationships as “most effective.” These examples of vertical leadership development methodologies give leaders the opportunity to stretch and apply their knowledge to real life challenges and shift learning from an isolated event to a concrete experience. Leaders of color and rural leaders in particular, placed less emphasis on the transmission of content to the leader (horizontal) and more on the transformation—the mind-sets, identity, and mental models—of the leader (vertical). Respondents appreciated opportunities where they can leverage and immediately apply learning towards the big challenges they face in their work. For a list of programs that were recommended for providing vertical leadership, see Appendix C.

“We are a community that’s used to attacking problems in a concrete way of, ‘Okay. We need a YMCA. So we’re going to build that.’ Well, how do you move people out of poverty and how do you train the next generation of employees when you no longer have natural resource based jobs?”

“I feel like the paradigm for nonprofit leadership programs really has to shift, because right now they’re just so surface-level. There are so many leadership programs in Seattle. There are quite a few. But what they have is they’re more like a nonprofit management 101-type versus actual leadership. I think leadership is about vision and change. And what most nonprofit leadership programs are, these are five skills that you need. And I think that needs to be flipped on its head. Right now we try to get people who might be leaders, and we train them on stuff. And then we hope that they’ll apply their skills to something that they’re passionate about, some problems in society. And I think that needs to be flipped, which is we need to find people who are already passionate about something in society that they want to change, and then get them the skills and the connections that they need to do that.”

While many providers indicate they use experiential learning and action learning in their program design and delivery, it is the least common methodology they offer. As one provider shared, “Leaders don’t need more training. They need help taking what they learn and putting it into practice.”
Cultural Relevance and Responsiveness

Given the emphasis on lived, community, and cultural experience in communities of color, it makes sense that for leaders of different race, ethnicity, and cultural backgrounds, how they define the “effectiveness” of leadership development programming or services is closely related to how culturally relevant and appropriate the services are.

In a focus group with SCC grantees, participants cited a number of benefits for having leadership development opportunities delivered by members of diverse communities directly for those communities. Many SCC grantees are using this train-the-trainer model to not only develop the capacity of members of their communities but to also then build the capacity of organizations in those communities. Some of the values of investing in community expertise included leaders of color being recognized as experts, increased collaboration among siloed organizations, and empowering community members to step into leadership roles to move systems forward.

Native, immigrant, and refugee community leaders we interviewed articulated community strengths of resilience, loyalty, and cultural traditions and how those can and should be tapped to help meet the needs and create solutions for the issues their communities face.

“We recruit talented emerging leaders, we train them, provide them with mentorship and financial support, healthcare. And then we send them to work in communities of color-led nonprofits with the hopes that they will stay in the field, and they’ll help their organization develop their capacity. And to get diverse communities to work together to push for systems change.”

“We leaders are seeking forums to talk about “cultures and historical trauma…and how they affect being a leader and doing this sort of work. Many of the leadership programs just focus on this heroic leader structure that has been the mainstream model for such a long time. And they focus on things like how to do public speaking or how to run a meeting. No one is talking about how to work with elders or how to work after your community has gone through war and forced migration.”

Offering leadership programs customized to specific populations of leaders was identified as an area of need by 100% of interview and focus group respondents. In particular, respondents identified the need for customized trainings for leaders who are often marginalized and not in positions of power and authority, including individuals of color, women, young and emerging leaders, and leaders in rural locations. In survey responses, leaders of color were more likely to identify the need for leadership training for specific groups (27%) compared to Caucasian respondents (19%) as well as cultural competency (21% compared to 6%).

Every leader of color in the interviews and focus group indicated that while there are existing programs available in Washington, they are seen as leaning toward the mainstream, lacking cultural competence or the inclusion of issues of race, power and privilege that often come up for leaders in their work. Specifically,
the participants and trainers were described as homogeneous and programs described as having little discussion (or even acknowledgement) of cultural differences. As a result, some entities have begun to create culturally specific trainings on their own.

“If folks of color are going to commit and be a part of a leadership program, it needs to be relevant, culturally versatile or inclusive. …Oftentimes general programs that are out there don’t speak to them [leaders of color] that way, so they don’t typically sign up. They don’t feel like that’s for them.”

“I haven’t discovered it yet. And I’m constantly on the prowl, on the look trying to identify who is out there— there are lots of entities that talk about leadership development. But from a culturally relevant perspective, understanding the leadership development needs of a diverse community, I’ve not seen it.”

Respondents thought programs could be improved with the inclusion of content that focuses on multicultural skills and racial equity, communication across communities and sectors, providing supportive environments for staff of color, addressing power and privilege, and breaking down structural racism. As one respondent reflected, “I see a big need to address the reality of the gaps between well-intended white-led organizations and communities of color and the reality of sexism and other dominating /excluding behaviors being accepted among/by ‘progressive’ leaders and activists.”

While lack of cultural relevance was emphasized as a primary barrier, it was not the only barrier acknowledged. Leaders we spoke with articulated a lack trust in the willingness of funders to invest in their smaller more nascent organizations. There is a sense from leaders that funders expect to invest in episodic trainings or a series of short-term services one year and not the next, and still see immediate changes in outcomes and capacity. In fact, a central theme that emerged is the perception that funders are not investing in communities of color to build their capacity, which is what prevents them from engaging in leadership development opportunities.

“Sometimes foundations like to think, ‘Oh, yes, if we just go and teach those folks of color how to be better nonprofit managers, then they should do better. Or maybe if they were more efficient with what little they have.’ There are all kinds of other frames that have led philanthropy to thinking about, well, we’re just going to give a little bit of money to the capacity-building thing over here, and they’ll make do. They’ll make up the rest. Right? But that’s not enough.”

“Funders are not investing enough in communities of color, because they have this sort of mainstream definition of what things should be. And then communities are stuck in this capacity paradox.”

“There’s a fundamental problem in philanthropy that’s been around for years, which is they don’t fund communities of color, so communities of color don’t ever have the same access to resources to ever build their capacity.”
“There needs to be more discussion about institutionalized, structural barriers that exist that prohibit communities of color from participating.”

We should note a trend that emerged during the survey process – leaders of color (both those we interviewed and those who declined to participate) indicated a strong sense of “fatigue” from being asked to participate in funder conversations, sit on committees, or respond to surveys. This fatigue was present for several reasons: 1) they do not have enough capacity in their organizations to allow for them to participate without losing ground back at work; 2) they are often not adequately acknowledged or compensated for their time and expertise; and 3) their input is rarely followed up on.

“Honestly, people are so tired of surveys. We keep asking for the same things: General operating, capacity building, multi-year funding, etc. Until progress is made on those things, people are just going to get sick of being asked.”

Finally, the majority of leaders of color suggested that white allies can play a larger role in dismantling the oppression that is playing out in organizations and communities across the state. While this includes understanding and recognizing white privilege and increasing self-awareness of racial socialization, it also involves engaging in authentic dialogue about issues of race, racial stereotypes, racism, whiteness, and internalized dominance and ultimately seeking to address and dismantle systems of oppression.

“And then I think part of it is there is a lot of work to be done on behalf of white leaders. I know people that are great white allies, and are in leadership positions, and have actively worked to acknowledge and check their own privilege in certain spaces and center the experiences of their staff that are people of color. But that work of educating other white leaders needs to come from other white allies. It can’t just be people of color saying, ‘This is what you need to do.’ We need people who have a good social justice lens educating their peers.”

The Role of Geography

For rural leaders, leadership training and support services are (still) not provided in the communities where they work and live and therefore, are not accessible. When services do exist, leaders said they were often sporadic and not sustained. Geography was cited as a barrier to participation by every interviewee outside of Seattle and Spokane, but by only 6% of survey respondents (note: 80% of survey respondents are based in Western Washington, 53% from Seattle). Several interviewees noted that a large number of opportunities are offered in the major urban counties and cities, such as King County and Seattle, and that it was difficult to find the time and/or resources to travel across the state to participate in these opportunities.

Traveling a significant distance to participate in leadership development also means additional costs for the participants including hotel stays and meals. Funding for individual leaders to go through certification programs was mentioned several times as having high value. Leaders particularly appreciated the wrap-around support provided by the Medina Foundation so they did not have to worry about any of the travel and overnight stay costs associated with participating.
In rural areas, technology access was also a barrier, with connectivity being an issue and limiting access to the Internet and online learning opportunities. When leaders did have access to online learning, they were increasingly taking advantage of it for their development.

“For Eastern Washington—Spokane or Seattle are the only hubs to access leadership development training – and the travel time and cost become an issue.”

“This part of Washington is frontier, according to the USDA—not just rural, but frontier. And so you don’t have access like cellphones. You don’t have access to the Internet.”

Geography also can impact how leaders engage with one another. In rural regions of the state, close-knit communities facilitate an all-hands on deck mindset when it comes to tackling problems. Leaders talked about the, “one for all and all for one” mentality where everyone knows one another and everyone pitches in. They shared the authentic ability to collaborate and to tackle problems together. “When there is a problem, if we can identify it we can work on it.” Rural community leaders specifically talked about the “homesteader” mentality of community spirit, self-reliance, and self-determination. Clearly, there are many strengths to draw from in these communities. However, every rural leader interviewed qualified this by saying a “culture of nice” gets in the way of challenging leadership or working to address more entrenched or systemic community issues.

“Genuinely, people are nice, but to the point where it’s staged; to the point where we don’t get work done because people are afraid to rock the boat.”

One of the interesting findings is that the term “community” is used so loosely that it implies one community. In many regions of the state, there are plural communities in one region. We repeatedly heard terms such as “there are two Walla Wallas,” “two Spokanes,” “two Methow Valleys,” with distinct lines drawn across race, income and class. In these regions, those in leadership are often not representative of those communities most impacted by social disparities or inequities.

“The boundaries, the racial boundaries, are pretty bright. They’re not discussed. They’re not highlighted in the community itself. But they’re very present. So in terms of obstacles, just the lack of everyday relationships between underrepresented communities and the principal [mainstream] community is, in itself, a barrier.”

Finally, many respondents stressed that the demographics of Washington communities are changing at a rapid pace, expressing concerns that positional leadership does not represent the demographics of their communities and there is a devaluing of younger leadership.

“The school is approaching 40% Latino. And four of the six elementary schools have a Latino student enrollment of 40%. But virtually none of the leadership positions reflects that reality.”

“Demographics tell such a huge story. And they actually give the funders a blueprint for where they need to go and how they need to build.”
Bright Spots

“Where these opportunities fall on fertile soil, nurture that.” - Interviewee

Effective Leadership Programs, Providers, Offerings

The lists below illustrate leadership offerings that were recommended by interviewees and survey respondents. Note that the programs and offerings recommended by leaders of color and rural leaders tends to emphasize specific populations and communities, while programs recommended by survey respondents tend to have a broader (e.g., multi-regional or national) focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended by Leaders of Color and Rural Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Leadership Forum Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for a Just Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Islander Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Education Strategy Roundtable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Director Happy Hour, Seattle, Vu Le</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Family Foundation Leadership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Community Fund Nonprofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Academy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Education for Asian Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OneAmerica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Institute for Undoing Institutional Racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project LEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainier Valley Corps*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Trust Community Leadership Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way King County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Washington, Evans School of Public Affairs (MPA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Washington, Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute (NELI)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Nonprofits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended by Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501 Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP Northwest Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Neighborhood Excellence Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoardSource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Director Happy Hour, Seattle, Vu Le</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Eastside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Works (Table Talks), Janet Boguch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranate Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood Leadership Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University Master of Nonprofit Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Management Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Washington, Evans School of Public Affairs (MPA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Washington, Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute (NELI)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Nonprofits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

35 See Appendix for complete list of recommended programs and for a list of programs broken down by region
36 Bold = program or offering was recommended in both qualitative interviews and in survey
*represents an SCC leadership grantee
“And I felt like that was the first time I was in a leadership program that was like not only are you accepted, but we’re going to talk about how your cultural and racial background and all these things influenced the type of leader that you are, and your communication style, and what are those things about how you’ve been socialized that influenced how you might be perceived by traditional leadership structures. And I thought that was really valuable.”

“Policy was drafted by leaders who had been working in the communities for years, based on their actual experience and comments and suggestions that they gathered by the community. As a result, the leaders were more confident to carry on work that’s grounded in their communities.”

“It is a phenomenal model. I think it has tremendous impact in a relatively brief timeframe. You know, it’s very time limited. It’s a brief program, offers a tremendous amount of value for the time invested. I actually went through that program through funding through the Medina Foundation.”

“The content is about capacity, but you hear about struggles, you hear about barriers, you hear about why certain funding streams are working or not working.”

“We’re doing some leadership training that is testing this kind of a multiple leadership intelligence approach and trying to teach it alongside the project. So teaching happens not only in the classroom, but happens with people collaborating on doing something important together. And we discovered that in the doing part, all kinds of leadership emerges that is never visible earlier on in the process.”
The Ideal Leadership Program

Just under half of consumers provided input on additional programs or initiatives they believe are needed to cultivate leadership in the field in which they work (42%) and interviewees and focus group respondents were asked to design a program to help nonprofit leaders become more effective. The following provides a compilation of components and quotes:

- Nonprofit 101 and Organizing 101 programs so people get the foundational pieces first
- A combination of theory, skills building, reflection, and practice
- Programs that put native communities and communities of color at the center (in design and delivery)
- An approach that acknowledges strengths and challenges of different communities
- Programs based in cultural awareness of the communities
- Approaches that combine cohort learning with coaching or mentorship
- Spaciousness so people can reflect on learning
- Opportunities for real-time application of learnings
- Inclusion of people from different sectors and different backgrounds
- Programs that include coaching and/or mentorship
- Programs that include cohort, peer-to-peer learning
- An approach that allows leaders to participate as a team, and that recognizes leaders from different parts of the organization
- A network for participants to stay engaged and connected to one another post program

“Design with native and tribal communities at the center, so it’s really about supporting them, helping them to build relationships, overcome the barriers. And then once they are a little bit stronger and more together, then open it up to other organizations that might be able to support them.”

“Put yourself in some kind of service roles, so you end up getting exposed to these other aspects of leadership and mentorship that aren’t quite as formal.”

“Bring a team, a couple of different leaders from the organization so that the leadership doesn’t just rest with one person.”

“Consider funding the leaders themselves rather than providers. Let leaders apply for a Nonprofit Professional Development Account where they are given $2500 (for example) to use themselves or distribute to their staff…. If they can show they used their full account, provide them with a matching general operating grant that recognizes the time they or staff spent in learning and professional development. This incentivizes them to spend the time on development and avoids funders making the decisions about what people need.”
Comparison of Leadership Development Priorities

Comparison of Consumer, Provider, and Funder Priorities in Leadership Competencies

Consumers were asked to consider which of the following leadership domains are *most essential* to them to achieve the impact they are seeking. Because we see these competencies as interdependent, the goal of the scan was not to force respondents to choose one over another. However, we were curious to see which areas might need more attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Interviews/ Focus Group</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Self (individual development, self-awareness, and self-management)</td>
<td>Ranked #2 (tie)</td>
<td>Ranked #1 (tie) (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading with Others (team performance, social awareness, relationship management)</td>
<td>Ranked #5</td>
<td>Ranked #1 (tie) (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading the Organization, Program, or Project (ability to interpret and adapt to the context within a system, entity, organization)</td>
<td>Ranked #3</td>
<td>Ranked #2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within the Community (ability to navigate within systems often without positional power or authority)</td>
<td>Ranked #2 (tie)</td>
<td>Ranked #3 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within a movement (ability to engage in boundary crossing; engage stakeholders from different sectors, communities and disciplines)</td>
<td>Ranked #1</td>
<td>Ranked #5 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, each domain was deemed essential by a portion of respondents, with some distinctions of note:

While leaders of color in particular felt that they have achieved progress in working more collaboratively across diverse ethnic and racial groups and engaging stakeholders across boundaries, *leading within a movement* (see definitions) is the leadership competency leaders of color find “most essential”. Although this competency received the lowest overall rating in the survey, it was still ranked a 5 in terms of its perceived importance by 20% of consumers and 23% of funders, making it the most important essential leadership competency to respondents of this survey. Funders and leaders focus the least in this domain and 15% of providers don’t focus on it at all.
Leading with others and the soft skills and interpersonal skills in this domain were also emphasized by survey respondents in particular. Leading self was emphasized as it related primarily to race, class, power, and privilege and to self-care and burnout prevention. Beyond the traditional management skills needed, survey respondents emphasized two areas of needed attention in the Leading the organization domain: Adaptive Leadership and Succession Planning.

While leading with others was ranked essential by a majority of survey respondents overall, it was ranked least essential by a majority of rural leaders and leaders of color in the interviews, which contradicts the emphasis they placed on relationships and engaging staff and community stakeholders during the interviews. It is assumed this distinction is due to their perceived effectiveness in those domains, which prompts them to prioritize the other areas first. Leaders in the interviews did overwhelmingly state that while not all of the domains are sequential, leading self and leading with others competencies need to be mastered before one can be successful in the other domains.

Comparison of Consumer, Provider, and Funder Priorities in Professional Development Support

Leaders in the survey were asked to identify their top three priority funding areas if funding were specifically available to develop the leadership to achieve the outcomes their organization, community or movement seeks. These priorities were compared with what funders identified as programs or initiatives they had funded in the past two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Support</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General operating funding for talent management</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External multi-session leadership development programs</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability recruit high potential staff</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coaching</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/networking events</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer networks/peer learning groups</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build talent management</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External one-off trainings</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit management certificate/degree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other leadership development/talent management support</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association membership</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close alignment between consumers and funders
Higher priority for consumers than funded by funders
Frequently funded but not a high priority for consumers
Consumers and funder priorities appear to be fairly aligned in prioritizing general operating funding for talent management (e.g., development of staff). Please note that the survey responses are primarily from mainstream organizations. 100% of leaders of color and rural leaders prioritized general operating support overall. They are also aligned in prioritizing multi-session leadership programs.

However, while 82% of funders indicated that they fund conferences and networking events, only 26% of consumers identified this as one of the three most valuable forms of support they could receive. Note that survey results align with leader of color and rural leader responses as well.

Nearly a third of consumers identified the ability to recruit high potential staff as a top three priority but only 18% of funders report providing support in this area. Aligning this finding with the priority consumers place on needed support for succession planning, this is a potential area funders need to explore further for support.

Nonprofit management certificate or degree programs were identified as a “top three priority” by 13% and 15% of consumers. And none of the funders indicated that they had funded or provided funding for this type of development in the past two years. However, 56% of survey respondents who identify as leaders of color have utilized nonprofit management certificate or degree programs. They mentioned a primary reason for participating would be for the credibility or validation degrees and formal certification training in various leadership tools bring.

“It’s been really empowering to people of color in those systems to be now acknowledged as experts. Which it feels weird to say that, but in some ways it’s kind of like getting your degree. That validates your indigenous knowledge that you’ve had your whole life. But now you have the degree, so now they can put money behind you, they can put energy behind you. And that’s really empowering in some ways.”

While providers deliver or fund a range of professional development opportunities, topical workshops and conferences were cited in the survey as the most common opportunity, offered or funded (69%).

While planned instruction is by offered by the majority of providers, (73%), it was ranked as the least preferred learning technique and least effective by consumers, primarily mentioned as “just another training,” and “not culturally relevant or diverse.” Respondents also shared that trainings are often “designed to the middle,” so people who are beginners do not get the basics and individuals that are more advanced do not get their needs met.

“Just sending people through training is a great start, but I don’t think it’s going to help us address the challenges that our communities are facing as rapidly as we need them to.”

“We should invest less in the one-day workshop, the one-day conference. I just feel like we keep trying that and we haven’t seen people getting extraordinarily better at their jobs.”

37 See Appendix for all quantitative survey data compiled by Social Policy Research Associates for this scan
Additional Program Needs Articulated by Consumers

When asked what additional leadership programs or initiatives were needed, peer networking, partnerships, and collaboration were identified most often by consumers who provided open-ended responses (28%). Offering leadership programs customized to specific populations of leaders was identified as an area of need by 18% of consumers who provided input.

See “What’s Still True” section for further detail on organizational development needs. See “What’s New” section for further detail on peer networks/collaboration and leadership training needs for specific groups.
In this section, we present recommendations that are directly informed by the scan results. This is meant to provide some form of road map for a “now what?” or a “what next?” At the end of the section, we include a list of suggestions broken into categories based upon short-term, relatively low cost action; mid-range; and longer-term investments.

Because this work was commissioned by the SCC, we see the recommendations as being primarily for funders and providers of leadership development. However, we acknowledge that our nonprofit work is part of a complex and interdependent ecosystem. Therefore, many of these recommendations can apply to nonprofit leaders and key stakeholders as well.

Be Clear About Impact

Leadership development is murky and complex. As the survey indicates, there is no one form of leadership and what one person deems effective, another might not. Be clear about what you actually mean by “leadership” including what intended impact and outcomes you seek to achieve. As Ira Hirschfield of the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund suggests, consider what kind of leadership is needed at the individual, organizational, network or movement level to achieve your (or the) program priorities, and then fund and design to that.

Acknowledge Interdependencies

Between Management and Leadership

Respondents emphasized the importance of both technical management skills and leadership skills. While these two domains are indeed different, they are not mutually exclusive. Rather, consider what competencies are needed to be a good manager and a good leader and treat them as separate, but interdependent areas that work together to ensure organizational, project, or program success.

Core Support and Leadership Development

One major theme permeated this scan: It is the access to financial resources (rather than access to leadership development support) that is perceived as the greatest obstacle. The need for more general operating and capacity building funding remains high, particularly for small and nascent organizations. A recent finding from Management Assistance Group’s Networked Leadership Learning Lab report was that “among the most challenging barriers to developing long-term vision and infrastructure is the way in which leaders are expected to grow their own organization or group as well as their own leadership, particularly in a resource-short environment.”

---

40 See Definitions on page 12
Under the right conditions, leaders are quite capable of focusing on leadership development and forward movement. However, when simply struggling to find financial and organizational stability from month to month, the focus will instead pivot to simply surviving.

“If they said, ‘We will not only fund the conference or program you want to attend, but we will provide you with an equal amount of funding for your services’, I would be willing to bet you would see a real sea change in terms of any hesitation towards attending those. I think most nonprofits do want to improve themselves. They do want to seek these opportunities. But they see it as a choice between service delivery and attending them.”

Of Leadership Methodologies

While the data collection unpacked several leadership methodologies, each of them are essential dependent upon the situation and context. Be clear about desired impact and then determine best methodologies from there. Consider a blend of adult learning approaches like “70/20/10” (70% on-the-job learning, 20% coaching and mentoring, and 10% formal training).

Pay Attention to Leadership Succession

Beyond the traditional management skills needed, consumers emphasized succession planning as an essential leadership competency. Succession planning is a significant, strategic opportunity to increase an organization’s capacity, program effectiveness, and long-term stability and sustainability. It also ensures attention is paid to distributing leadership across an organization, rather than consolidating in one positional role, which can lead to depletion and burnout. Key ingredients of succession planning would include developing an emergency succession plan, engaging and developing future positional leaders to ensure talent management is in place, ensuring ongoing board involvement in the succession process, and understanding that financial stability is essential to effective executive transitions.

Invest in what is Already Working

Instead of reinventing the wheel, leverage and invest in what is already working well (like developmental relationships such as informal peer networking and mentoring). In rural and urban areas, leaders are already coming together informally to collaborate, share knowledge, provide support, and most importantly, build trust. Seen through a more mainstream lens, these informal peer gatherings and mentoring relationships might be dismissed. However, it is clear these leaders are benefitting a great deal from being in community with one another.

“I can point to 20, 25 young folk along that I work with on an ongoing basis…I have travel money, site visit money, meeting with people, opening doors for people. If I’ve got a young person interested in law for instance, I put them in touch with the judge or put them in touch with the whatever, help them build the leadership they need to go from there. But that’s time. That’s money.”
Additionally, funders can make more long term investments into those programs that have already been identified as effective. This allows programs to refine their approaches over time to meet the evolving needs of the sector.

**Nurture and Amplify Without Over-scripting**

By supporting the networking and mentoring that is already happening without over scripting how and when it happens, we create safe space for leaders to gather to understand promising practices, share resources, and develop authentic relationships that can strengthen the sector and community of nonprofits. This also includes flexible leadership approaches like funding individuals directly with discretionary funds to use however they see fit.

**Go Directly to the Communities and Listen Deeply**

Without exception, nonprofits leaders encouraged funders to go directly (and in person) to the community and its leaders they are hoping to invest in with no preconceived agenda or plan other than to simply to listen to them.

“I think the one learning circle that I would really appreciate having would be a community based organization or leader based learning circle that also includes funders. I don’t know that we ever get to talk to them. We never get to meet with them. What is an emerging issue in communities of color is not necessarily always emerging for a funder. And with such huge funders in our backyard, it’s really difficult to have established conversations with them and still be truthful to the power dynamic that’s in the room.”

Physical presence allows funders to better understand the unique strengths, needs, and approaches to problems and solutions for diverse communities. In the absence of physical presence (or ideally, in addition to physical presence), consider flexible, community-driven resources that support culturally specific approaches to leadership, which better meet the needs of leaders of color and community leaders.

“No body knows a community like itself…In order for our entire state to be successful, we have to make sure that we’re developing leadership across the state, in every city and every county. And we’ve got to make sure that we’re develop-ing leadership that’s appropriate for that area. And I think only a community could tell you that.”

However, listening is only part of the equation. Be mindful of the trickle down community engagement that can happen and seek to fund and support leaders directly to be engaged in dialogue.

---

42 Haas Jr. Fund Flexible Leadership Awards
Address Cultural Relevance and Responsiveness Needs

Address the cultural relevance and responsiveness needs highlighted in this scan and begin to dismantle the structural inequities that are keeping leaders from different races, backgrounds, and communities from accessing the leadership development opportunities they need to impact social change. Funders and providers can make a tremendous impact in our sector by continually working to become aware of our identity and cultural location and consider what is needed within our funding institutions and programs to address issues of diversity, equity and inclusion; to bring a deeper level of cultural competency to program and grantmaking; and to support leadership development at all levels of the organization.

“But those are the kinds of things that I wish that philanthropy and [providers] would be willing to do, is really educate ourselves on the differences that we have so that we can be adaptable to those differences.”

Pay Attention to Relevant Leadership Trends

While not entirely new, we see vertical leadership, adaptive leadership, and network/movement leadership as important trends to pay closer attention to.

Vertical and Adaptive Leadership Development

It is clear the respondents of this scan are prioritizing vertical approaches such as experiential and action learning as effective methodologies for leadership development. It is also clear these leaders are dealing with complex adaptive challenges that will require risk-taking, experimentation, and tackling real world issues in real time. We want to be clear that traditional, horizontal competencies still matter. Nonprofit leaders need to know the “what” of leadership in order to be effective. However, they also need to spend much more time focusing on the “how” of leading with others, within their organization, their community, or their movement as well. We suggest focusing on both strategies.

“So for one, I guess I would just encourage the funders to be willing to experiment with a different model. And maybe it’s not the right one. But I think if we just keep trying to make a better conference or a better workshop or a better webinar, we’re not going to move the needle.”

“Invest in service learning models tailored to refugee and immigrant community contexts. Recruit leaders from refugee and immigrant communities and place them into CBOs as core staff who build organizational capacity over a focused time period. They gain leadership, community development and professional skills, while helping the organization to build critical infrastructure. These leaders receive a stipend and healthcare to work full-time at immigrant and refugee-led organizations, with the hope that many will assume leadership of the organizations in the long-term.”

Networked Leadership

Invest in creating smart leadership networks which can come together and disband in response to various organizational and community challenges. The networks might contain people from different geographies, functions, and specializations both within and outside org. Leadership spread throughout a network must include things like open flows of information, flexible hierarchies, distributed resources, distributed decision-making, loosening of centralized controls. Additionally, research suggests the reason so many leadership programs fail is that there is a “massive difference between what we know about leadership and what we do as leaders. In other words, the critical challenge of leadership is, mostly, the challenge of emotional courage.”

This concept was highlighted in the scan by several respondents who emphasized the challenge of a “culture of nice” in their communities. Leaders would be best served by learning how to disagree in a principled way and knowing how to share power and talk openly and non-defensively about the dynamics at play around race, class, power, and privilege in the relationship, and how to reach decisions in the face of disagreement.

Embrace Failure and Disruption as a Learning Opportunity

Allow leaders and programs to practice experimentation and risk-taking without fear of losing core funding or support.

“One of the things that we don’t talk about is disruptive organizations. In that we are talking about organizations that try to remedy a problem, but not try to get to the root of the problem. We’re trying to deal with issues around education. But we know that the root cause of educational issues run deeper than just education. And if you are in a disruptive organization, it’s hard to get leadership assistance or grant funding or any of those kinds of things because the very nature of what you do may challenge the core of who they are. Or we’re going to just tinker around the edges and we will make adjustments and some accommodation for people with health disparities and disproportionate engagement in the criminal justice system. And we will make adjustments, but we won’t change it.”

“American poet and historian, William Thompson, talks about how everything in the civilization starts with heresy and ends as heritage. Meaning that on the journey of change…its people who are outside the consensus of reality who can see possibilities and give them voice. And on that journey, then artists join in eventually to give shape to those insights. And then entrepreneurs, and at the very end it’s politicians who are in charge of distributing the wealth and the gifts of that insight. So that’s how it works. But if we break it down at every phase of that journey, the needs of leadership are very different. Many funders want to fund the heritage part of the equation, but very little funding goes into the heresy part of the equation, where everything starts.”

45 Peter Bregman, Why So Many Leadership Programs Ultimately Fail, Harvard Business Review
**Suggested Action List**

The following provides a list of suggestions broken down by investment.

**Short Term**

*Short term; low hanging fruit; leverages what already exists; start or keep funding these things*

- Use logic models or theories of change to get clearer on what leadership competencies you are most interested in impacting. Align resources and evaluation to those outcomes.

- Build leadership development line items into program grants. Ensure funding goes directly to key program staff doing direct service or line work so they have opportunities for leadership development.

- Provide grants that cover a longer period of time (e.g., multi-year funding) and that provide general operating support to stabilize key community organizations so they can also invest in leadership development.

- Offer support to informal peer groups, such as meeting space and meals or participant stipends without requiring any formal outcomes or reporting.

- Commit to long-term support of effective programs identified in the scan (see Appendix C) so the programs can be refined to better serve the sector.

Acknowledge community content and context experts. Compensate 1) individuals who are already formally (and informally) mentoring community and emerging leaders (see Appendix D) and 2) community based organizations to host up-and-coming leaders to apprentice and get to know a community based organization perspective (see Appendix C).

- Provide training (e.g., in assessment tools, facilitation, coaching, etc.) and/or scholarships for certificate/degree programs to increase internal advancement opportunities and access for leaders of color.

- Invest in individuals or organizations that may not have a traditional, 501c3 status, which can be exclusionary to community leaders who are doing the actual on-the-ground work.

- Support leadership development that involves not just the executive director, but also program-level staff. Provide general operating support and restricted leadership grants to support participation.

- Support feedback mechanisms (like 360 leadership assessments, coaching, or peer feedback), so leaders can consider which competencies they have strengths in and which they need to tend to.
• Don’t sever learning from the larger organizational, community, or movement context

• Blend vertical leadership approaches with horizontal. Integrate approaches that support adaptability, creativity, learning from failure, boundary spanning, contextual intelligence, systems thinking, and/or networked leadership. Invest in 70-20-10 leadership development model

• Emphasize emotional intelligence content such as non-defensive communication, awareness and management of race, class, power, and privilege dynamics, and how to reach decisions in the face of disagreement

• Invest in the creation of a curated leadership development directory or catalog for those programs that already exist. Focus on highlighting programs for non-traditional, diverse, and rural leaders.

• For the SCC specifically, continue to invest in the efforts of the eight grantees working across the state on developing meaningful venues and building the capacity for underrepresented constituencies to engage in community solutions processes.

**Mid-Range**

*Replication, research or pilots to consider investing in*

• Learn from and replicate programs that already have traction such as Latino Community Fund Nonprofit Leadership Academy, Pomegranate Center, or Sherwood Trust Community Leadership Institute

• Identify regional or national programs that could meet some local capacity needs such as Ford Family Foundation Leadership Program, Leadership Education for Asian Pacific, Rockwood Leadership, or People’s Institute for Undoing Institutional Racism

• Invest in and partner with community leaders and partners who are “context experts” to support mainstream providers to re-tool and adapt their programming appropriately to better meet the needs of diverse leaders. Ensure appropriate funding and support that will allow them to engage in this work in a meaningful way, rather than a tokenizing way

• Invest in flexible leadership approaches. For example, provide flexible leadership consultants from similar cultures that support leaders in feeling less alone and better understood. Or create flexible leadership accounts that fund individuals directly, rather than providers. Leaders can use these discretionary funds however they see fit

• Invest in sabbaticals and coaching as a way to provide reflective opportunities for nonprofit and community leaders and to help engage leadership in succession planning. Provide strategic leader
development support for the organization to help ensure continuity during the sabbatical period. Pay attention to succession needs in communities of color

- Invest in prototyping action-learning programs that help leaders address real-life, in the moment challenges that are impacting their organizations and communities

- Invest in Circuit Riders who are experienced in key areas (e.g., land trusts) who travel around the state providing expert coaching, mentorship, and support

- Support providers and management support organizations to access lessons on multi-cultural skills and racial equity, communication across communities, providing supportive environments for staff of color, addressing power and privilege, and breaking down structural racism

- Look into ways to provide services virtually, again removing the barriers of time and access that exist for leaders in rural parts of the state. Collaborate with facilities with sound technological capacity to provide virtual services in rural areas where connectivity is an issue

- Honor and shine a light on community strengths and cultural traditions and consider how those can be tapped to help meet the needs and create solutions for the issues communities face

- Invest in methods to support funders and nonprofit leaders to become “conscious consumers” of leadership development (see Coaching and Philanthropy Project as example)

- Track and report on philanthropic giving in leadership development in Washington State

**Long-Term**

**Adaptive work to address complex problems; will take more time and require multiple stakeholders**

- Bring together key stakeholders who are working at the intersection of racial equity and leadership in Washington State. Invest in the value of building community among people bringing a racial justice lens to leadership work, a community that could be a source of learning and collaboration. Learn from models like Leadership Learning Community’s Racial Equity Leadership Network.

- Develop a long-term strategy for leadership investment that takes into consideration non-traditional leadership and provides opportunities for new and emerging leaders

- Provide resources to train community leaders in the key areas of leadership capacity needed for their own community. This could eliminate the barrier of time and distance by having service providers and technical experts directly embedded in the community they serve
• If deemed necessary, invest in the development of leadership programs customized to specific populations including those who are marginalized and not in positions of power and authority (e.g., individuals of color, women, young and emerging leaders, and leaders in rural locations)

• Similarly, consider a leadership program for community organizers to learn personal and collective leadership methods

• Understand the changing state demographics (with particular attention to positional and non-positional leadership) and develop an action plan to support leadership that ensures representation for those most impacted by social issues

• For funders and providers: understand your own identity and cultural location, especially if you are going to be partnering with or visiting communities of color to deepen your understanding and then link that to your capacity building efforts

• For white leaders and allies: Consider how to better understand and dismantle racist systems
Closing Reflections

This scan provides a wealth of information and insights about leadership development experiences in Washington State. The primary purpose was to deepen the SCC’s understanding of the state’s nonprofit sector in building its leadership capacity and to help make recommendations to the ten partner funders about how best to invest in leadership in the state with their identified pooled resources. We have made some recommendations that can make an immediate impact with relatively limited resources. Certainly, there are many bright spots we can point to as potential investments.

While money will certainly support change efforts, it is only part of the equation and as a standalone strategy, will not drive the change that is truly needed for leadership development to take root in a transformational way. As nonprofit and social justice issues become more complex, nonprofit leaders will require more complex and adaptive approaches.

The good news is that the leadership is already here. It is in every community we spoke with. The SCC has generously offered to share this report with its constituents and the sector at large. Our hope is that readers will use this information to start conversations about where there is alignment and where things might be re-imagined. And to make choices about how to redefine leadership that is inclusive of non-traditional perspectives. Ultimately, our hope is that nonprofit leaders, providers, and funders will partner more closely to tackle what it will really take to achieve their collective goals in a state that is becoming increasingly diverse.

“Leadership is never going to work the same, no matter how much we want to generalize it. And how do we support leaders that are different than us? It’s by acknowledging their power and their right to be the way they are…You can’t do it to us. That’s not going to work. You have to do it with us.”
Appendices
Appendix A: Leadership Scan Interview Protocol

Name of Interviewee: [Please confirm we have the correct spelling]
Title or Role: [Please confirm the interviewee for their current title/role]
Organization/Affiliation: [Please confirm current organization/affiliation]

Context to convey to interviewee:
- The Statewide Capacity Collaborative (SCC) is a group of nine funders committed to supporting and strengthening the state’s nonprofit sector. SCC has engaged CompassPoint to conduct a leadership scan to understand what the field needs to support building the state’s nonprofit leadership capacity. [Funders: Empire Health Foundation, Medina, Campion, Gates Foundation, Seattle Foundation, Sherwood, SVP Seattle]
- CompassPoint Nonprofit services has worked with nonprofit organizations and leaders for over 35 years. Based in Oakland, CA. Our practice uses teaching, coaching, consulting, and peer learning to support leaders at every level within nonprofit organizations and across the sector. We believe that leaders exist at all levels and can influence an organization or network regardless of title or tenure. And as a multicultural organization, CompassPoint is responsive to the needs of diverse leaders and communities.
- Interviewer say a sentence or two about who you are.
- These conversations are a follow-up to a survey we conducted of nonprofit leaders (consumers), service providers and funders, we had over 400 responses to the survey. Upon analysis of the survey results, we discovered that we did not have as diverse pool of respondents as we would have liked. Therefore, in these conversations we are trying to get a better understanding of the needs for leaders of color, emerging and non-traditional leaders, and leaders that represent communities in Eastern Washington. As such we are interested in understanding:
  - What supports are needed to build the capacity of leaders that represent the demographic we just mentioned, and what are the barriers that exist to accessing those supports?
  - What are the priority leadership competencies for this demographic?
  - What are leaders in this demographic currently accessing, if anything, to build their leadership capacity?
- Themes will be reported to the funding partners in the aggregate, and no attribution made by participant name or organization. If there’s anything that you want say off the record, just let me know.
- We our offering all participants in the interview a stipend of $150 to acknowledge that we value your time and input. Post the interview we will send you via email a short form to complete and submit to Social Venture Partners to facilitate stipend payment.
- Our plan is to share back the final report from the Leadership Scan with everyone that participated in these interviews.
• As a next step post interviews we will be sharing back themes with community members through a meaning making conversation to ensure we are accurately reflecting community experience and priorities.
• The “*” questions are priority questions.
• 1 hour, okay to record? [INTERVIEWER RECORD NOW]

ABOUT YOU AND LEADERSHIP

CompassPoint uses the following definition to describe leadership: “the process of working with others in order to move forward an organizational or community vision and agenda” and clarification that “leaders can live anywhere in an organization, community or movement, regardless of title or position”

*1. Given this definition, please tell me how you describe yourself -- as an organizational leader (positional), a community leader, or a movement leader?
   a. If a community leader, please describe the community you lead in.
   b. If a movement leader, please describe the movement you lead in.

*2. When you think of your own leadership development, how would you say you’ve developed it so far? Prompts: E.g., You’ve learned on your own, through observation or experimenting. You’ve participated in formal leadership development programs, training, or education. You utilize specific leadership theories or frameworks.

*3. Because of where you are as a leader, what impact have you been able to make in your community? What changes? Who or what supported you to do that? [Leadership to what end]?

4. Who is someone you consider to be a successful leader in the NP community? What are some of their qualities?

5. How many years of experience do you have in the nonprofit sector? In a leadership position?

ABOUT YOUR COMMUNITY

6. What unique strengths and challenges should we be aware of about the community you are a part of?

ABOUT LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

7. Now, we’d like to ask you some questions about leadership development programs and services.
In the email you received confirming the interview, we provided a set of definitions for five leadership domains. [Interviewer just read the domain titles unless the interviewee asks for clarity]

**Leading Self** (individual development, self awareness and self-management)
**Leading with Others** (team performance, social awareness, relationship management)
**Leading the Organization, Program, or Project** (ability to interpret and adapt to the context within a system, entity, organization)
**Leading within the Community** (ability to navigate within systems often without positional power or authority)
**Leading within a Movement** (ability to engage in boundary crossing; engage stakeholders from different sectors, communities and disciplines)

8. Which do you think should be a priority area of focus in terms of leadership development...
   a. For you? b. For others in your organization/community?

10. Thinking about how leadership development services are provided, how would you rank the following methods in terms of their effectiveness? [1 being least effective and 4 being most effective.]
   - Developmental relationships (coaching, mentoring)
   - Planned instruction (training or course that follows a planned curriculum)
   - Action Learning (a process which involves working on real challenges, using the knowledge and skills of a small group of people combined with skilled questioning, to re-interpret old and familiar concepts and produce fresh ideas.)
   - Experiential (process of learning through experience, and is more specifically defined as learning through reflection on doing.)

11. *As part of your leadership development have you ever had a mentor, formal or informal? If yes, can you describe what you think are characteristics of an effective mentor relationship?*

12. *Are there specific networks, cohorts or organized peer learning that you know of or participate in that support successful leaders?*

13. From your perspective, what are the barriers to accessing leadership development programs/services?

   [Interviewer if you need some examples as prompts, barriers mentioned in the survey include: time, access to providers/services, staff capacity, geographic barriers, difficulty finding appropriate trainers/trainings, lack of knowledge of what is available.]
a. Of these barriers which would you say are the top two that get in the way of accessing programs and services for leadership development?
b. In times where you did access programs/services were there things that help you overcome the barriers you mentioned to do so or otherwise supported your participation?

14. *If you were to design a program to help nonprofit leaders become more effective, what would the ideal program look like?

ABOUT FUNDING SUPPORT OF LEADERSHIP

15. *If you had a say or influence in where funders should be investing in leadership for WA state nonprofits, where would it be?

16. Over 80% of funders say that they provide funding and support for conferences, networking events, and peer learning.
   a. Do you and other leaders in your organization attend funder supported conferences and other events? If yes, what would you say are the primary reason you attend?
   b. Have you participated in funder supported peer learning or peer networks? If yes, what would you say are the primary reason you attend?

17. Any additional feedback that you would like to provide the Washington funders on how they can best support the leadership of nonprofit leaders in the state?

Our intent is to ensure that we have diverse voices and perspectives in this scan. To that end if you wouldn’t mind answering a few demographic questions. [Interviewer, if any of these have already been answered in previous questions, don’t re-ask.]

   a. What is your race/ethnicity?
   b. What is your current title/position?
   c. What region of the state do you currently work in, Eastern or Western Washington?
   d. Would you consider the region you work in rural or urban?

BELOW ARE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS THAT YOU CAN ASK IF YOU TIME ALLOWS:

Mentoring and training for specific groups came up as an area of interest/need particular from respondents that identified as leaders of color? Specific examples of this include, trainings on multi-cultural skills and racial equity, communication across communities and sectors, how to
provide supportive environments for staff of color, addressing power and privilege, and breaking down structural racism.

a. Do you agree that these specific programs/services are needed?
b. Are you aware of anyone in your region or community who offers programs or services in these areas? If yes, who/what are they?
c. Have you participated in any of these programs/services and if yes, did you find them effective? Is there anything you would change or add?

The following three areas: ability to recruit high potential staff, nonprofit management and certificate degrees, and sabbatical programs were named as high priority by consumers.

a. Do you agree that funders should invest in these three areas as priority for supporting leadership development in the nonprofit sector? If yes, would you rank these three areas by priority with 1 being the highest and 3 being the lowest.
b. Are there other leadership development strategies you would like funders to prioritize their support for?
Appendix B: Survey Sample from Leadership Survey Scan
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Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Anglo</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial/multi-ethnic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to respond</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographic Location of Respondents’ Headquarters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or Outside WA</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-priority</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or Outside WA</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Position of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/Executive Director</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Director</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Manager/Director</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior-level Consultant*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Program Manager or Director - 15% - 3%
Professional Non-Manager* 1% 1% 0% 1%
Assistant/Receptionist <1% 0% 0% <1%

Note: Response option not available for consumers and funders

Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>In Nonprofit Sector</th>
<th>As Nonprofit ED</th>
<th>On Nonprofit Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more years</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Role</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leader</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasoned leader</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-career leader</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Leader</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement leader</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Categories not mutually exclusive.

Salary by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>CEO/ED</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
<th>Middle Manager</th>
<th>Non-Manager</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-30,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-50,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-75,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-100,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-150,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001-200,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,001+</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Key Learnings from Leadership Scan of Washington State

#### Age and Education Levels of Consumer and Other Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school or equivalent</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Status and Language of Consumer and Other Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic Status Growing Up</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle class</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in the USA</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other languages include Danish, Somali, and Swedish.
Appendix C: Interview, Focus Group and Meaning-Making Participants

Lupita Ayon, Leadership Development and Civic Engagement Academy
Hamdi Abdulle, Somali Youth & Family Club
Susan Barbeau, First 5 Fundamentals/United Way of Seattle
Kris Becker, Jumping Mouse Children’s Center
Sarah Brooks, Methow Conservancy
Jessica Cafferty, Women’s Funding Alliance
Jessica Case, Medina Foundation
Tawhnee Colvin, Spokane Tribe of Indians
Lynn Coriano, Social Venture Partners
Mike Curry, Catholic Community Services
David Daw, South King Council of Human Services
Susan Dobkins, Russell Family Foundation
Tara Dowd, Spokane County United Way
Danielle Garbe, Sherwood Trust
Peter Bloch Garcia, Latino Community Fund
Kathleen D. Edwards, Cedarmere Foundation
Ceil Erickson, The Seattle Foundation
Sally Gillis, Social Venture Partners
Maria Griffin, Potlatch Fund
Mauri Ingram, Whatcom Community Foundation
Thelma Jackson, Black Education Strategy Roundtable
Greg Knight, Rural Resources
Vu Le, Rainier Valley Corps
Cassie Lentz, Grays Harbor County Public Health & Social Services
Nancy Long, 501Commons
Paola Maranan, Children’s Alliance
Milenko Matanovic, Pomegranate Center
Melanie Matthews, Campion Foundation
Alison McCaffree, Washington Nonprofits
Sharonne Navas, Equity in Education Coalition
Susan Newton, Principal, Consultant
Erin Okuno, Southeast Seattle Education Coalition
Lyle Quasim, Black Education Strategy Roundtable
Sue Ellen Riesau, Olympic View Community Foundation
J. Andrew Rodriguez, J. Andrew Rodriguez Consulting
Sili Savusa, The White Center Community Development Association
Gary Stewart, Rural Development Initiative
Rich Stolz, OneAmerica
Jamie Stroble, Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation (ACLF)
Victoria Woodards, Tacoma Urban League
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Program or Offering</th>
<th>Recommended By</th>
<th>Recommended For</th>
<th>Regional Location</th>
<th>Notes or Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Non-traditional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01 Commons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide or Mix</td>
<td>Recommended for Peer Learning/Networking and Management Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP Northwest Chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide or Mix</td>
<td>Recommended for Peer Learning/Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Leadership Forum Northwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King Pierce</td>
<td>Offices in the Twin Cities, Portland, Seattle, Des Moines, and Tacoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for a Just Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Peer Learning/Networking Emerging Leaders Network and Public Leaders Network Based in Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Leadership Forum, Tacoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Recommended for Peer Learning/Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans for the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Network Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Neighborhood Excellence Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Education Strategy Roundtable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Recommended for Network Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoardSource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Could not identify current offerings National provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Ethical Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Peer Learning/Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Courage and Renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Non-traditional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Vision, Federal Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Peer Learning/Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Non-traditional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Community in Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Non-traditional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director Happy Hour, Seattle, Vu Le</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Peer Learning/Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families of Color Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Recommended for Non-traditional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Recommended by Colorful Leader</td>
<td>Recommended by Rural Leader</td>
<td>Cultural Relevance</td>
<td>Developmental Relationships (e.g., Peer Learning, Coaching, or Mentoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino Community of Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Family Foundation Leadership Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray's Harbor Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn of Africa Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Center For Nonprofit Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Community Fund Nonprofit Leadership Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide or Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Eastside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Education for Asian Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Spokane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lummi CEDAR Project*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Learning Center, sponsored by Walla Walla Community College and the Sherwood Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Works (Table Talks), Janet Boguch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OneAmerica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Institute for Undoing Institutional Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A National program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranite Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potlatch Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project LEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainier Valley Corps*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood Leadership Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A National program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University Master of Nonprofit Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Trust Community Leadership Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali Community Services of Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South King Council Human Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Seattle Education Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County United Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Circle Native Nonprofit Leadership Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A Based in Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Recommended by Leader of Color</td>
<td>Recommended by Rural Leader</td>
<td>Recommended by SURVEY Respondent</td>
<td>Cultural Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Management Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Good Neighbors of Jefferson County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way King County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington, Evans School of Public Affairs (MPA)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington, Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute (NELI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla Leaders Network</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Community Action Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Nonprofits</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Center CDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Nonprofit Professionals Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Program Quality Initiative, School’s Out Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold = Programs recommended more than three times**
Appendix E: Recommended Programs by Geography

Recommended Leadership Programs by Geographic Area

Statewide or Mix
- 501Commons
- AFP Northwest Chapter
- Latino Community Fund Nonprofit Leadership Academy
- Washington Community Action Network
- Washington Nonprofits
Leadership Programs Recommended* by Geographic Area

**King**
1. Alliance for a Just Society
2. Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation
3. ED Happy Hour, Hosted by Vu Le
4. Leadership Eastside
5. Leadership Tomorrow
6. OneAmerica
7. Pomegranate Center
8. Nonprofit Works Table Talks, Hosted by Janet Boguch
9. Rainier Valley Corps
10. Seattle University Master of Nonprofit Leadership
11. The Management Center
12. United Way King County
13. University of Washington, Evans School of Public Affairs (MPA)
14. University of Washington, Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute (NELI)

**Gray’s Harbor**
1. Gray’s Harbor Community College

**Jefferson**
1. United Good Neighbors of Jefferson County

**Kitsap**
1. Kitsap Center For Nonprofit Excellence

**Pierce**
1. African American Leadership Forum Northwest
2. American Leadership Forum
3. Black Education Strategy Roundtable

**Spokane**
1. Leadership Spokane
2. Project LEAD
3. Spokane County United Way

**Statewide or Mix**
1. 501Commons
2. AFP Northwest Chapter
3. Latino Community Fund Nonprofit Leadership Academy
4. Washington Community Action Network
5. Washington Nonprofits

**Walla Walla**
1. Nonprofit Learning Center, sponsored by Walla Walla Community College and the Sherwood Trust
2. Sherwood Trust Community Leadership Institute
3. Walla Walla Leaders Network

**Whatcom**
1. Lummi CEDAR Project

*Programs recommended more than three times in scan
For full list of recommended programs, see Appendix C
We asked all respondents to share a leader in their community, region, or field that exemplifies the type of leadership they most greatly admire. The following provides a list of those leaders who were mentioned by more than three respondents.

- Anthony Airhart, Coastal Harvest
- Ethiopia Alemneh, Ethiopian Community in Seattle
- Lupita Ayon, Leadership Development and Civic Engagement Academy
- Janis Avery, Treehouse
- Kris Becker, Jumping Mouse Children’s Center
- Peter Bloch Garcia, Latina Community Fund
- Sarah Brooks, Methow Conservancy
- Sonya Campion, Campion Foundation
- Andrea Caupain, Centerstone
- Tawhnee Colvin, Spokane Tribe of Indians
- Mike Curry, Catholic Community Services SW
- Jim Daly, Grays Harbor Community Foundation
- David Daw, South King Council of Human Services
- Peter Drury, Splash
- George "Jock" Edwards, Sherwood Trust, Walla Walla
- Maria Griffin, Potlatch Fund
- Rosalinda Guillen, Community to Community
- Kris Hermanns, Pride Foundation
- James Hong, Vietnamese Friendship Association
- Susan Howlett, Susan Howlett Consulting
- Mauri Ingram
- Thelma Jackson, Black Education Strategy Roundtable
- Lawson Knight, Intermountain Impact Investments (retired)
- Greg Knight, Rural Resources
- Craig Kanaya, Asian Pacific Islander
- Community Leadership Foundation (ACLF)
- Megan Karch, FareStart
- Vu Le, Rainier Valley Corps
- Cassie Lentz, Grays Harbor County Public Health & Social Services
- Robin Lester, Courage360
- Jan Levy, Leadership Tomorrow
- Nancy Long, 501Commons
- Paola Maranan, Children’s Alliance
- Diane Narasaki, Asian Counseling and Referral Services
- Sharonne Navas, Equity in Education Coalition
- Ed Petersen, Housing Hope/HopeWorks
- Erin Okuno, Southeast Seattle Education Coalition
- Kristin Rowe-Finkbeiner, MomsRising
- Sili Savusa, The White Center Community Development Association
- Alice Shobe, Building Changes
- Jamie Stroble, Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation (ACLF)
- Rich Stolz, OneAmerica
- Patricia Talton, Northwest Leadership Foundation
- James Whitfield, Leadership Eastside
- Victoria Woodards, Tacoma Urban League
Appendix G: Quantitative Data from Leadership Survey Scan of Washington State
Compiled by Social Policy Research Associates

Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Anglo</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial/multi-ethnic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to respond</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographic Location of Respondents’ Headquarters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or Outside WA</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Non-priority</th>
<th>Missing or Outside WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Position of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/Executive Director</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Director</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Manager/Director</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Senior-level Consultant*</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Program Manager or Director</th>
<th>Professional Non-Manager*</th>
<th>Assistant/Receptionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Response option not available for consumers and funders

### Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>In Nonprofit Sector</th>
<th>As Nonprofit ED</th>
<th>On Nonprofit Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more years</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Role</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leader</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasoned leader</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-career leader</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Leader</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement leader</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Categories not mutually exclusive.

### Salary by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>CEO/ED</th>
<th>Senior Manager</th>
<th>Middle Manager</th>
<th>Non-Manager</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-30,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-50,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-75,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-100,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-150,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001-200,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,001+</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Age and Education Levels of Consumer and Other Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school or equivalent</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Status and Language of Consumer and Other Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic Status Growing Up</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle class</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Language</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in the USA</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other languages include Danish, Somali, and Swedish.

#### Skill Area Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Area Needed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft skills</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating and partnering with other organizations</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with public and community stakeholders</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development, teamwork, and cultivating talent</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and tools related to management</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sector trends</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Area Needed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-care and personal development</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None, not applicable, or blank</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Programs/Initiatives Needed (% of 168 consumers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Programs/Initiatives Needed</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer networks and collaboration</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training for specific groups</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring and coaching</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competency</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft skills or personal development</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable trainings</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Barriers to Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Participation</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited staff capacity</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a priority among senior staff (including Board)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic barriers</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding appropriate trainers/training opportunities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge about what is available</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Blank</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Respondents

|                                                                   | 100%  | 20%  | 80%  | 14%  | 80%  |

Note: Race/Ethnicity is broken down into two categories: Those identifying as Caucasian/ango (White) and those identifying as people of color (POC)

Note: Percentages are across the 168 (42%) of consumers who provided a response to this question.

### Rankings of Leadership Competencies across Consumers and Funders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competencies</th>
<th>Consumers (scale of 1-5)</th>
<th>Funders (scale of 1-5)</th>
<th>Provider focus Very focused</th>
<th>Focused</th>
<th>Not at all focused</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading with Others</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading the Organization</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Self</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within the Community</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Leading within a Movement | 2.5 | 2.5 | 25% | 55% | 15% | 4%

Consumers’ Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competencies</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Self</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading with Others</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading the Organization</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading with the Community</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within a Movement</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Consumer Priorities and What Funders Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Support</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General operating funding</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability recruit high potential</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coaching</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/networking events</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer networks/peer learning</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build talent management</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit management certificate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other leadership development</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association membership</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Green: Close alignment between consumers and funders
- Red: Higher priority for consumers than funded by funders
- Pink: Frequently funded but not a high priority for consumers

Comparison of Consumer Priorities Across Consumer Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 Funding Priorities for Professional Development Support</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General operating funding</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External multi-session leadership development programs</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability recruit high potential staff</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coaching</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/networking events</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer networks/peer learning groups</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build talent management</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Top 3 Funding Priorities for Professional Development Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External one-off trainings</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit management certificate/degree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other leadership development/talent management</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association membership</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent of Respondents                                                   | 100%| 81%  | 19%   | 15%     | 78%     |

**Other Requested Analyses**

Which of the following professional development opportunities/leadership services have you utilized in your career and how effective were they? (Q16)

**Percent of Consumers Rating Leadership Services as “Very Effective”**

**By Race and Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Professional Development/Leadership Services Utilized</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Management Certificate/Degree Programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Coaching</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Networks/Peer Groups</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development Programs</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical Workshops/Conferences</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Association</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Of consumers who rated each option (not of all 291 consumers)*

**Percent of Consumers Rating Leadership Services “Very Effective”**

**By Position and Type of Leadership Role**

| Types of Professional Development/Leadership Services Utilized | ALL | Position | Leadership Role | Leadership Role |
|                                                             |     | Senior   | Emerging | Mid-Career | Seasoned | Org | Commu- | Move- |
|                                                             |     | Not Senior |         |           |         |     | nity   | ment |
| Nonprofit Management Certificate/Degree Programs             | 37% | 32%   | 55%      | 33%      | 31%     | 30% | 44%    | 54% |
| Executive Coaching                                           | 36% | 37%   | 29%      | 48%      | 36%     | 38% | 31%    | 31% | 37% |
| Peer Networks/Peer Groups                                    | 35% | 36%   | 33%      | 39%      | 33%     | 36% | 39%    | 44% | 43% |
| Leadership Development Programs                               | 26% | 26%   | 26%      | 27%      | 15%     | 38% | 28%    | 29% | 26% |
| Topical Workshops/Conferences                                 | 22% | 20%   | 29%      | 23%      | 21%     | 26% | 12%    | 22% | 20% |
| Professional Association                                     | 19% | 16%   | 31%      | 22%      | 16%     | 23% | 15%    | 23% | 18% |

*Note: Of consumers who rated each option (not of all 291 consumers). Respondents who selected CEO/Executive Director or Senior Manager/Director were counted as senior leaders under position, representing 79% of all consumers. Leadership roles are not mutually exclusive. That is, an individual may have selected emerging, organizational, and community leadership roles.*
### Additional Programs/Initiatives Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Leadership Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Emerg-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer networks and collaboration</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training for specific groups</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring and coaching</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competency</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft skills or personal development</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable trainings</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Respondents</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages are across the 168 (42%) of consumers who provided a response to this question, not across all 291 consumers respondents. Respondents who selected CEO/Executive Director or Senior Manager/Director were counted as senior leaders under position. Leadership roles are not mutually exclusive. That is, an individual may have selected emerging, organizational, and community leadership roles.

### Barriers to Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Leadership Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Emerg-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited staff capacity</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a priority among senior staff</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic barriers</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding appropriate trainers/training opportunities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge about what is available</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Blank</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Respondents</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents who selected CEO/Executive Director or Senior Manager/Director were counted as senior leaders under position, representing 79% of all consumers. Leadership roles are not mutually exclusive. That is, an individual may have selected emerging, organizational, and community leadership roles.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 Funding Priorities for Professional Development Support</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Leadership Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General operating funding for talent management</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External multi-session leadership development programs</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Not Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability recruit high potential staff</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coaching</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Mid-Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/networking events</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Seasoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer networks/peer learning groups</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build talent management</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External one-off trainings</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit management certificate/degree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other leadership development/talent management</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association membership</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents who selected CEO/Executive Director or Senior Manager/Director were counted as senior leaders under position, representing 79% of all consumers. Leadership roles are not mutually exclusive. That is, an individual may have selected emerging, organizational, and community leadership roles.
Appendix H: Project Limitations

This report is focused primarily on “leadership”, rather than on “leaders”. Specifically, this report is not meant to serve as an assessment of CEO tenure and needs in the Washington State nonprofit sector. Rather, it is meant to focus on leadership from various levels of an organization, community, or movement.

All leadership programs and resources listed in this report come directly from respondent recommendations. CompassPoint did not conduct an online scan of Washington State programs.

Limitations of Data Collection

In our opinion, the strongest research is a combination of Quantitative and Qualitative data collection. Despite extensive outreach for participation, the majority of survey participants were white (76%) and female (70%). This led us to emphasize the qualitative data more strongly (see Methodology). While we used interview and focus group protocol to ensure consistent measurement during the scan, we also employed Construct validity, measuring leadership traits and speculations that were self-reported rather than observed firsthand.

We described the sample of interview and focus group participants only at the aggregate level (and not for the purpose of detailed analyses). Comparing the statistical significance and sample size is done to be able to extend the results obtained for the given sample to the whole population. We cannot assert that qualitative results would hold across all racial, ethnic, or rural groups across the state.

Though the participation percentages by race and ethnicity do closely mirror national demographics of the sector. 3% of respondents choose not to identify their race or gender. There are currently no racial/ethnic demographics available for Washington state nonprofits. Though national data shared in the literature review reflect the demographics of scan participants. Lack of data on racial and ethnic demographics for nonprofit staff and populations served is a national issue. Nonprofits are not currently required to report this data as part of their 990s. Though there is increased interest for both funders and nonprofits to collect and report on demographic data more consistently as part of efforts to work towards diversity, equity and inclusion in both sectors.

While we weight funder responses equal to consumers in priority areas, only 5% of respondents identified as funders versus 76% as consumers (see Methodology).

While the survey collected zip codes from participants to determine regional priority, it did not collect counties. However, response rate from participants outside of King County was not significant enough to warrant a full data analysis of respondents by county. We do not feel this undermines the data.
CompassPoint has been retained by Social Venture Partners Seattle and the Statewide Capacity Collaborative (SCC) to deepen understanding of Washington State’s nonprofit sector in building its leadership capacity. This survey is for nonprofit leaders, providers of nonprofit leadership programs, and funders of nonprofit leadership development in Washington State. The survey should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete. This survey is anonymous -- we will only be sharing data from this survey in the aggregate and not making individual attributions. Your personal information and individual responses will not be shared without your expressed permission. Results will be shared with SVP Seattle, SCC, and key partners to help them learn more about how best to develop and support strong nonprofit leaders across Washington State. We ask that you complete this survey by **February 26, 2015**.

Instructions for taking the survey:

- For each question, choose the answer(s) that comes closest to being true for you. In some cases, the question instructs you to select a certain number of responses from a list; please choose the number of responses requested.

- If you have more than one job, choose the one that you are most invested in (e.g., feel your career is most aligned with) and answer all survey questions about that position. Please do not switch between jobs in your answers.

- The best way to take the survey is all at once; it takes approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete.

**Note on terminology: The titles Executive Director and CEO are both used throughout the nonprofit sector. For the purposes of this survey, we use the abbreviation ED to mean both.**
Please tell us about you.

1. I describe myself as primarily: *
   - A **consumer** of nonprofit leadership services (e.g., nonprofit Executive Director, manager, director, coordinator, etc. who participates in various formal leadership development activities)
   - A **provider** of leadership services (e.g., consultant, trainer, facilitator, or coach)
   - A **funder** of nonprofit leadership services
   - Other

Section One: About You Continued

Page description:

2. Which of the following best describes your current position? *
   - CEO/Executive Director
   - Senior Manager/Director - Directly reporting to the CEO/Executive Director
   - Middle Manager/Director
   - Professional Non-Manager (e.g., teacher, social worker, counselor)
   - Coordinator
   - Assistant/Receptionist/Entry-level administrator
   - Other (write in your role)
3. How long have you been in your current position? *

[Blank field] years

4. How long have you worked in your current organization? *

[Blank field] years

Section Two: Your Career Path
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Please tell us about your career path.

5. Throughout your entire career and including your current position(s), **how many total years** have you worked as paid staff within the nonprofit sector? *

- Less than 1 year
- 1 year - 2 years, 11 months
- 3 years - 5 years, 11 months
- 6 years - 9 years, 11 months
- 10 years - 19 years, 11 months
- 20 years +
6. Throughout your entire career and including your current position(s), **how many years have you served as a nonprofit ED** (including your current position)? *

- Never
- Less than 1 year
- 1 year - 2 years, 11 months
- 3 years - 5 years, 11 months
- 6 years - 9 years, 11 months
- 10 years - 19 years, 11 months
- 20 years +

7. Throughout your entire career and including your current position(s), **how many years have you served on a nonprofit board of directors**? *

- Never
- Less than 1 year
- 1 year - 2 years, 11 months
- 3 years - 5 years, 11 months
- 6 years - 9 years, 11 months
- 10 years - 19 years, 11 months
- 20 years +

8. Are you currently serving on a nonprofit board of directors? *

- Yes
- No
9. Are you currently volunteering for a nonprofit organization? *

☐ Yes

☐ No

Section Three: Your Leadership

Page description:

For the purposes of this survey, we define leadership as the process of working with others in order to move forward an organizational or community vision and agenda. Leaders can live anywhere in an organization, community, or movement, regardless of title or formal position.

10. Given the above definition of leadership, which best describes you in the role you are in now? (Check all that apply.) *

☐ Emerging leader

☐ Mid-career leader

☐ Seasoned leader

☐ Organizational leader (e.g., positional leader)

☐ Community leader

☐ Movement leader

☐ Other (please specify)
11. Which best describes the level of impact you are currently focused on achieving? Please select one. *

- Enabling an organization to succeed
- Enabling a community to succeed
- Enabling a field or movement to succeed
- Other (please specify) *

12. Given your response to the question above, which of these leadership competencies do you feel are most essential to you to achieve the impact you are seeking?

PLEASE PRIORITIZE IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Least Important and 5 = Most Important *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Self (individual development, self-awareness, and self-management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading with Others (team performance, social awareness, relationship management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading the Organization, Program, or Project (ability to interpret and adapt to the context within a system, entity, organization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within the Community (ability to navigate within systems often without positional power or authority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within a Movement (ability to engage in boundary crossing; engage stakeholders from different sectors, communities, and disciplines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How effective do you **currently feel** in each of these leadership areas? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Area</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Self (self-awareness and self-management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading with Others (social awareness and relationship management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading the Organization, Program, or Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ability to interpret and adapt to the context within a system, entity, organization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within the Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ability to navigate within systems often without positional power or authority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within a Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ability to engage in boundary crossing; engage stakeholders from different sectors, communities and disciplines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. In your own words, what do you wish to learn more about in order to be a more effective leader? *
15. Thinking about your organization, what are the **three most critical attributes** that you anticipate senior leaders will need over the next two years in order to achieve the outcomes your organization seeks?

In identifying attributes, consider skills, competencies, behaviors, experience, background, demographics, etc. *

1. 
2. 
3. 

Section Four: Experience with Leadership Development
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Please tell us about your experience with leadership development.
16. Which of the following professional development opportunities/leadership services have you utilized in your career and how effective were they?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive coaching</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional associations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Management Certificate/Degree programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical workshops and conferences</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development programs (eg: Rockwood, Center for Ethical Leadership)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer networks or peer groups</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. In the grid below, please list the names of UP TO FIVE specific leadership programs or initiatives that you are aware of that help cultivate leaders in your field. For each one you name, indicate your assessment of its effectiveness, and whether you or any of your colleagues have participated. If you are not aware of any programs or initiatives that help cultivate leaders in your field, simply proceed to the next question.

For the purposes of this survey question, "effectiveness" means the program successfully impacts the development of leadership competencies identified in the program objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Initiative Name</th>
<th>Your Assessment of its Effectiveness</th>
<th>I participated</th>
<th>A colleague participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 18 through 20 refer to the leadership initiatives/programs that you have listed in the chart above.

If you did not provide the name of at least one leadership initiative/program in the preceding chart, please skip to question 21.

18. Of the programs you’ve utilized personally, **which would you recommend** to a colleague?

19. Of the programs you’ve utilized personally, **what was the most applicable skill learned?**

20. Please describe the most influential moment or learning experience from your participation in the programs you’ve utilized.
21. Beyond what is available right now, what kinds of ADDITIONAL programs or initiatives, IF ANY, do you believe are needed to cultivate leadership in the field in which you work?

22. What professional development opportunities/leadership programs are you interested in accessing that you have not yet accessed?
23. Imagine that funding were available specifically to help develop the leadership required to achieve the outcomes your organization, community, or movement seeks. Which of the following would be the most valuable to you? You may select up to three. *

- A. Funding to support our organization’s ability to recruit high-potential staff
- B. Funding for technical assistance to help build our organization’s talent management processes
- C. General operating funding (or unrestricted general support) to enable additional internal capacity for talent management
- D. Funding for staff to participate in external multi-session leadership development programs
- E. Funding for staff to participate in external one-off trainings on specific topics
- F. Funding for staff to attend conferences or other networking events
- G. Funding for executive coaching
- H. Funding to support high-potential staff in taking sabbaticals
- I. Funding for professional association membership
- J. Funding for nonprofit management certificate/degree programs
- K. Funding for peer networks or peer learning groups
- Other (required) *

24. Besides funding, what gets in the way of you/your organization accessing the leadership resources you identified above?

For example: Lack of internal staff capacity, not enough time, leadership not a priority for senior management, etc. *
25. In the past two years, has your organization received funding to invest or participate in any of the following activities? Please check all that apply. *

☐ A. Funding to support our organization’s ability to recruit high-potential staff

☐ B. Funding for technical assistance to help build our organization’s talent management processes

☐ C. General operating funding (or unrestricted general support) to enable additional internal capacity for talent management

☐ D. Funding for staff to participate in external multi-session leadership development programs

☐ E. Funding for staff to participate in external one-off trainings on specific topics

☐ F. Funding for staff to attend conferences or other networking events

☐ G. Funding for executive coaching

☐ H. Funding to support high-potential staff in taking sabbaticals

☐ I. Funding for professional association membership

☐ J. Funding for nonprofit management certificate/degree programs

☐ K. Funding for peer networks or peer learning groups

☐ L. Other leadership development/talent management support [please specify] *

Section Five: Leadership in Your Community

Page description:

Please tell us about leadership in your community or region.
26. Who is a leader in your community, region, or field that exemplifies the type of leadership you most greatly admire? Please include the person’s full name (and organization, if applicable) in your response.

Note: We will be using this information to reach out to identify leaders for potential interviews or focus groups.

27. How well do you know the amount of offerings/providers of leadership programming across Washington state? *

- I am not sure how/what programs are offered across Washington
- I have a good idea, though I expect I am unaware of a number
- I think I know what’s offered
- I have a thorough understanding of what’s offered
28. Based on what you know, how would you rate the AVAILABILITY of leadership development PROGRAMS in your community? *

- Very high
- Somewhat high
- Low
- Very low

Comments

29. How would you rate the AVAILABILITY of leadership development RESOURCES in your community (eg. coaching, workshops, peer networks)? *

- Very high
- Somewhat high
- Low
- Very low

Comments
30. In your opinion, what do existing leaders in communities and the Washington State nonprofit sector need in order to sustain their leadership?


31. What do you anticipate will be the most important leadership-related issue in the nonprofit sector over the next few years?


32. In your opinion, do leaders of color have equal access to leadership opportunities in your community? *

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know
- I don’t feel qualified to respond

Comments


33. In your opinion, how representative of diverse perspectives and voices is the leadership in your community? *

- Somewhat diverse
- Not at all diverse
- I don't feel qualified to respond

Comments

34. What is your greatest hope for leadership in the Washington State nonprofit sector?

35. Additional Comments

Section Six: Demographic Information: About You

Page description:
36. What is your current annual pre-tax salary (excluding benefits and other non-monetary compensation)? *

- $0 - $30,000
- $30,001 - $50,000
- $50,001 - $75,000
- $75,001 - $100,000
- $100,001 - $150,000
- $150,001 - $200,000
- $200,001+

37. What is your age? *

- under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-54
- 55+

38. What is your gender? *

- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- Decline to state
- Self-identify
39. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply) *

☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
☐ Black/African-American
☐ Latino/a
☐ Middle Eastern
☐ Native American
☐ White/Anglo
☐ Other
☐ Decline to Respond

40. Were you born in the United States? *

☐ Yes
☐ No

41. What is your primary language?


42. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed? *

- Graduated high school or equivalent
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctorate degree
- Other

43. Which best describes your family's socio-economic status when you were growing up? *

- Poor
- Working class
- Middle class
- Upper-middle class
- Upper class

Section Six: Demographic Information: About your Organization

Page description:

Answer these questions ONLY if you currently work for a nonprofit organization.
44. How many paid staff (both full-time and part-time) does your organization employ?

- 0 (no paid staff; all volunteer)
- Between 1 and 4
- Between 5 and 10
- Between 11 and 20
- Between 21 and 50
- Between 51 and 100
- Over 100

45. What is the annual operating budget of your organization?

- $0 - $25,000
- $25,001 - $100,000
- $100,001 - $500,000
- $500,001 - $1 Million
- $1.1 Million - $3 Million
- $3.1 Million - $5 Million
- $5.1 Million - $10 Million
- $10.1 Million - $20 Million
- $21 Million +
46. What is the primary activity of your nonprofit organization? Choose the one that comes closest.

- Human Services (non-healthcare)
- Health/Mental Health
- Arts/Culture
- Environment
- Public Benefit/Advocacy
- Education
- International/Foreign Affairs
- Religious/Spiritual
- Animal Welfare
- Community/Economic Development
- Foundation
- Other (please specify) *

47. Does your organization serve low-income communities? Please select the option that is most applicable to you:

- My organization exclusively serves low-income communities or persons
- My organization primarily services low-income communities or persons (i.e., at least 50% of clients are low-income individuals or persons)
- Neither of the above
48. Does your organization serve communities of color? Please select the option that is most applicable to you:

- My organization exclusively serves communities of color and/or persons of color
- My organization primarily services communities of color and/or persons of color (i.e., at least 50% of clients are persons of color)
- Neither of the above

49. In what zip code is your office headquarters located?

Other

Section I: Your Experience with Leadership Development

Page description:
50. Which best describes your current employer? *

- Nonprofit Provider (e.g., capacity building, consulting firm, leadership program provider)
- For-profit, Private Business (e.g., capacity building, consulting firm, leadership program provider)
- Nonprofit Foundation providing leadership development
- Public Agency or Government Institution
- Solo Practitioner (e.g., self-employed coach, consultant)
- Other (please specify) *

51. Which of the following best describes your current position? *

- CEO/Executive Director of provider firm/organization
- Senior-level Consultant/Coach
- Program Manager or Director
- Professional Non-Manager (e.g., teacher, social worker, counselor)
- Coordinator
- Assistant/Receptionist/Entry-level Administrator
- Other *

52. How long have you been in your current position? *

[ ] years
53. How long in total have you worked as a provider of leadership development including your current employer/position and previous positions? *

[ ] years

Please tell us about your experience with leadership development.

54. Which of the following professional development opportunities/leadership services do you (or your organization) deliver or fund? *

☐ Executive coaching

☐ Professional associations

☐ Nonprofit management certificate/degree programs

☐ Topical workshops and conferences

☐ Leadership development programs (eg: Rockwood, Center for Ethical Leadership)

☐ Peer networks or peer groups

☐ Other (please specify)
55. **In the grid below, select the option that best describes how much your leadership development programs/initiatives focus on each domain.** If you are a solo practitioner, please select the options that best describe what YOU focus on in your work with clients. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Very Focused</th>
<th>Focused</th>
<th>Not at All Focused</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Self (individual development, self-awareness and self-management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading with Others (team performance, social awareness, relationship management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading the Organization, Program, or Project (ability to interpret and adapt to the context within a system, entity, organization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within the Community (ability to navigate within systems often without positional power or authority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading within a Movement (ability to engage in boundary crossing; engage stakeholders from different sectors, communities and disciplines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

56. **Which of the following methodologies do you use in your programs?** *

- Planned instruction
- Action-learning
- Developmental relationships (e.g. coaching, mentoring)
- Experiential
- Other (please specify)
57. In the grid below, please list the names of UP TO FIVE specific leadership programs or initiatives that you are aware of that help cultivate leaders in your field. For each one you name, indicate your assessment of its effectiveness, and whether you or any of your colleagues have participated. If you are not aware of any programs or initiatives that help cultivate leaders in your field, simply proceed to the next question.

For the purposes of this survey question, “effectiveness” means the program successfully impacts the development of leadership competencies identified in the program objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Initiative Name</th>
<th>Your Assessment of its Effectiveness</th>
<th>I (or my organization) deliver/s this program/initiative</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE EFFECTIVE NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE</td>
<td>YES NO Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program/Initiative Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program/Initiative Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program/Initiative Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program/Initiative Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Program/Initiative Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
58. Beyond what is available right now, what kinds of ADDITIONAL programs or initiatives, IF ANY, do you believe are needed to cultivate leadership in the Washington State nonprofit sector?
59. Imagine that funding were available specifically to help develop the leadership required to support organizations, communities or movements in Washington achieve the outcomes they seek. Which of the following would be the most valuable? You may select up to three. *

☐ A. Funding to support nonprofits to recruit high-potential staff
☐ B. Funding for technical assistance to help build nonprofit talent management processes
☐ C. General operating funding (or unrestricted general support) to enable additional internal capacity for talent management
☐ D. Funding to provide external multi-session leadership development programs
☐ E. Funding to provide external one-off trainings on specific topics
☐ F. Funding to offer conferences or other networking events
☐ G. Funding to provide executive coaching
☐ H. Funding to provide sabbatical programs
☐ I. Funding to offer association membership
☐ J. Funding to offer nonprofit management certificate/degree programs
☐ K. Funding to offer peer networks or peer learning groups
☐ L. Other leadership development/talent management support *

Comments


Section II: Leadership in Your Community

Page description:
Please tell us about leadership in your community or region.

61. Who is a leader in your community, region, or field that exemplifies the type of leadership you most greatly admire? Please include the person’s full name (and organization, if applicable) in your response.

Note: We will be using this information to reach out to identify leaders for potential interviews or focus groups.

62. How well do you know the amount of offerings/providers of leadership programming across Washington State? *

- I am not sure how what programs are offered across Washington
- I have a good idea, though I expect I am unaware of a number
- I think I know what’s offered
- I have a thorough understanding of what’s offered

63. Based on what you know, how would you rate the AVAILABILITY of leadership development PROGRAMS in your community? *

- Very high
- Somewhat high
- Low
- Very low
64. Overall, I rate the AVAILABILITY of leadership development RESOURCES in my community (e.g., coaching, workshops, peer networks) as: *

- Very high
- Somewhat high
- Low
- Very low

65. In your opinion, what do existing leaders in communities and the nonprofit sector need in order to sustain their leadership?

66. What do you anticipate will be the most important leadership-related issue in the nonprofit sector over the next few years?
67. In your opinion, do leaders of color have equal access to leadership opportunities in your community? *

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know
- I don’t feel qualified to respond

Comments

68. In your opinion, how representative of diverse perspectives and voices is the leadership in your community? *

- Somewhat Diverse
- Not at all Diverse
- I don’t feel qualified to respond

Comments
69. What is your greatest hope for leadership in the Washington State nonprofit sector?

70. Additional Comments

Section III: Demographic Information

71. What is your current annual pre-tax salary (excluding benefits and other non-monetary compensation)? *

- $0 - $30,000
- $30,001 - $50,000
- $50,001 - $75,000
- $75,001 - $100,000
- $100,001 - $150,000
- $150,001 - $200,000
- $200,001+
72. What is your age? *
- under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-54
- 55+

73. What is your gender? *
- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- Decline to State
- Self-identify

74. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply) *
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African-American
- Latino/a
- Middle Eastern
- Native American
- White/Anglo
- Other
- Decline to respond
75. Were you born in the United States? *
- Yes
- No

76. What is your primary language? *

77. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed? *
- Graduated high school or equivalent
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctorate degree
- Other

78. Which best describes your family’s socio-economic status when you were growing up? *
- Poor
- Working class
- Middle class
- Upper-middle class
- Upper class

Section III: About your Organization/Company/Firm
79. How many paid staff (both full-time and part-time) does your organization/company/firm employ? *

- 0 (no paid staff; all volunteer)
- between 1 and 4
- between 5 and 10
- between 11 and 20
- between 21 and 50
- between 51 and 100
- over 100
- N/A - I am a solo practioner

80. What is the annual operating budget of your organization/company/firm? *

- $0 - $25,000
- $25,001 - $100,000
- $100,001 - $500,000
- $500,001 - $1 Million
- $1.1 Million – $3 Million
- $3.1 Million - $5 Million
- $5.1 Million - $10 Million
- $10.1 Million - $20 Million
- $21 Million +
- N/A - I am a solo practioner
81. Please describe the primary market your practice serves (e.g., consumer group, region, demographics, or community for examples "nonprofit boards in Seattle", "community-based organization in public schools", "child care providers in rural Washington").

82. In what zip code is your office headquarters located? *

Section 1: Your Experience with Leadership Development

Page description:

83. Which best describes your current employer? *

- Nonprofit Organization
- Nonprofit Foundation
- Public Agency or Government Institution
- For-profit, Private Business
- I am self-employed
- Other (required)  *

* Required field
84. Which of the following best describes your current position? *

- CEO/President
- Senior Manager/Director/Vice President - Directly reporting to the CEO/Executive Director
- Middle Manager/Program Director/Program Officer
- Professional Non-Manager (e.g., teacher, social worker, counselor)
- Coordinator
- Assistant/Receptionist/Entry-level Administrator
- Other

85. How long have you been in your current position? *

\[
\text{years}
\]

86. How long have you worked in your current organization? *

\[
\text{years}
\]

Please tell us about your experience with leadership development.
87. Which of the following professional development opportunities/leadership services do you (or your foundation) deliver or fund? *

- [ ] Executive coaching
- [ ] Professional associations
- [ ] Nonprofit management certificate/degree programs
- [ ] Topical workshops and conferences
- [ ] Leadership development programs (eg: Rockwood, Center for Ethical Leadership)
- [ ] Peer networks or peer groups
- [ ] Other (please specify) *

88. On the grid below, rank each of the following leadership domains on a scale of 1 - 5 where 5 = Most Valuable and 1 = Least Valuable

Leadership development programs have the most value in supporting participants’ ability to... *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Domain</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Self (self-awareness and self-management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead with Others (social awareness and relationship management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead the Organization, Program, or Project (ability to interpret and adapt to the context within a system, entity, organization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead within the Community (ability to navigate within systems often without positional power or authority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead within a Movement (ability to engage in boundary crossing; engage stakeholders from different sectors, communities, and disciplines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89. In the grid below, please list the names of UP TO FIVE specific leadership programs or initiatives that you are aware of that help cultivate leaders in your field. For each one you name, indicate your assessment of its effectiveness, and whether you or any of your colleagues have participated. If you are not aware of any programs or initiatives that help cultivate leaders in your
field, simply proceed to the next question.

For the purposes of this survey question, “effectiveness” means the program successfully impacts the development of leadership competencies identified in the program objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program/Initiative Name</th>
<th>Your Assessment of its Effectiveness</th>
<th>I fund this program/initiative</th>
<th>participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
90. Beyond what is available right now, what kinds of ADDITIONAL programs or initiatives, IF ANY, do you believe are needed to cultivate leadership in the field in which you work?

91. In the past two years, have you funded programs/initiatives for any of the following purposes?

Please check all that apply. *

- [ ] A. Funding to support nonprofits to recruit high-potential staff
- [ ] B. Funding for technical assistance to help build nonprofit talent management processes
- [ ] C. General operating funding (or unrestricted general support) to enable additional internal capacity for talent management
- [ ] D. Funding to provide external multi-session leadership development programs
- [ ] E. Funding to provide external one-off trainings on specific topics
- [ ] F. Funding to offer conferences or other networking events
- [ ] G. Funding to provide executive coaching
- [ ] H. Funding to provide sabbatical programs
- [ ] I. Funding to offer association membership
- [ ] J. Funding to offer nonprofit management certificate/degree programs
- [ ] K. Funding to offer peer networks or peer learning groups
- [ ] L. Other leadership development/talent management support [open response] *

Section 2: Leadership in Your Community
Please tell us about leadership in your community or region.

92. Who is a leader in your community, region, or field that exemplifies the type of leadership you most greatly admire? Please include the person’s full name (and organization, if applicable) in your response.

Note: We will be using this information to reach out to identify leaders for potential interviews or focus groups.

93. How well do you know the **amount** of offerings/providers of leadership programming across Washington state? *

- I am not sure how what programs are offered across Washington
- I have a good idea, though I expect I am unaware of a number
- I think I know what’s offered
- I have a thorough understanding of what’s offered
94. Based on what you know, how would you rate the AVAILABILITY of leadership development PROGRAMS in your community? *

- Very high
- Somewhat high
- Low
- Very low

Comments

95. Overall, I rate the AVAILABILITY of leadership development RESOURCES in my community (e.g., coaching, workshops, peer networks) as: *

- Very high
- Somewhat high
- Low
- Very low

Comments
96. In your opinion, what do existing leaders in communities and the nonprofit sector need in order to sustain their leadership?

97. What do you anticipate will be the most important leadership-related issue in the nonprofit sector over the next few years?

98. In your opinion, do leaders of color have equal access to leadership opportunities in your community? *
- Yes
- No
- I don’t know
- I don’t feel qualified to respond

Comments


99. In your opinion, how representative of diverse perspectives and voices is the leadership in your community? *

- Somewhat diverse
- Not at all diverse
- I don’t feel qualified to respond

Comments

100. What is your greatest hope for leadership in the Washington State nonprofit sector?

101. Additional Comments

Section 3: About your Organization/Foundation

Page description:
102. How many paid staff (both full-time and part-time) does your foundation employ? *

- 0 (no paid staff; all volunteer)
- between 1 and 4
- between 5 and 10
- between 11 and 20
- between 21 and 50
- between 51 and 100
- over 100

103. What is the annual operating budget of your foundation? *

- $0 - $25,000
- $25,001 - $100,000
- $100,001 - $500,000
- $500,001 - $1 Million
- $1.1 Million - $3 Million
- $3.1 Million - $5 Million
- $5.1 Million - $10 Million
- $10.1 Million - $20 Million
- $21 Million +
104. Please describe your primary funding focus (e.g., kind of organizations, programs, region, or community for example “collaborative school-based leadership programs in Seattle” "community-based nonprofit organizations" "Child care providers in rural Washington").

105. In what zip code is your office headquarters located? *

Attribution & Contact Information

Page description:

106. May we use your responses either anonymously or attributed in the final report? *

- No, in the final report please aggregate my responses and do not use specific quotes at all.
- Yes, in the final report feel free to use my responses anonymously.
- Yes, in the final report please attribute my responses to me.
107. How would you like your responses to be attributed?

First Name

Last Name

Title

Organization or Affiliation

Other

108. In addition to this survey, we will be conducting interviews and focus groups for this leadership scan. Would you be willing to participate in an interview or focus group? If you say “yes,” you will be taken to a separate page unconnected with your survey responses and asked for your contact information. If you say “no,” then you will not be contacted again in connection with this study. *

- Yes
- No

Comments

Thank You!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.
**Ballmer Group Philanthropy**

**Leading for Impact/ Bridgespan**

**Geographic Area:** King County  
**Leadership:** Self, Organization  
**Description:** King County Cohort model providing multi-year capacity building and training to 50 organizations.  
**More Information:** [Leading for Impact](#)

**Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation**

**501 Commons**

**Geographic Area:** State  
**Leadership:** Self, Others, Organization  
**Description:** General Operating Support  
**More Information:** [501Commons](#)

**Washington Nonprofits**

**Geographic Area:** State  
**Leadership:** Community, Movement  
**Description:** Connect & coordinate policy priorities and actions across local networks, nonprofit support organizations, coalitions, policy leaders, local and state government, business and philanthropy.  
**More Information:** [Washington Nonprofits](#)

**Rainier Valley Corps**

**Geographic Area:** Southeast Seattle  
**Leadership:** Self, Others, Organization, Community, Movement  
**Description:** Increase the number of emerging leaders who are able to build capacity of immigrant/refugee-serving CBOs in the Rainier Valley; increase the involvement of immigrant/refugee-serving CBOs in decision-making roles for systems level initiatives and civic engagement efforts; and establish the RVC as a key change agent for capacity building, leadership, and community organizing in refugee/immigrant communities.  
**More Information:** [Rainier Valley Corps](#)

**Philanthropy NW**

**Geographic Area:** State  
**Leadership:** Organizations, Community, Movement  
**Description:** Provide technical assistance, convening, and professional development activities in support of the Building Community Philanthropy learning community and the broader network of community philanthropy organizations in Washington.  
**More Information:** [Philanthropy NW](#)
Coalition of Communities of Color

**Geographic Area:** Oregon

**Leadership:** Organizations, Community, Movement

**Description:** Support collective learning, authentic engagement and sharing of promising practices for the Strengthening Collaborations learning community of six grantees which are within and across low-income communities and communities of color to increase the likelihood of identifying alternative, targeted approaches to close opportunity gaps for those most affected by poverty and inequity.

**More Information:** Coalition of Communities of Color

University of Washington

**Geographic Area:** State

**Leadership:** Movement

**Description:** P-3 Leadership Institute will build and support a cadre of leaders – in both early childhood and elementary education – who are dedicated to ensuring Washington’s young children have a high-quality continuum of learning that begins at birth and extends through elementary school.

**More Information:** P-3 Executive Leadership

Puget Sound Educational Service District

**Geographic Area:** Seattle & South King County

**Leadership:** Organizations, Movement

**Description:** Provide technical assistance, capacity building, skills development, as well as peer support to K12 district staff that participate in the Road Map Equity Consortium focused on closing opportunity gaps for students of color.

**More Information:** Puget Sound ESD

OneAmerica

**Geographic Area:** Seattle & South King County

**Leadership:** Organization, Movements

**Description:** Provide technical assistance, convening, as well as peer support to K12 district staff that participate in the Road Map English Language Learner (ELL) Work Group focused on improving policies, practices, and resources for ELL students.

**More Information:** OneAmerica

Campion Foundation

**AFP Advancement Northwest**

**Geographic Area:** State

**Leadership:** Varies

**Description:** General Operating Support

**More Information:** AFP Advancement NW
Appendix J: Leadership Resources

501 Commons
- **Geographic Area**: State
- **Leadership**: Varies
- **Description**: General Operating Support
- **More Information**: 501Commons

Washington Nonprofits
- **Geographic Area**: State
- **Leadership**: Varies
- **Description**: General Operating Support
- **More Information**: Washington Nonprofits

Philanthropy NW
- **Geographic Area**: State
- **Leadership**: Community
- **Description**: Convening a capacity building learning community that brings together funders and nonprofits across the state in open conversation and shared learning about critical nonprofit capacity issues (co-funded with Statewide Capacity Collaborative). To be launched in 2016.
- **More Information**: Philanthropy NW

Professional Development Grant Program
- **Geographic Area**: Varies
- **Leadership**: Varies
- **Description**: Grants, up to a maximum of $5,000, available to any employee of a current grantee for activities which will provide personal and professional growth opportunities relevant to their current (or future) position.
- **More Information**: Campion Capacity Building

Cedarmere Foundation

Quarterly ED Peer Exchanges
- **Geographic Area**: Puget Sound
- **Leadership**: Self, Others, Organization
- **Description**: Facilitated Peer Exchange for EDs of grantee organizations.
- **More Information**: Cedarmere Foundation

Responsive Training Funds
- **Geographic Area**: Puget Sound
- **Leadership**: Varies
- **Description**: Funds available for training fees, conference registrations, etc with no formal application needed.
- **More Information**: Cedarmere Foundation
Boards in Gear Training Module

**Geographic Area:** Internet Accessible

**Leadership:** Others, Organization, Movements

**Description:** Funded the development of an online board governance training module developed by Washington Nonprofits which is now available to anyone with internet access.

**More Information:** Boards in Gear

Capacity Building Grants

**Geographic Area:** Puget Sound

**Leadership:** Varies

**Description:** Provide multi-year capacity building grants.

**More Information:** Cedarmere Foundation

Cedarmere, Campion & SVP

**Capacity Building Workshops**

**Geographic Area:** Seattle

**Leadership:** Varies

**Description:** Funders collaborate to provide grantees with targeted trainings 1 to 2 times per year, often with one-on-one support provided post training.

Empire Health Foundation

**Cerebyte Transformational Leadership**

**Geographic Area:** Spokane & Statewide

**Leadership:** Varies

**Description:** EHF has done this 20-week process internally for staff last year, and currently statewide with Accountable Communities of Health and Health Care Authority leaders.

**More Information:** Cerebyte

Medina Foundation

**Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute (NELI) Sponsorships**

**Geographic Area:** Counties in Western Washington

**Leadership:** Self, Others, Organization

**Description:** Each year Medina pays full costs for 6 organizational leaders to attend the Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute at the UW Evans School.

**More Information:** Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute
Rural Capacity Building Conferences/Workshops

**Geographic Area:** Counties in Western Washington  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** Provided funding for workshops and conferences in Clallam, Grays Harbor, Whatcom, and Pacific Counties - all of which had leadership training components.  
**More Information:** [Medina Foundation](#)

Satterberg Foundation

**501 Commons**  
**Geographic Area:** Puget Sound  
**Leadership:** Organization  
**Description:** Fund consulting and organizational assessment grants to reduce the cost barriers facing small nonprofits (annual budget <$1MM).  
**More Information:** [501Commons](#)

Seattle Foundation

**501 Commons**  
**Geographic Area:** State  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** General Operating Support  
**More Information:** [501Commons](#)

Washington Nonprofits

**Geographic Area:** State  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** General Operating Support  
**More Information:** [Washington Nonprofits](#)

Nonprofit Assistance Center

**Geographic Area:** Greater Seattle  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** General Operating Support  
**More Information:** [Nonprofit Assistance Center](#)
Rainier Valley Corps

**Geographic Area:** Southeast Seattle  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** General Operating Support  
**More Information:** [Rainier Valley Corps](#)

University of Washington - NELI

**Geographic Area:** Seattle & Statewide  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** General Operating Support to Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute  
**More Information:** [Nonprofit Executive Leadership Institute](#)

Wayfind

**Geographic Area:** King County  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** General Operating Support  
**More Information:** [Wayfind](#)

Youth Development Execs of King County (YDEKC)

**Geographic Area:** King County  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** General Operating Support  
**More Information:** [YDEKC](#)

Leading for Impact/Bridgespan

**Geographic Area:** King County  
**Leadership:** Self, Organization  
**Description:** King County Cohort model providing multi-year capacity building and training to 50 organizations.  
**More Information:** [Leading for Impact](#)

Neighbor to Neighbor Funder Collaborative

**Geographic Area:** Greater Seattle  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** Increase capacity of grassroots organizations.  
**More Information:** [Neighbor to Neighbor Fund](#)
Sherwood Trust

**Community Leadership Program**

**Geographic Area:** Walla Walla Valley  
**Leadership:** Self, Community  
**Description:** Each year train 25-30 community leaders from diverse backgrounds, ages, and experience levels on the skills they need to be more engaged in the community and accomplish a team project. Contract through Rural Development Initiatives Inc. to provide the training.  
**More Information:** Sherwood Trust and Rural Development Initiatives

Pomegranate Fellows

**Geographic Area:** Walla Walla Valley  
**Leadership:** Community  
**Description:** Periodically contract with Pomegranate Center to provide community building and collaboration training to community volunteers.  
**More Information:** Pomegranate Center

Nonprofit Learning Center

**Geographic Area:** Walla Walla Valley  
**Leadership:** Self, Others, Organization  
**Description:** Through a partnership with Walla Walla Community College, fund a Nonprofit Learning Center to provide free classes to nonprofit leaders, staff, boards, and volunteers throughout the year.  
**More Information:** Nonprofit Learning Center

Annual Workshop

**Geographic Area:** Walla Walla Valley  
**Leadership:** Organizations  
**Description:** Sponsor all-day workshop each year for nonprofit leaders, staff, and board members on topics relevant to leading in the nonprofit sector.  
**More Information:** Sherwood Trust

Social Venture Partners (SVP)

**Leadership Development Support**

**Geographic Area:** King County  
**Leadership:** Varies  
**Description:** Provide current grantees with custom leadership development support based on the needs of the organization. Examples include: coaching, professional development, peer cohorts, executive leadership training, etc.  
**More Information:** Strengthening Nonprofits
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