MEETING NOTES

Metro DNA

In Attendance

Brian Kurzel, Jennifer Riley-Chetwynd, Leslie Pickard, Stephanie Stowell, Jeff Su, Anna Zawisza, Bill Fulton, Emily Patterson, Susan Daggett, Dana Coelho, Kristen Greenwald, Sara Abdulla, Sarah Thomas, Liz Drogin

Collective Impact Reflections (Bill)

- Use of Data: A distinguishing feature of "business as usual" vs. collective impact is that in collective impact there is agreement on high-level outcomes and indicators that are requisite for measuring success
    - Important to have ongoing shared measurement structures so can assess if "moving the needle"

- Action Mapping vs. Traditional Strategic Plan
    - Action Map: Works backwards from the most important impacts. How do you want to "move the needle?" Then, asks what are the most effective strategies for "moving the needle?" This is not simply an inventory of what's happening. Typically, you'll find there is a distinction between what we have always done, what we're doing, and what needs to be done to achieve the desired impact (results).
    - Action Mapping & Data: Be sure to remain focused on how the data we're collecting and mapping informs the indicators and results that mDNA identified.

    Bill's Recommendations:
- Spend time looking at structure of collective impact organizations in other sectors (e.g. early childhood, health sectors). Important to recognize how these constellations function. STRIVE partnership (Cincinnati); Magnolia Place (LA); Tamarack Institute (Canada)

- You might need a facilitated conversation around results, shared indicators, and what needs to happen to achieve the results. Bill refers to this as a "Turn the Curve" meeting. Everyone adds in current work so you have a sense for what's already happening towards these results and how you can then leverage, strengthen, coordinate the work that is ongoing. This helps achieve alignment. The goal of this meeting would be to tacitly "ground truth" the results, indicators, while starting to build the action map.

- Collective Impact vs. Association: The association excels by growing its number of members. The collective impact group is not just a membership group. It is essential to be moving the needle on issues you've identified.

Overview of Phase 2

NOTE: See attached handout (Timeline- mDNA Phase II)
- Task 1: Slightly modified from proposal to better understand the organizational needs:
    - *Survey:* Recommend adding this methodology to gather information about organizational needs that would not be available through online research.

- o *Inventory:* Recommend modifying initial proposal (inventory of on-the-ground efforts) to an inventory of coalitions and collaborative entities that are currently providing the kinds of infrastructure support that mDNA ultimately imagines providing. This provides additional insight for gap analysis.

Group Input/Feedback on Task 1:

Gap Analysis: Include evaluation & impact

Inventory of Coalitions: Document memberships in each coalition so it is possible to map organizational overlap; Capture not only regional coalitions but also statewide and smaller-scale coalitions; Include local "hot spots" (e.g. crucial to capture RDU area; stock show area); Incorporate coalitions focused on equity;

Surveys/Interviews: Provide "strawman," set of assumptions, concrete ideas when gather information. Avoid asking about needs in an open-ended manner because groups are likely to focus on funding, marketing, other operational support.

Expect an email from Sarah in the next few days soliciting information about coalitions and stakeholders for inventory and interviews

- Task 2: No major modifications from proposal.
  - o *Additional Conversation with Steering Committee:* Presentation of initial findings from Task 1 in combination with discussion of other models (Intertwine, etc.). Preparing materials for "road show" with key stakeholders (meetings, focus groups, etc.). Use input from these meetings for a second facilitated conversation with Steering Committee to finalize mDNA roles.

- Tasks 3, 4, 5: Will be making forward progress on these so have basic models/alternatives to share with key stakeholders during "road show."

Expect an email from Sarah including a modified proposal incorporating today's discussion. Sarah will also briefly review these modifications at the February 8th meeting.

Phase 2 Logistics & Inclusion

Q: Who gets included in the strategic planning process?
- Invite folks who have expressed interest in involvement (e.g. surveys from December stakeholder meeting)
- Targeted invitations to key stakeholders

Q: Do we want to include the Next 100 and Jes Ward in our steering committee meetings?
- General consensus = this is a valuable perspective to have join the conversation

Current Thoughts on Roles, Results, Indicators

NOTE: See attached handout (Possible Roles for mDNA)

Q: Where is current thinking about possible roles for mDNA?
- Communications/branding seems to be missing as a possible role
  - e.g. Portland Intertwine = members can point to how they contribute to the larger coalition, can reference in funding applications, etc.
- "Measure success" doesn't seem sufficient. Must be something about identifying and elevating shared goals. Highlighting shared successes.
- Advocacy and policy seem to be missing. But, for some groups in the room this is not feasible. Continue this conversation at a later date.
- Equity isn't on here. This is overarching but needs to be made explicit since the group is promoting a more inclusive and equitable approach to greenspace – "Advance an Equitable Regional Vision"

Q: How do the various roles align with the results mDNA has identified?
- The hope is that mDNA's functions will advance all of the results in an integrated manner.
- Important to ask organizations which mDNA functions will best enable them to "move the needle" on key indicators

Q: Is "Advance a Regional Vision" at the center or is collective impact and elevating shared goals at the core?
- Regional vision is the core. This becomes evident through communications and branding, happens because facilitating collaboration, etc.

Q: Can we capture these roles in a more simplistic way?
- Possibly narrow to a few kinds of actions: (a) Communication/Conversation, (b) Research/Clearinghouse, (c) Advancement/Advocacy

Q: Where are we in terms of thinking about results and indicators?
- The group feels solid about results statements. Could use more time to incorporate stakeholder feedback on indicators.

  Consider devoting meeting time and/or working in a subgroup to finalize indicators

Additional

Sarah & Liz will only be facilitating and providing note-taking at key junctures in the strategic planning process. Recommendation that the Steering Committee develop interim internal roles around this and other functions.