

**BUILD TOOLS FOR NONPROFIT SUSTAINABILITY  
AND INNOVATIVE GIVING APPROACH**

**EVALUATION REPORT OF SECOND NETWORKING MEETING**

**SUBMITTED BY CATHY L. MARTINEZ, PH. D.  
CENTERPOINT INSTITUTE, INC.  
NOVEMBER 17, 2003**

**BACKGROUND**

October 28-30, 2003, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF) Philanthropy and Volunteerism program area hosted the second of what it hopes will be several networking meetings for a cluster of grantees within the “Building Tools for Nonprofit Effectiveness and Innovative Giving” approach of its Unleashing New Resources initiative. The 21 invited grantees represent roughly half of the grants made to date within the Tools approach; they were selected to participate in cluster activities because of their potential for productive interaction, joint programming, collaboration, and developing a community of practice. If these potentials could be realized, the cluster would make a significant contribution to the ability of nonprofit organizations to sustain themselves and to creating new avenues for more citizens to give their time, money, and know-how to improving the quality of life in communities.

The networking meeting was held at the Tempe Mission Palms in Tempe, AZ. The site was selected for the March 2003 networking meeting to take advantage of proximity to the Arizona State University (ASU) Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management (CNLM). The CNLM was subsequently added to the cluster because of its WKKF grant to build programs and tools that increase nonprofit sustainability in the region.

Representatives from all 21 cluster member organizations attended the meeting; the final attendee roster consisted of 69 individuals – 44 leaders from the 21 cluster member organizations, 8 speakers, 8 representatives of intermediary organizations (both cluster and initiative-level) and 9 representatives from WKKF (program directors and P&V impact services staff). Of the 44 leaders from the cluster member organizations, 23 had also attended the first networking meeting in March, 2003. All 44 cluster member attendees were asked to complete the post-conference assessment; 29 completed assessments were received; the response rate was 66%.

**The Program**

The program for this second meeting in the series was designed by an advisory panel of cluster members in conjunction with the cluster leadership team (WKKF and CenterPoint). The meeting’s objectives are listed below, along with the program elements that were intended to contribute to each objective.

- Objective 1. Members learn about other organizations and continue building the community of practice. Program elements include:
- Organization Profiles (written, disseminated prior to meeting).
  - Organization Presentations (oral, at meeting).
  - Venture Fund written and oral reports.
  - Sharing during work sessions, unstructured time, and following the meeting via the Tools list server.
- Objective 2. Members learn about and discuss organization sustainability strategies and related topics. Program elements include:
- Opening session: Fish Bowl on Organization Sustainability Issues.
  - Case Study: CompuMentor.
  - In-depth workshops with resource leaders.
  - Closing plenary on Organization Sustainability.
- Objective 3. Members continue exploring WKKF's vision for the Tools cluster and the Unleashing New Resources initiative. Program elements include:
- The cluster's unifying factors and themes.
  - Plans for finding common ground for a collective agenda for learning and action.
  - Work going forward in the Unleashing Resources initiative's other two programming approaches.
  - Inclusion of communities of color through a second Venture Fund.

For reference purposes, the program schedule is attached at the end of this report (see Appendix A, page 14).

### **Evaluation Design**

The primary purpose for the networking meeting evaluation was program development; specifically to gather information that would allow the planning teams to understand the effectiveness of their work on the networking meeting. The evaluation instrument used several different types of questions in an attempt to understand how the members responded to the meeting's learning objectives and methodologies. The types of questions used included a) Likert-type scales to assess satisfaction with meeting objectives, usefulness of information provided, meeting communications and materials, informal interaction, and new member orientation, and b) open-ended questions to gather information on how participants felt about the program and to seek suggestions for program and communications improvements.

## FINDINGS

The purpose of this evaluation was to aid in program development. Specifically, participants in the networking meeting held October 28 – 30, 2003 were asked to provide feedback regarding achievement of learning objectives, indicate usefulness of information provided through various components of the program, and provide information to aid in development of future networking meetings. The findings and discussion are organized according to the questions asked. Not all comments received from the participants are represented in the body of the report. Instead, selected quotes that represent those provided by respondents have been shared. It should be noted that no significant difference was found for mean scores between those who had attended both networking meetings (March 2003 and October 2003) and those who attended only the October 2003 meeting.

### Achievement of Program Outcomes

Participants were asked to assess the extent to which they were satisfied that the following program features or outcomes had been achieved (a five-point Likert-type scale was used where 1 = Very Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 5 = Not Satisfied).

**Table 1: Ratings of Importance and Performance on Program Learning Objectives**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>Range</b>
Learn something that will help me in my work.	29	1.79	1-4
Learn something that will help my organization be more effective.	29	1.83	1-4
Meet other grantees/become familiar with other people and organizations in the cluster.	29	1.45	1-3
Develop relationships with others in the cluster whom I would feel comfortable contacting.	29	1.55	1-3
Increase understanding of the Build Tools for Nonprofit Effectiveness and Innovative Giving approach.	28	2.11	1-4
Increase understanding of W. K. Kellogg Foundation expectations concerning participation in the Tools cluster.	29	1.79	1-3

Overall, the ratings indicate that participants were satisfied that the program outcomes had been achieved.

### Usefulness of Program Aspects for Developing Knowledge and Understanding of Cluster Members

In order to build a community, prospective members of that community need to learn about one another and their similarities/differences. The cluster leadership team, aided by an advisory group of cluster members, planned components of the program that would help build members' understanding and knowledge of one another.

Participants were asked to indicate how useful they found these program components to developing their knowledge and understanding of other cluster members (a five-point Likert-type scale was used where 1 = Not Useful, 3 = Useful, 5 = Very Useful).

**Table 2: Level of Usefulness for Developing Knowledge and Understanding of Cluster Members**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>Range</b>
The Organization Presentations (Tuesday afternoon)	28	4.14	2-5
Self-organized dinner groups (Tuesday evening)	27	4.00	2-5
Organization sustainability workshop (Wednesday afternoon)	29	4.24	2-5
Dinner at the Bamboo Club (Wednesday evening)	26	3.88	2-5

Overall, the ratings indicate that participants found the program components to be useful in developing their knowledge and understanding of other cluster members.

**Usefulness of Program Components for Providing Information**

Much of advisory panel’s focus was on identifying the type of informative sessions that would be useful for participants in this second networking meeting. Cluster members were involved in determining the specific topics and sub-topics to be addressed through a polling process and the advisory group. The team was interested to learn whether cluster members were satisfied with the sessions that were subsequently planned to address their interests.

Participants were asked to indicate how useful they found the information from the following program components (a five-point Likert-type scale was used where 1 = Not Useful, 3 = Useful, 5 = Very Useful).

**Table 3: Level of Usefulness for Providing Information**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>Range</b>
General Session with P&V Staff (Tuesday afternoon)	27	3.78	2-5
The Organization Presentation (Tuesday afternoon)	28	4.04	2-5
The Venture Fund discussion (Tuesday afternoon)	27	3.67	2-5
The Fish Bowl (Wednesday morning)	27	4.00	1-5
CompuMentor case study (Wednesday morning)	28	4.07	2-5
Organizational sustainability workshops (overall)	26	3.96	1-5
Evaluation discussion (Thursday morning)	25	3.56	2-5
Pre-view of March '04 meeting (Thursday morning)	16	3.38	1-5

The participants were allowed to self-select sustainability workshops to attend (the topics had been selected by polling the cluster members). The ratings for the individual sessions are listed below (a five-point Likert-type scale was used where 1 = Not Useful, 3 = Useful, 5 = Very Useful).

**Table 4: Level of Usefulness by Sustainability Workshop Topic**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>Range</b>
Alternative Funding	8	4.13	3-5
Commercial Ventures	3	3.00	3
Institutional Collaborations	9	3.67	1-5
Marketing	1	5.00	5
Pricing	4	4.25	1-5

Overall participants found the information from the general program components as well as the sustainability workshops to be useful.

**Rating of Registration Information**

Participants were asked to rate the registration information provided in advance of the networking meeting on two dimensions, quantity and quality. Scores for quantity were: 1 = Too Much, 2 = Just Right, 3 = Too Little; scores for quality were: 1 = High, 2 = Medium, 3 = Low.

**Table 5: Rating of Registration Information**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Quantity	27	2.70
Quality	21	1.19

Overall participants felt that pre-meeting communication was approaching “too little” in terms of quantity, and high in terms of quality.

**Rating of Reading Packet Materials**

An extensive reading packet was provided in advance of the networking meeting. Participants were asked to rate the items in the reading packet in terms of how useful they found the information. Scores for reading packet materials were: 1 = Very Useful, 2 = Useful, 3 = Not Useful, 4 = Didn’t Read.

**Table 6: Rating of Registration Information**

	<b>n (Readers)</b>	<b>Mean Score for Readers</b>	<b>Didn’t Read</b>
Organizational Profiles	27	1.55	2
Community of Practice Paper	28	1.68	1
Venture Fund Reports	27	2.00	1
Rolling Up Our Sleeve Report	24	1.83	4
SeaChange Report	27	1.63	2

The majority of respondents had read the items in the reading packet and found the information they contained to be useful.

**Rating of Time Available for Interaction with Cluster Members**

Networking among members is a desirable outcome for the networking meetings. The leadership team was concerned that the program was very full and might not allow sufficient time for participants to interact with one another. Participants were asked to rate the amount of time available to interact with other cluster members during the networking meeting. Scores for amount of time available were: 1 = Too Much, 2 = Just Right, 3 = Too Little.

**Table 7: Rating of Time for Informal Interaction**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>
<b>Quantity of Time</b>	26	2.08

Overall members felt they had an adequate amount of time available for interaction with other cluster members.

**Rating of New Member Orientation**

During planning for the networking meeting, the leadership team realized that the individuals attending this second meeting may not be the same as those who attended the first networking meeting. Since part of the purpose of these meetings is to build a community, it was decided that the program should include an orientation for new members so that they could share some of the same understanding and background about this community as those who had attended the previous meeting. New participants were asked to rate the New Member Orientation session. The scale for rating the session was: 1 = Very Useful, 2 = Useful, 3 = Not Useful, 4 = Didn't Attend.

**Table 8: Rating of New Member Orientation**

	<b>n (Attendees)</b>	<b>Mean Score for Attendees</b>	<b>Didn't Attend</b>
Usefulness of Orientation	10	1.5	4

Over half of the attendees rated the orientation as very useful; only one rated the orientation as not useful.

The next several sections present findings from the open-ended questions. Not all comments received from the participants are represented in the body of the report. Instead, selected quotes that represent those provided by respondents have been shared.

### **Factors Contributing to Future Participation**

Participants were asked several additional open-ended questions. The first of these was, “what factors will contribute to your active participation?” Twenty-four of the 29 respondents shared ideas which covered a range of topics from networking opportunities, to potential for new funding for collaborative learning, permission of their organizations, and the organization or structure of future meetings.

Eight members discussed the need to gain something for the organization; the take-aways that may improve their work or help to address issues being experienced by their organization:

*Usefulness to my organization in furtherance of mission and collaborations possibilities.*

*Take-aways to help effect change.*

*Problem-solving opportunities with colleagues, resource experts, and Kellogg folks.*

*Learning for me that I can bring back – helping do my job better, more effectively.*

Seven of the members discussed opportunities for networking and “deal making” as a factor that will influence their continued participation:

*Solid networking – good value proposition.*

*Chance to find partners for our work; maximize and leverage the resource of these partners.*

*Continued opportunities to engage with my peers in the sector.*

Five members discussed aspects of the environment and member participation for the networking meetings as a factor:

*Support afforded by CenterPoint – opportunity to learn from others in a “safe” environment.*

*Needs full participation of entire group; gets fragmented as people come late and leave early.*

*Increasing understanding of why we’ve been brought together.*

*Continued attendance of senior executives/managers from each organization (peering).*

Three members indicated that having naked sessions at future meetings would contribute to their participation:

*Co-ed naked break-out groups.*

Two members indicated that continued funding opportunities may be a factor:

*Continued funding opportunities for cluster members' collaborative efforts.*

Two members indicated that continued participation would depend upon their organization's continuing support for their participation:

*If I am sent by my executive team again.*

Other factors mentioned by individual members included having input into the themes for future meetings, future opportunities to “dig deep” on topics, and opportunities to work with small groups between the networking meetings as they did with the last Venture Fund.

### **Follow-up Needed to “Get the Most” from the Meeting**

Fourteen participants responded to the question, “What follow-up is needed to help you get the most out of this meeting?” The responses fell into three basic categories – access to knowledge resources, personal efforts that need to be made, and access to follow-up consulting with the sustainability workshop presenters.

Ten members indicated that providing information on the website and notices being sent when things were posted would be helpful. Among items desired to be posted were marketing communications, evaluation, proposals for the Venture Fund – Engaging Communities of Color, updates on progress, a bibliography, a list of resources in the area of sustainability, and the presentation/materials from workshops members could not attend.

Four members indicated they needed to make some efforts on their own:

*Our organization needs to follow up with (list of organizations) to discuss potential collaboration.*

*I need to do a lot of follow up to get the most from the networking and ideas.*

Finally, four members indicated access to follow-up consulting would be beneficial:

*Opportunity for using a consultant from the meeting for ½ day session.*

*Consulting funds to work once with workshop leader – even by phone.*

### **What Participants Liked Most**

Twenty-five members shared their views regarding what they liked most about the networking meeting; twenty-one shared comments regarding what they liked least.

When discussing what they liked most, eighteen members described specific program/meeting elements. Among the elements described were the breakout meetings on sustainability (13), Fish Bowl (4), the P&V panel (4), the organization presentations (3), time in the schedule for meetings and informal conversations (2), dinner at the Bamboo Club (2), the case study (2), Bob Long's presentation (2), pre-meeting materials/the Community of Practice paper (2), the Venture Fund 2 discussion (1), and the session about the next meeting (1).

Seven members described the opportunity to socialize and become better acquainted with potential new partners:

*Socializing with peers.*

*Meeting people in this community.*

Five members mentioned the work of CenterPoint and WKKF staff concerning the attention to detail when planning the meeting and presentations; specifically mentioned were the quality of the meeting/presentations, accessibility of staff, and the amenities of the location.

*Courtesies to us as adult learners (comfortable surroundings, good food, reasonable breaks, etc.) – efforts to vary presentation styles and have fun.*

*Terrific organization, personal accessibility of CenterPoint staff – pace of meeting and time for interaction – food terrific – Thanks! Terrific use of our time for the most part; very responsive.*

*Honest assessment of the Kellogg Foundation's expectations and willingness to go the distance.*

Seven members commented on the sense of progression from the last meeting and the deepening connections being built:

*The continuity and progression from last meeting. It makes me feel like we are moving forward as a group. That brings satisfaction for our efforts and a good investment of time. It is also empowering and this lasts well beyond the workshop. A larger objective view is seen; just enough time to really explore and learn.*

*Deepening the connection; seeing greater opportunities.*

*I felt like we really started to connect – collaborate more during this meeting (there are several individuals I'm sure I'll contact for various reasons between now and the next meeting).*

Two members appreciated the level of thought and discourse that were apparent at the meeting:

*The high level and depth of thought around the purpose of the initiative.*

*Bob Long's introductory talk did my heart good; inspiring role model.*

### **What Participants Liked Least**

In discussing what they liked least, four members were disappointed they could not hear all the organization presentations:

*Organizational presentations were very useful, but I only saw 3 and had poor attendance at ours, so I wonder if there were missed opportunities to know about others and to have substantive discussions.*

Three members described their reactions to the evaluation presentation:

*Thursday AM first session on evaluation – we're tired, pace is dragging.*

*Perhaps evaluation discussion could have been incorporated into a working lunch or breakfast. Sample evaluation materials might be helpful (i.e. response that Kellogg thought was particularly helpful; examples of qualitative and quantitative data).*

Three members described specific program elements:

*Length seems long for purposes – noisy restaurant on Wednesday night interfered with this – PowerPoint that people read, second only to people reading to me – disparity among participants (level of decision makers present) – length of discussion Tuesday over Greg's comment re: venture fund. WAY too much response to this inane comment.*

*Too much talk about process (need to find balance) – not starting on time – are breaks too long? Or would they not be if on time?*

For three members, the changing of organization representatives at the meeting was a cause for concern:

*Question value of changing representatives from organizations – hard to build when new players each time; relationships are personal.*

Two members liked the Future Search presentation the least.

Two members felt the information at the meeting lacked relevance to their work:

*So what do I DO now? Too far removed for efficient, short term action and sustainability is such a critical issue.*

One member was unable to access the reading material; another felt there was too much advance reading material.

One member was uncomfortable with an aspect of the Fish Bowl presentation:

*I was uneasy about using mental health as a metaphor for the Fish Bowl – for what it’s worth, it would be unacceptable in the UK disability community.*

One respondent described their discontent with the Venture Fund discussion:

*The Venture Fund discussion was extremely frustrating – the Kellogg definition of “people of color” seems limiting and short-sighted. Speaking personally, it seems like Kellogg’s focus on “non-whites” forgets GLBT folks, and other maligned individuals – Kellogg needs to re-examine this issue and should go deeper – beyond “people of color” if it wants to be inclusive.*

### **Other Comments**

Additional comments written in the margins which were not represented elsewhere included ideas for future networking meetings:

*More structured time for group problem solving and using each other as resources. Maybe a Philanthropy and NPO cohort could have some “home room” time for the checking in and problem solving?*

*I’d like the chance to present some of my organizational (board/grant/leadership) challenges to the group or small group and get feedback/coaching from those in the group.*

*How to use data information from evaluation process (good to evaluate management? PR? Marketing?).*

*A tools cluster team t-shirt or fleece for our next meeting could be cool. Also, a group walk up the hill behind the hotel might be fun.*

*Workshop on evaluation would be fabulous! United Way Cleveland has a great instruction book. Also communication workshops (with clients) would be good workshops too.*

### **CONCLUSION**

The second networking meeting for the “Build Tools for Nonprofit Sustainability and Innovative Giving” cluster provided numerous challenges. The first challenge was to continue building knowledge of the Foundation’s interest in the group while attending to their need to find the benefits for themselves and their organizations. The second challenge was to craft a program for the meeting that would facilitate continued relationship building among the participants so they

could extend their networks and find partners for collaboration. The third challenge was to continue to build interest in a common learning and action agenda that the members would feel merits further meeting and exploration.

The program for the meeting focused on three objectives:

- Members learn about other organizations and continue building the community of practice.
- Members learn about and discuss organization sustainability strategies and related topics.
- Members continue exploring WKKF's vision for the Tools cluster and the Unleashing New Resources initiative.

Responses to this evaluation indicate that significant progress was made on all three objectives. Comments from the open-ended questions indicate that participants found some value for themselves or their organizations in this second meeting, and that some are beginning to sense that a community of practice may be developing; at the very least, some members feel a level of commitment to continue attending future meetings and find value in the network that is being built.

## **Appendix A –**

### **Schedule for October 2003 Networking Meeting**

## **Tools Cluster Networking Meeting Objectives and Schedule**

### **Objectives**

---

1. Members learn about other organizations and continue building the community of practice. Program elements include:
    - a. Organization Profiles (written, disseminated prior to meeting).
    - b. Organization Presentations (oral, at meeting).
    - c. Venture Fund written and oral reports.
    - d. Sharing during work sessions, unstructured time, and following the meeting via the Tools list server.
  
  2. Members learn about and discuss organization sustainability strategies and related topics. Program elements include:
    - a. Opening session: Fish Bowl on Organization Sustainability Issues.
    - b. Case Study: CompuMentor.
    - c. In-depth workshops with resource leaders.
    - d. Closing plenary on Organization Sustainability.
  
  3. Members continue exploring WKKF's vision for the Tools cluster and the Unleashing New Resources initiative. Program elements include:
    - a. The cluster's unifying factors and themes.
    - b. Plans for finding common ground for a collective agenda for learning and action.
    - c. Work going forward in the Unleashing Resources initiative's other two programming approaches.
    - d. Inclusion of communities of color through a second Venture Fund.
-

## Schedule

### Monday, October 27

---

Various times	Early arrivals. Dinner on your own (reimbursable).
---------------	---

---

### Tuesday, October 28

---

	<i>Mission Palms Conference Dining Room: The Cloister (Open 6:30 – 9:00 a.m., or other location of choice)</i>	Breakfast on your own for early arrivals (reimbursable).
10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom Foyer</i>	Meeting registration.
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	New Members' Orientation. For members who did not attend the March 2003 meeting.
11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.	<i>Mission Palms Conference Dining Room: The Cloister</i>	Lunch (included in the conference package). Members need name badge.
1:00 p.m. – 2:10 p.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Opening General Session. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Welcome and Introductions.</li> <li>▫ Opening Remarks.</li> <li>▫ P&amp;V Unplugged: Members Question Kellogg Staff. Kellogg Foundation vision for the Unleashing New Resources initiative and for the Tools Cluster.</li> </ul>
2:15 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	<i>Breakout Rooms</i>	Organization Presentations: Round One.
	<i>Campanile</i>	Association of Small Foundation Community Foundations of America Foundation Incubator
	<i>Colonnade</i>	CityCares Plugged In – Learning through Technology VolunteerMatch
	<i>Capistrano</i>	GuideStar Groundspring Philanthropix Partners
	<i>Ironstone</i>	Acumen Fund GlobalGiving Network for Good

**over**

**Tuesday, October 28,  
continued**

3:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	<i>Courtyard</i>	Break.
3:30 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.	<i>Breakout Rooms</i>	Organization Presentations: Round Two.
	<i>Campanile</i>	CompuMentor – Tech Soup NPower NPower Michigan
	<i>Colonnade</i>	Capital Markets Access National Center on Nonprofit Enterprise Women’s Funding Network
	<i>Capistrano</i>	Arizona State University – Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management Grand Valley State University – Johnson Center Michigan Nonprofit Association
4:15 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Venture Fund Discussion and announcement of Venture Fund #2.
5:15 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Wrap up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Reflections on the day.</li> <li>▫ Organize dinner/discussion groups.</li> </ul>
Evening	<i>Various locations</i>	Informal dinner and conversation time. Unscheduled.
6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.	<i>Board Room</i>	Workshop Leaders’ dinner and meeting.

**Wednesday,  
October 29**

6:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.	<i>The Cloister</i>	Breakfast.
8:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Opening session: Fish Bowl on Organization Sustainability.
9:45 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	<i>Courtyard</i>	Break.
10:15 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Case Study: What CompuMentor learned in preparing for and winning the Yale School of Management - Goldman Sachs – Pew Trust National Business Plan Award.
11:15 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.	<i>The Cloister</i>	Lunch and free time.
12:45 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.	<i>Breakout Rooms</i>	Organization sustainability workshops.
	<i>Dolores</i>	Nonprofit Products and Pricing: Science or Art? Kevin Walters
	<i>Campanile</i>	Commercial Ventures and Earned Income. Jerr Boschee
	<i>Colonnade</i>	Alternative Funding Sources. Elyse Cherry
	<i>Capistrano</i>	Beyond Collaboration. David La Piana
	<i>Ironstone</i>	What are You Known For? Marketing and Branding. Bob Tobin and Toyin Adegbite Moore
2:15 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.	<i>Courtyard</i>	Break.
2:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.	<i>Breakout Rooms</i>	Sustainability workshops continue. Same rooms.
4:15 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Closing plenary session on organization sustainability. Reflections on the day.
5:30 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.		Free time. Visit the Concierge Desk to make arrangements for transportation to the airport.
6:45 p.m.	<i>Mission Palms Lobby</i>	Meet in lobby and walk to the Bamboo Club restaurant for dinner. Directions to the Bamboo Club are in the meeting folder. Dinner begins at 7:00 p.m.

**over**

**Thursday, October  
30**

6:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.	<i>The Cloister</i>	Breakfast.
8:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Cluster evaluation plan and links to communication activities.
9:45 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	<i>Courtyard</i>	Break.
10:15 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Preview of the March 2004 networking meeting. Developing the shared agenda for learning and action via Future Search methodology.
11:15 p.m. – Noon	<i>Palm Ballroom</i>	Wrap-up and reflections. Q&A for Kellogg staff. Meeting Evaluation.
12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.	<i>Boardroom</i>	Planning Team meeting - Networking Meeting #3.