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The 7th annual convening of grantees of the Northern California Environmental Grassroots Fund and the California Wildlands Grassroots Fund was held at the beautiful Berkeley City Club. 113 people attended the convening from 69 different small grassroots environmental groups. Many traveled great distances to attend – from Del Norte County in the far northern part of the state, to as far south as Joshua Tree. Twenty-seven Cal Wildlands grantees attended, representing 21 different groups (see attached list).

Evaluations

For the second year, we collected convening evaluations online. In total, we receive 46 evaluations. This is less than 50% of attendees, and slightly less than we received last year (58 in 2011). We should strategize how to encourage more people to complete the evaluations at future convenings.

Of those who completed an evaluation, 88% said the convening was “Extremely” or “Very” useful. Additionally:

• 93% said it was a “great” or “good” opportunity to learn;
• 87% said it was a “great” or “good” chance to be energized;
• 85% said it was a “great” or “good” opportunity to network;
• 75% said it was a “great” or “good” opportunity to reflect.

What People Liked Most

Based on the evaluations, people really liked the reality grantmaking panel. As one grantee expressed, “I found the reality grantmaking session absolutely great. It was so helpful to hear the nitty-gritty of the decision-making process on funding. It gave me some insights that I don't think I would have had any other way.”1 Another remarked, “Listening to the panel’s comments took the ‘scary factor’ out of grant writing.”

Secondly, people liked the opportunity to network. “Met new connections both for my local area and causes, and beyond.”

---

1 All quotes are from grantee evaluations
Thirdly, people liked Marjorie Fine’s workshop on asking people for money. “Margie’s class was very inspiring! Her positive approach and realistically optimistic attitude were both great, and her practical tips on approaches to asking for donations was helpful.”

**What People Liked Least**

Even though we built more free time into the schedule this year, people wanted even more opportunities to network. Many had productive suggestions on how to structure networking, like grouping people at tables over lunch either by issue or geography or by having small group breakout discussions.

Several folks mentioned wanting to attend more than one workshop. And a couple people mentioned wanting more advanced sessions.

**Reality Grantmaking Session**

The Reality Grantmaking panel was a big hit again this year, with 98% saying it was “great” or “good.”

*It was very encouraging and inspiring to finally get some guidance, direction, and understanding about grant writing and grantors.*

*The reality grantmaking panel was a real eye opener for me personally. I have taken several grant writing classes but was still unsure of my abilities to do this. After watching and listening to the panel I feel confident that yes I can do this!*  

**Raising Money From Major Donors with Gusto in Challenging Times by Marjorie Fine**

Marjorie Fine gave a dynamic and informative presentation on asking donors for money. Her workshop received a 94% “great” or “good” rating on the evaluation. People like the real life examples that she included in her presentation, and many participants commented that she helped them overcome their fear of asking people for money. As one attendee said, “[Her] energetic presentation was contagious but also material discussed was valuable.” The only downside mentioned in the evaluation was that she didn’t have enough time to discuss all her handouts.

**Writing Donor Appeal Letters by Dalya Massachi**

People who attended Dalya’s workshop said that she presented really good information and tips, and they liked the interactive and brainstorming parts of her presentation. But people also commented that her presentation style lacked energy, and that they didn’t have an opportunity to work on the writing samples they were asked to bring. 83% said the workshop was “great” or “good.” One attendee said, “Bring Dalya back! Folks who didn’t attend her workshop should have an opportunity to do so.”
Increasing the Impact of Your Online Communications
by Misty Avila and Jessica Steimer

In the technology workshop, there seemed to be a cultural and perhaps generational disconnect between the attendees and the youthful presenters. While some attendees said that the workshop was “very useful,” most didn’t like the presenters’ style, and even complained that the presenters’ use of the word “cool” after every sentence was distracting.

Misty and Jessica had audience members stand on a continuum line to reflect how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements that they posed like “technology is important for my group to accomplish our mission.” One attendee described it as, “we were being shuffled around like a bunch of second graders and being asked to do the hoochi-goochie. I was really despairing, but finally some helpful info arrived [at the end of the workshop].”

Many people thought the discussion was too much of an overview, which lacked specifics until the very end of the workshop, “They … seemed to be rigid in adhering to a set presentation even though the audience asked for more content and how-to. It took until the last 15 minutes of the presentation to hear about the publishing matrix and RSS feed, which are useful new tools for my work.” The workshop received a 53% “great” or “good” rating.

Ask the Experts!

Attendees felt like the Ask the Experts panel was a good way to wrap up the day and was an opportunity “to get a taste of what was presented” at the other workshops. But people thought it was a little unfocused and less dynamic than they expected. The panel was ranked 81% “great” or “good.”

This was a good way to end the day. I think. Although it was “catch as catch can,” it was an opportunity to hear from everyone.

Topics for Next Convening

The most popular topic was some variation on fundraising, either individual donors, foundations, or government grants. Other topics included the following in no particular order:

• Collaborations, coalitions, alliances
• Recruiting younger people
• Reaching underserved populations
• Ways to diversify fundraising sources
• Reality grantmaking panel
• Social media
• Database design and management
• Advocacy
• Litigation strategies
• Major donor fundraising and asking people for money

Additionally people suggested that we recruit a convening speaker from Mission Minded – a marketing and communications consulting group for nonprofits. Other suggestions were that the Rose Foundation should set up a petition website for grantees, and that we should hire a PR person who would publicize grantees’ issues and causes.

**Travel Stipends**

To make the conference affordable for those traveling from far away, we offered travel and hotel stipends for those traveling from afar. We provided 28 travel stipends of up to $200, and 16 hotel stipends of $125 each. Grantee travel and hotel stipends totaled just under $6,000.

**Spanish Interpretation/Translation**

Once again, we provided simultaneous Spanish interpretation, and sent out convening invitations in Spanish. This is the 4th year that we have used Los Eco Amigos for translation services. Their mission is to educate the Latino population in the United States to help them find their voice to protect the environment and the health of their families. Los Eco Amigos has helped to develop collaborations between some of the primarily Spanish speaking organization.

**Video Taping of Convening**

For the first time, we video recorded all of the convening sessions. While a good idea in theory, in practice it proved difficult as the conference recording service we hired took months to get us the finished DVDs, and then provided them in the wrong format, so we had to pay our technology consultants to upload them to the internet. Ultimately the file sizes were so large that the only way we could host such large files was to go to a for-profit site that subjected viewers to commercial advertisements. This was obnoxious and distracting for viewers. The good news is that all of the videos are available now from our website (for free, but with commercials), although the reality grantmaking video cuts off after about 45 minutes (due to an error by the conference recording services.)

**Berkeley City Club Venue**

The Berkeley City Club was a beautiful venue to host the convening, and was much appreciated by convening attendees. As one grantee remarked, “The Berkeley Club was a beautiful location and easily accessible by public transportation. The historic and elegant decor was a great calming ambience for the scrappy work that many of us do.”

The Berkeley City Club did make event planning easier, since I was able to make arrangements for the facilities, catering and hotel rooms with one entity.

But the City Club had its pitfalls also. When we arrived to set-up, we were greeted by a ballroom full of people who were attending another function and a brass marching band that led a procession of people through the hallway as we attempted to set-up.
Ultimately venue staff flipped the ballroom quickly and efficiently, and we got off to a timely start despite the rattled nerves of Rose staff. Additionally, we had to vacate the upstairs portion of the venue prior to our final afternoon session, which was disruptive and inconvenient. The room we moved to was too small for the number of people we had attending the closing session.

**Food and Beverages**

For the most part, people seemed to really like the food. Said one, “The lunch was really good. I’m a vegetarian and I was able to make a plate that was satisfying.” Of course some complained about the non-gluten-free breakfast pastries and another wanted soy milk for their coffee.

**Zero Waste**

The conference was very close to being zero-waste, as all the food was served with non-disposal plates, cups, flatware and cloth napkins. The City Club provided recycling and composting.

**Carbon Footprint**

To offset the carbon footprint of the event, we made a donation to Solar Richmond, which provides job training and solar installations to low-income residents of Richmond, and is a former grantee of the Grassroots Fund.

**CALIFORNIA WILDLANDS GRASSROOTS FUND GRANTEES IN ATTENDANCE**

- Californians for Western Wilderness
- Citizens for East Shore Parks
- Community Action Project
- Community Off-Road Vehicle Watch
- Environment in the Public Interest
- Environmental Council of Sacramento
- Foothills Water Network
- Friends of Del Norte
- Friends of the Gualala River
- Friends of the West Shore
- Mare Island Heritage Trust
- Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecology Center
- Noyo Headlands Unified Design Group
- Sacramento River Preservation Trust
- Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment
- Save Auburn Ravine Salmon and Steelhead
- Sugar Pine Foundation
- Tolowa Dunes Stewards
- Washoe Meadows Community
- Wild Equity Institute
- Wolf Creek Community Alliance
**Northern California**

**Environmental Grassroots Fund**

**2012 Convening Budget with Actuals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Actuals 2012</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Wildlands Grassroots Fund</td>
<td>10,119</td>
<td>10,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California Environmental Grassroots Fund</td>
<td>12,367</td>
<td>10,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Actuals 2012</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taping Conference</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Interpretation</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Offsets</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Stipends</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>6,421</td>
<td>5,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (Speaker)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Scholarships</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website - Video's online</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of total expense for Cal Wildlands portion

Less 10% admin fee discount

California Wildlands Share

10,119
Convening Survey Partial Results
2012

Please rank the convening as a whole. How useful was the convening to you?
Extremely  41%
Very 47
Moderately 11
Somewhat 2
Not Useful 0

Comments:

• Down to earth, flat-footed advice for the grassroots. Nice crowd. Very friendly people. Good spirits.
• Panel information is invaluable for me in applying for grants. Also the networking was excellent.
• Great chance to network, see old friends and make new ones. Enjoyable and informative sessions. Excellent food.
• It re-inspired our funding strategy. It was also fun to meet people working in similar organizations.
• Reality grant making was great. Networking is very helpful. It is uplifting to hear of other projects and efforts being undertaken by these other groups through the reality grantmaking process.
• The full and transparent evaluation of the 6 grant applications was very informative, and delightfully helpful in sorting out what the Rose Foundation (and others) are looking for, and how to get that across. I really appreciated the risk of being this transparent – the benefits for us as attendees were clear. I also really liked Margie’s workshop on face-to-face donor contacts. Extremely well done, high energy, clear, and, by the end, I felt like, “hey, I could do that!” That’s a successful workshop.
• My level of experience was such that the workshops were too elementary and redundant. The 1st half was well done, but too many $1,000 applications were reviewed to hold interest of participants. Need for break-out groups is evident and less talking to audience without participation.
• Good connections! Met new connections both for my local area and causes, and beyond. Very constructive sessions, helpful ideas for getting organized or re-organized, and using online opportunities wisely.
• I found the reality grantmaking session absolutely great. It was so helpful to hear the nitty gritty of the decision-making process on funding. It gave me some insights that I don’t think I would have had any other way. Margie’s class was very inspiring! Her positive approach and realistically optimistic attitude were both great, and her practical tips on approaches to asking for donations was helpful.
• I loved the location. Of course, I live in the Bay Area. The building was beautiful though and the atmosphere very inviting. The panel discussion in the morning was helpful.... The lunch was really good. I'm a vegetarian and I was able to make a plate that was satisfying. I was able to say hi to a couple of people I met last year at the Convening Conference and it felt so good to see them again. The afternoon session I attended about writing donor appeal letters and writing in general was excellent.
• Topics and reality grantmaking review very helpful.

How useful was the Convening for you as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Not very good</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An opportunity to network?</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An opportunity to learn?</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An opportunity to reflect?</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A chance to be energized?</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convening Survey Partial Results
2012

Comments:

- It's always personally restorative to hear and talk with people that have gotten up off the couch and committed to personal action and providing an opportunity and structure for others to do the same.
- I did learn quite a bit. I like the "style" of the Grassroots Convening. I felt comfortable, encouraged and challenged.
- Thank you for putting on this event. I hope you will continue to do so. I blocked this on my calendar months ago, and will continue to attend each year that the event is held.
- Sometimes seeing everything I am doing wrong is a bit depressing, even if it IS a good learning experience.
- A bit more downtime and lower energy time would help on 'reflection' – but not for this workshop's timetable. On the other hand, some follow-up to conference attendees on what worked, what needs help, etc, in another month or so might be useful.
- A great mix of useful fundraising and pitch-making techniques and tips. Fellow grantees are great people to bounce ideas off of and share stories with – or just talk to in general. Nice sense of community.
- It was also an opportunity to be validated. Loved that part.
- I didn't find a lot of networking opportunities; there really wasn't time for me to seek out the people I would likely connect with. Possibly sending out a list of attendees and their contact info a couple of weeks prior to the convening would be more helpful. There was no time for reflection, but I didn't expect there to be, so that didn't disappoint me.
- I felt inspired today.
- Loved the facility.

Please rank the morning plenary: Reality Grantmaking Panel (moderated by Tim Little)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Not very good</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of presentation</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of topic to your work</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of audience participation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall session ranking</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- The reality grantmaking panel was a real eye opener for me personally. I have taken several grant writing classes but was still unsure of my abilities to do this. After watching and listening to the panel I feel confidant that yes I can do this!! And will do this for my organization. Listening to the panel's comments took the 'scary factor' out of grant writing.
- I liked the panel a lot. The audience participation piece was so fragmented . . . It probably was useful to the individuals asking the questions, but I'm not sure it was the best format. I could feel Tim trying to pull some coherence out of the various threads and questions, but I don't think it was entirely successful.
- Never assume funder knows anything, don't use jargon, give message of what you are trying to achieve. Grant writing ideas on green sheet with Red, Green Lights, Do's and Don'ts will be very helpful I believe.
**Convening Survey Partial Results**  
**2012**

- I find this to be a very valuable session. It was hampered by poor sound system which made panelist difficult to hear.
- Although I am beginning to understand how to format a grant submittal and what needs to be in it or not in it, I have to say that how the grantors make decisions still seems subjective and mysterious to me.
- I like this activity, but I feel like it is a bit limited in scope and applicability. Because the grant application "instructions" are so vague (except for length!), it is less realistic than if there was a focused set of criteria – as is often the case in real grant apps. I wonder if the format could be tweaked a little to make it a slightly different exercise – especially considering that many grantees return to the convening more than once and have experienced the reality grantmaking panel in this iteration before. Another – related – thought is to do something regarding the growing trend towards online applications – to help grantwriters adjust and adapt to this new format.
- What can I say.....great!
- This is a fabulous idea and was definitely the highlight of the Convening for me.

**Please rank the afternoon workshop: Writing Donor Appeal Letters by Dalya Massachi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Not very good</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of presentation</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of topic to your work</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of audience participation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall session ranking</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Dalya's donor letter workshop was far better than expected. Really good tips. Thanks!
- So little time, so much opportunity
- We were asked to bring one of our own letters for critiquing. I was just sorry that she never got to bring it up in the workshop.
- I did not get much out of the presentation. It is hard to put my finger on what really went wrong, but I didn't really get the feeling that she had many innovative ideas or was a very experienced, successful communications person. I recently attend and OUTSTANDING session locally, that was MUCH more helpful. It was from an organization Mission Minded, and the session was about the minute message.
- Good content and I liked the interactive and brainstorming parts, but much of the 2-hour presentation could have been covered in a 2-page handout instead. Would have liked to see more analysis of sample appeal letters and comparison of examples that do and don't work, rather than just the overview of techniques.
- One thing missing that I would have liked to hear is a few tricks for evaluating the success of newsletters, and marketer polling for the suggested techniques.
- I thought that Dalya had good information to share and was well-organized, however, I did not leave the session feeling very inspired. I felt the energy of the presentation was only "okay"... I would have liked to have spent more time on the exercise where we actually put the tips she was teaching us to use.
- Really helpful on so many levels. I purchased a copy of her book.
- Bring Dalya back! Folks who didn't attend her workshop should have an opportunity to do so.
Please rank the afternoon workshop: Increasing the Impact of Your Online Communications by Misty Avila and Jessica Steimer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Not very good</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of presentation</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of topic to your work</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of audience participation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall session ranking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- The last nine minutes had some info I could hold on to. Early on when we were being shuffled around like a bunch of second graders and being asked to do the hoochi-goochie. I was really despairing, but finally some helpful info arrived.
- The content was very introductory, and activities were somewhat elementary, but the session was good for many, if not most, of the participants. There were several of us who were much more advanced than the majority of the group, and so did not find it as helpful as we would have hoped. That is the only reason for my personally low ranking of this session. I thought the presenter was very bright and a talented speaker.
- It would have been great to see examples of what worked at other organizations. It was very theoretical, not so practical.
- The content in this presentation could have been presented in about 20 minutes and added to. The presenters had great enthusiasm and energy. They also seemed to be a wealth of information about online communications. They also seemed to be rigid in adhering to a set presentation even though the audience asked for more content and how-to. It took until the last 15 minutes of the presentation to hear about the publishing matrix and RSS feed, which are useful new tools for my work.
- This will help with orienting the online approach of 2-3 organizations that I can give input. If they'll listen!
- Would have liked to see more exact examples rather than general descriptions.
- Misty and Jessica seemed enthusiastic about the "megaphone" approach to online communications but they didn't actually answer the "how to?" questions that came up, except to give out their business cards and tell people to call.
- Very useful.

Please rank the afternoon workshop: Raising Money From Major Donors with Gusto in Challenging Times by Marjorie Fine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Not very good</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of presentation</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentation</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of topic to your work</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of audience participation</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall session ranking</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convening Survey Partial Results  
2012

Comments:

• Wow! I was still talking about Marjorie's workshop several days later. She was really inspiring and it would be nice to share her with others/other non-profits the next time she is in the area. Thanks!
• This Brooklyn-American rocks! She was very real and I loved the tid-bids of real life she included in her presentation. She asked lots of questions and answers lots of question – quite interactive. Excellent session.
• Ms. Fine helped me to think about roadblocks that I put in my own way when I think about asking people to support my organization. She got me to think about people (and different kinds of people) whom I should approach. On the downside, she assumes a level of social networking that I do not have.
• Energetic presentation was contagious but also material discussed was valuable. The 10 attitude adjustments you need for raising money are good guide...get over frustration and move on, listen to donors, tell stories, build relationships
• A very lively and informative presentation by Marjorie Fine!
• She has a lot of verve, humor and skillful ideas.
• Marjorie was a really good presenter, she had so much energy! She did have a lot of handouts and we didn't go over all of them.

Please rank: Ask the Experts!  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Not very good</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of presentation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of topic to your work</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of audience participation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall session ranking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• The major issue for me is that I was unable to attend two sessions that were being held simultaneously – letters and online communications. But what the hay ... an excellent course. Thank you
• This is an excellent thing to do. I'm sure you'll do it again.
• This was a nice wrap, but a bit unfocused. However, it did give us a chance to get a taste of what was presented in the other sessions. Thanks!
• Difficult to hear some presenters....the ah hahs participation was good. Good to hear the presenters we couldn't hear earlier. Thank you all for a very worthwhile day.
• I had to leave to attend to the animals on the farm.
• This was a good way to end the day, I think. Although it was “catch as catch can,” it was an opportunity to hear from everyone.
• I felt it was perhaps a watered down version of each presenter's workshop, that was even further diluted by requesting audience participating re "aha" moments. Not bad, but not as dynamic as I expected, unfortunately.
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Please tell us what you like most and least about the convening.

Liked Most:

- Reality Grantmaking Panel (20)
- Networking (7)
- Learning
- Rose Foundation is open handed and open hearted; it feels like you really want to help us succeed. The sense of belonging and of being in a "supportive community" is really special. Fostering that sense of being "coddled" and mentored in creating broader, stronger networks is useful. So is creating physical spaces and opportunities for that.
- Chance to see others working in the environmental field.
- The outpouring of generously wanting to help small non-profits become all that they can be.
- Opportunities to interact and ask questions.
- Speakers
- Setting, people attending.
- Encouragement, advice, and inspiration for grant-seekers
- Learning new things and approaches
- Networking and hearing what others are doing, getting new ideas, the advice from experts in the workshops
- Meeting the funders and colleagues from other organizations.
- Energy, focus, excellent materials and presenters.
- Dalya's workshop
- New ideas, reinforced my gut instincts
- The people attending, of course. Parking close by and cheap!
- Enthusiasm of small NGOs
- The Web presentation
- Being able to return and build on past experiences – with your repeating themes like the morning plenary – this was my 3rd conference.
- I love that you have a category for "Terrible." You surely are asking people to be honest! I cannot imagine anyone would give that ranking for today's experiences though. It was a GREAT conference.

Liked Least:

- More time to network with other groups (most common feedback)
- Inability to attend more than one of the afternoon sessions
- Would have been nice to have had more of an emphasis on finding parallels in everyone's work and gaining contacts and potential partnerships from this network.
- Literature Table (I never have time to look at it)
- The end of the day session
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- I wasn't able to stay for the last panel and "mixer" so I didn't have the opportunity to chat with lots of other folks, not my strong suit anyway. Also, having to choose only one breakout session...without a lot of info or understanding what would be covered in each and how it would relate to my situation.
- Too short of time to cover so much information
- Writing donor appeals
- Long day
- Ending
- I didn't leave enough time before/after for more networking.
- Sitting inside all day
- The pastries at breakfast - I'm gluten free
- Getting up at 4:30AM to catch a plane, but it is worth it to be able to attend.
- My workshop had too many handouts that we didn't go over.
- Online communications presentation first 30 minutes
- Closing session didn't quite gel as new or enough good info to work.
- Final session
- Center of Berkeley difficult for those not on BART
- Too many proposals reviewed
- Liked the 1st session on the review of applications but felt it could have been done in less time.
- I guess the online communications workshop

Please rank the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Not very good</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was the registration process?</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Berkeley City Club a good meeting space?</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Berkeley and the East Bay a good location?</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the food?</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- If it ain't broke ...
- Please seat us by interest during lunch or a break out session. Also, we have a very unpopular cause and would love to know how others handle the uphill battle.
- Some kind of icebreaker early in the day could be useful. More actively connecting up attendees by geography, area/scope of work, constituency, target or mission perhaps could help in the "sorting" --or Dumbledore's sorting hat. Being at tables instead of an auditorium setting was helpful. Re: breakouts--having the possibility of a high level recap or summary of the breakout sessions for the benefit of the whole convening, perhaps in conjunction with the afternoon break? If you did this, sorry i missed it.
- The location was perfect. Having to move in the middle of the afternoon was disrupting and the vibe was lost after that. With so much info to cover perhaps having two convenings per year. I would have liked to be in on two different workshops.
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• Would have been nice to have the "ask the experts" session upstairs in the same location - roomier and more relaxed.
• There needs to be some more advanced sessions.
• LOVED the Berkeley City Club, and would attend there again next year, although a Sacramento venue would make it easier for others from the Sierra Nevada to attend.
• It would be great to have a fictitious/humorous Grantmaking proposal entry along side the current format. Our work is serious but we need to laugh more often. The non-profit world is full of characters, processes and environments that allow for quirkiness, absurdity, embellishments, silly antics and nuances to come through. I'm sure the panel would absolutely appreciate the entries and change of pace, I would. Lessons can be learned from humor.
• Take a field trip to a project funded by the Rose Foundation.
• The Berkeley Club was a beautiful location and easily accessible by public transportation. The historic and elegant decor was a great calming ambience for the scrappy work that many of us do. Thank you Rose Foundation for putting on this event.
• Only one issue: no one told me and others there was a check in our name-tag badge. As I left, I was talking with another attendee outside on the sidewalk and took my badge off to throw it away, when I noticed something stuck on the inside and realized immediately it was a check for $75. I mentioned it to the other attendee who also did not know there was a check in his badge. I wonder how many people threw there badges away along with the check?
• A bit more time for direct contact with fund representatives? Maybe a time for small group meetings with reps -- sign up ahead.
• Dividing up participants into budget levels for focus break-out. Dividing up participants in categories of mission for education and advice.
• Soy milk for coffee.

Topics for next convening:

• Legal action and its costs, strategies and pitfalls. Maybe some examples and case summaries by participants
• How to recruit and involve younger people
• Avoiding burn-out, grants for effective political lobbying, does Social Media really work?
• Building alliances
• Possibility of collaborations, shared resources, engaging and managing volunteers for fun and profit(able) use of their time. Membership development with dues or subscriptions.
• Finding diversified sources of funding.
• I was looking forward to having one of my own letters looked at for points of improvement
• Different fundraising sources
• Mission Minded
• Overcoming fear of asking – never gets old
• The opening panel is the cornerstone. For the afternoon sessions, I like the nuts and bolts approach to fundraising.
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• Database design and management
• Maybe something on intersection of politics, community building, and advocacy.
• Developing partnerships, successful campaigns, managing staff
• You’re very much the experts so I defer to you.
• Media/outreach/social marketing/how to put on a successful fundraising event
• Ditto the morning
• A new Rose Foundation sponsorship of a petition web site and a PR person for publicizing grantee issues and causes.
• Same as this year, plus follow-up – what worked; successfully bringing the new info home: overcoming barriers to institutional change
• How to handle partnerships
• Seeking public funding as well as private foundations, linking the two
• Best way to keep members active when it is years that an organization has been in existence
• Reaching underserved populations, forming coalitions
• Major donors
• Same morning plenary – so helpful. I feel you have your finger on the pulse of a good range of topics.

Location for next year:
• East Bay (25)
• Sacramento (5)
• San Francisco (2)
• Point Reyes?
• Tahoe!
• Easier access from the airport
• The Health organization where it was held in past years in Sacramento (Sierra Health Foundation)

Best time of year:
• Fall (20)
• October (6)
• November (3)
• September (2)
• Summer (1)
• Winter (1)
• Any time (1)
• Nov-Mar (1)
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Best day of week:

- Fridays (17)
- Not on Friday (2)
- Monday – Thursday (2)
- Weekends (1)
- Tuesday (1)
- Thursday (1)
- Monday (1)

Fridays may not best because of evening commitments or heavier than usual traffic, if public transportation is not available.

Friday works well for me because there are fewer (conflicting) meetings on Friday than most other days of the week.

I prefer Mondays to be away from both of my business activities but will schedule Friday if that is best for the majority

Monday thru Thursday, but not a Friday -- the traffic going home was terrible!

Any other comments:

- It was very worthwhile for me personally
- Really appreciated the lack of sugar coating.
- THANK YOU THANK YOU for making us feel valued and supported. The good will and good heart you bring to the Convening is absolutely apparent and infuses the whole day, and provides a safe container for us. Karla, Tim and your staff do wonderful work and even when we get turned down by everyone else, even you, we still feel valued and appreciated by Rose Foundation. If only for this, your contribution is invaluable. Your intention is a spark we carry with us. Thank you.
- A great job done by all involved, can't wait until next year. Thank you for all you do.
- Thank you. Please keep each individual attendee this year on your contact list, as well as the primary contacts for each entity.
- Thank you for doing this and getting us all together.
- Thanks so much for understanding and helping grassroots, efforts.
- The online evaluation format, excellent
- Thank you!
- Thank you!