Welcome! We are glad you are here.
All participants are in listen-only mode.
Slides will be shared after the webinar.
We encourage frequent use of the chat box to participate and ask questions.
Say hello now using the chat box to tell us your name and organization.
Agenda

1. Strategic Planning Timeline and Process
2. Results from the Grantee Perception Report
3. What’s Next
4. Questions & Answers
INTERACT FOR HEALTH PROMOTES HEALTH EQUITY TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH OF ALL PEOPLE IN OUR REGION.
Current Strategic Priorities (2018 – 2022)

• Reducing Tobacco Use
• Addressing the Opioid Epidemic
• School Based Health Centers
• Plus: COVID-19 Response
2022 Strategic Planning

- **Goal**: Build a five-year (2023-2027) strategy that defines our unique role in the community and outlines top priorities to improve health outcomes and health equity in the 20-county region.

- **Timeline**: Mar - Dec 2022

- **Guiding Principles**:
  - **We will center equity** – in the process and goals of the plan. Data will be disaggregated to identify the greatest health disparities.
  - **We will listen** – to the voices of a broad group of stakeholders, including partners, peers, community organizations, and people with lived experience.
  - **We will learn** – by being curious, asking questions, and "running to criticism."
  - **We will be transparent** – by providing regular updates to partners.
Key Questions The Strategic Plan Will Answer

• What are our region's most pressing health needs and disparities that Interact can address?

• What will it take to support efforts to re-build our community coming out of the pandemic?

• What should be our top priorities over the next 5 years? In what ways can Interact add unique value to accelerate progress and maximize impact?
  • What are we better positioned to do than any others?
  • What are our core competencies?
  • What should we do more or less of, and what should we start or stop doing?

• What does success look like, and how will we measure it?
Analyze top regional health needs & gaps via the CHNA, CHSS, etc.
Assess regional funding landscape and gaps
Bring forward lessons learned from current plan
Research peer health funders to benchmark

Key Dates:
April 29: Update on strategy process and grantee survey results

Listen to people, Listen to data

Interview and solicit feedback from internal and external stakeholders. Incorporate findings from Grantee Perception survey. (SWOT)
Synthesize findings from analysis of health needs, funding gaps, and benchmarking

Key Dates:
July 2022: Webinar update on SWOT, top health needs & gaps, strategies under consideration

Prioritize & plan

Refine strategic priorities in response to feedback
Develop proposed short and long-term goals in support of strategic priorities
Clarify theory of philanthropy and Interact for Health’s unique role in advancing regional health

Key Dates:
Oct 2022: Webinar update on final strategic priorities and next steps

Align & activate

Align internal operations to deliver on new strategic plan
Develop launch plan and communication assets for strategic plan
Share direct updates with stakeholders engaged in the process

Key Dates:
Jan/Feb 2023: Public launch of Interact for Health 5-year strategy (2023-2027)
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2021 Grantee Perception Report

• Conducted by the Center for Effective Philanthropy, which provides benchmarking to help institutional donors improve their effectiveness.

• Confidential, comparative feedback from our grantees collected in May/June 2021 compared to 2010.

• Benchmarked against a dataset of 300 foundations with 40,000 grantee responses, and a custom cohort of 14 peer health foundations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Trend Data (2010 &amp; 2021)</th>
<th>2021 Average Rating (Scale: 0-7)</th>
<th>2021 Percentile Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Impact</td>
<td>![Trend Graph]</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Grantees’ Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Impact</td>
<td>![Trend Graph]</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>51st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Grantees’ Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Impact</td>
<td>![Trend Graph]</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>34th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Grantees’ Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachability</td>
<td>![Trend Graph]</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>63rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Approaching the Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>![Trend Graph]</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Process</td>
<td>![Trend Graph]</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>45th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of the Selection Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“To what extent has Interact for Health affected public policy in your field?”
1 = Not at all, 7 = Major influence on shaping public policy

“To what extent has Interact for Health advanced the state of knowledge in your field?”
1 = Not at all, 7 = Leads the field to new thinking and practice
“It would be great for Interact to allow for some general sponsorship funds…Nearly all of our grants have been tied to very specific goals of the Foundation’s goals. Our goals - or needs - have not been at the center of the requests. Sometimes it feels as though we must fold ourselves into a pretzel to be viable for an Interact grant.”

“How aware is Interact for Health of the challenges that your organization is facing?”

1 = Not at all aware
7 = Extremely aware

“Overall, how would you rate Interact for Health’s impact on your organization?”

1 = No impact
7 = Significant positive impact
Grantmaking characteristics
Compared to overall funder dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Size of Grants</th>
<th>Average Length of Grants</th>
<th>Percentage of Grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$60K</td>
<td>1.7 years*</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. $100K</td>
<td>vs. 2.2 years</td>
<td>vs. 42%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the median size of Interact for Health grants</td>
<td>the average length of Interact for Health grants</td>
<td>of Interact for Health grantees report receiving some form of non-monetary support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the median size of grants at the typical funder</td>
<td>the average length of grants at the typical funder</td>
<td>of grantees at the typical funder report receiving some form of non-monetary support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Value is statistically significant compared to 2010 survey of Interact for Health grantees (2010 response: 2.5 years)
**This question was recently added to the grantee survey and depicts data from 25-50 funders in CEP's dataset.
“I think that the original vision and mission for IFH has greatly changed, and it is unclear what direction the foundation is heading.”

“How clearly has Interact for Health communicated its goals and strategy to you?”
1 = Not at all clearly
7 = Extremely clearly

“Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: Overall, Interact for Health demonstrates an explicit commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in its work”**
1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree

* Value is statistically significant compared to 2010 survey of Interact for Health grantees (2010 response: 5.95)
** This question was recently added to the grantee survey and depict data from 50-75 funders in CEP’s dataset.
“Overall, how would you rate Interact for Health’s impact on your local community?”
1 = No impact
7 = Significant positive impact

“How well does Interact for Health understand the local community in which you work?”
1 = Limited understanding of the community
7 = Regarded as an expert on the community
“To what extent did the evaluation result in your organization making changes to the work that was evaluated?”

1 = Not at all, 7 = To a great extent

“At any point during the application or grant period, did Interact for Health and your organization exchange ideas regarding how your organization would assess the results of the work funded by this grant?”

Proportion of grantees responding “Yes”
Our immediate next steps

✔ • Share these results with grantees and partners
✔ • Announce funding opportunities at the beginning of the year
✔ • Continue streamlining our grant application process to focus only on questions needed for decision-making
✔ • Build a robust stakeholder engagement strategy to bring their voice into the strategic planning process
  • Communicate transparently throughout the strategic planning process
Our longer term next steps

• Continue to move toward a trust-based philanthropy model
• Conduct grantee perception survey with CEP every three years and build annual feedback mechanisms
• Consider ways to invest more deeply in partners through larger, multi-year grants and/or general operating support
• Continue to streamline the grantmaking process to reduce burden on grantees
• Transparently and regularly communicate on strategy
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What’s Next

1. Help shape our strategic plan by completing our Stakeholder Survey today! **Deadline: Friday, May 6.**

2. Stay in the loop with future partner updates in July, October, January/February. Invites sent via HealthWatch.

3. Current funding opportunities available:
   - Evaluation of the Impact of School-Based Health Centers due May 10
   - Improving the Availability and Quality of Recovery Housing released June 7
   - Contact our team to share other ideas under our current priorities
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THANK YOU!