

Cathy: Welcome to. It Doesn't Hurt to Ask, a podcast where we talk about fundraising. This season we'll be talking to shift disturbers in philanthropy people who are shaking up traditional philanthropy practices. Today's guests, Laura Manning is the executive director at the Lyle S Hallman Foundation. It's not as easy to say as you might think. All right. A foundation. So fundraisers ears have perked up at that. Ooh, a foundation that maybe I haven't heard of before. If you're in the Waterloo area, keep your ears up because the Lyle S Hallman Foundations for health education and kids initiatives in the Waterloo region and maybe you'll learn something that you're finding helpful. If you're not in Waterloo, still keep listening cause I'm going to ask Laura that some of the shift disturbing work that they're doing at the foundation. So welcome Laura.

Laura: Good morning.

Cathy: Most of our guests raise money or spend money that is raised. Um, I'm looking forward to having a conversation with someone who gives money away. Now before you tell us about the Lyle S Hallman Foundation, I can't believe I'm having such a hard time saying that, tell us what it was like to make the shift from fundraiser to funder because before you became the executive director of this job, you were a fundraiser.

Laura: I was, I was in fundraising and communications and alumni relations in postsecondary for more than a decade before I moved into this role. And uh, I can tell you I like this side of the table better. Um, but it's also a harder, which nobody believes. It really is. The biggest difference is that in fundraising you have really clear structure. You know, if you're doing your job right, you have a clear measure, money is coming in, money is not, I have done all of my appropriate meetings or I have not. Trying to gauge progress in funding is incredibly difficult and particularly with the kind of work that our foundation does, which is very much focused on a prevention, proactive long term. So seeing any kind of results takes a very long time. And then being able to say, well, that piece is because of us is even more difficult to disentangle. So it's, I mean, yeah, you can give away money quite easily if all you want to do is write checks. If you want to do it. Well, it's really hard, but it's fun. And I like it.

Cathy: That's really interesting that it's harder to give away money. Wow. Yeah. Well that's reassuring. If I'm ever having a bad day about how hard it is to raise money. So who was this Lyle S Hallman who's really difficult to pronounce?

Laura: Um, and the S stands for Shantz, so be glad we didn't use the whole thing and make you say Lyle Shantz Hallman every time.

Cathy: Thank you very much.

Laura: Um, Lyle was a real estate developer in Waterloo region. He had a large portfolio of land that was, you know, that he developed and sold for homebuilding and he also had a huge portfolio of rental properties. So he was a landlord as well, and self-made entrepreneur, all of those kinds of things. And was quite a generous philanthropist in his lifetime as, as, uh, an individual. And, uh, towards the end of his life had an offer from a major company to purchase his entire portfolio of rental properties as a package. And

that was wonderful and seemed like a good idea, but then he had a tax problem, so he created a foundation.

Cathy: Okay.

Laura: But his intention was that he was going to run the foundation, you know, for the foreseeable future. Quite sadly, he died in a car accident just three months after he created this foundation. So he never really had the chance to do that, but it was created to meet the goals and interests that he had as an individual and continue the philanthropic work that he had already started.

Cathy: Okay. And so, um, so no, I'm, I'm sad that that's, that said that he, that uh, he wasn't able to see his sort of philanthropic vision in his lifetime, but it's nice that you're, that you're doing it. So, so what is the, can I just call it the Hallman Foundation so that I don't kangaroo. Okay. So what's the Hallman foundation all about?

Laura: It's really about building community more than anything. You know, that entrepreneurial spirit that Lyle brought has really carried through in the ongoing work of the foundation over the last 16 years now and is, uh, is carried very intentionally by the trustees. So our primary focus is kids and families and that, you know, as much as possible on early years zero to five, we do a lot of work also supporting parents and caregivers, both formal and informal, trying to make sure ultimately that every kid has a caring adult to support them. Of whatever connection. We also do work in supporting postsecondary education and in supporting healthcare through hospitals because those were things that Lyle also cared about. And in our way of looking at it, those are some of the systems that support strong families and strong neighborhoods. And so it all kind of ties together. But our approach, if you want to call it that, is really an effort to be driven by the needs and the realities of the community we serve. We're very place-based and very relational in a lot of what we do. And we work pretty hard to make sure that we've got multiple perspectives. And good information to inform the decision making that happens. .

Cathy: We're gonna circle back to it. I think some of those points, but I just wanted to really wanted to get into the meat of this because this podcast, this season is called shift disturbers in philanthropy. And so it's fabulous that, that your foundation is, you know, really clear about what it's doing and it's measuring its role in change. But I think the thing that I'm so interested about your work is the shift you've made to general operating support. So can you, can you maybe start out by telling us what the difference is between how you used to disperse money in and what this whole general operating support thing is all about.

Laura: So in most of our funding, we work in the very traditional way of being project based. You give us an application for a project that you want to have supported. We give you a grant for a year or two years or four years. You let us know how that went on. On we all go, but it's specific to a particular project. Um, our foundation several years ago was in the very fortunate position of knowing that we were going to have a significant and likely continuing increase in our assets. And so our granting was going to ramp up

significantly. But again, not as easy as it sounds to do. Well, it is much easier to plan within constraints than to say, we can do anything you want. Pick something.

Cathy: Wow. It's so interesting man. You know, Lisa Watson, that's how we were introduced. She and I are doing this whole thing around money mindset and the perspective that I've always thought about money mindset is around scarcity. But it's so interesting to hear someone talk about money mindset when you just have so much options. Yeah. Cool.

Laura: Yeah, and I mean it is a wonderful problem to have, but it's difficult to then select, you know, milestones or direction without anything particularly pushing you in one path or another. Right. So the trustees embarked on a process of trying to determine, you know, sort of what did we want to be when we grow up, kind of thing. Were there things we wanted to do differently? Did we want to start new streams of granting? Did we want to start running our own programs? Were we gonna pick a particular signature issue and try to do something about it, you know, where could we best apply these additional resources? And through a long series of learning and strategy discussions, part of what we decided to do was to pilot a couple of new styles of granting that were different than what we had done before. So one of those that we started two years ago was a pilot for a neighborhood level microgranting what we call neighborhood action grants. Those are very small grants given through a charitable partner within a specific neighborhood. Up to \$500 to residents to do whatever they think they need to do to make their neighborhoods stronger. So it tends to be pretty event based. It's not intended to be ongoing program funding, but people have done things like a multicultural potluck or a community garage sale or brought in a speaker or a group of youth that got together and uh, took over a piece of space in the community center and decorated it as a youth room or you know, whatever it happens to be, what they think they need to do to get to know their neighbors, to build that sense of social cohesion. And from our perspective, that started around this idea of a caring adult for every child. And as we were designing it, we had a number of neighborhood residents who were part of the design team who pushed back on us and basically said, if you have a neighborhood where people know and care about each other, they will look after each other's kids. You don't have to be that specific about it. And so we, we loosened up those parameters to just be build the neighborhood and the other stuff will come. We're one year into that, started in two neighborhoods. We're now expanding to for dipping our toe into that piece. And then the, the other piece and, and the bigger piece of learning was around, um, beginning to do work in general operating support. So I mean we're fairly, as funders go, we're fairly flexible. Even in program grants, we don't have a cap on administration. We will support costs for evaluation or professional development or you know, other stuff that is often considered extraneous by some funders or you know, not specifically part of the program. But it is still, you know, fairly constrained within specific to whatever this activity is that you want to do. 50 kids get after school homework help or whatever it happens to be. And initially the staff introduced the idea of general operating support probably almost three years ago. Did not get a resoundingly positive reception. And in reflection we didn't do a great job of bringing the idea in either.

Cathy: So I mean talk about the before you so interested here, but the process but just talking about general operating support. So the goal is instead of project based funding...

Laura: Yeah, completely unrestricted operating. You are identifying an organization that you believe in whose work you believe in and you are saying here, have this money to continue or better that work that you were doing without any around it.

Cathy: No strings attached,

Laura: No strings attached. You're doing great work. Keep doing your great work. Yeah.

Cathy: We love you. Wow. Okay. So that's the shift. I mean that is, that's a bit mind blowing. . Because you know, I mean, you know, when you're on the fundraising side and those of us who've been on this side for a long time have been crying for that, like help us, you know, we need to just do the good work that we're, that we're doing. Yeah. Okay. Wow. Okay. So, so you present this to the trustees and it's, it's not well-received initiative though.

Laura: There, there was a significant degree of trepidation around this idea. Um, but I, and I mean I under, I also understand that coming very much from a place of how does one do that and still feel comfortable that you are meeting your fiduciary responsibility and spending somebody else's money and in spending it in the highest interests of the community. Um, it wasn't a concept that they were familiar with. They couldn't wrap their heads around what reporting would look like in that kind of a situation. You know, that I, the one question that we got right off the bat was, well, what if they spend it badly? And my account, my counter to that was, well then we won't give them more money, but you know, help me understand what badly would mean as long as they're not like running off to Hawaii if the money's going into the community, what defines badly. But it was a very, very different way of thinking about funding from anything that they had done before.

Cathy: Or any like, I mean, there's not very many foundations that are giving general operating support. So this was not just new for your trustees but for the sector.

Laura: Yeah. So we, we went on a a learning journey with them. Did a lot of research talking to other funders, primarily in the US who were doing it and getting their perspectives on what worked and what didn't and why they made those decisions and all of that kind of thing. Looking at, you know, the best research that was out there from folks like the Centre for Effective Philanthropy and others. And then we also had the very fortunate opportunity to have Kathy Rich who is with the Ford Foundation and is running their build program, which is their massive international five year general operating support experiments.

Cathy: Oh wow.

Laura: And uh, we were able to have her come in and spend several hours with our trustees and person she was here for in our region for another commitment. And I, I pounced on her. Um, and that was incredibly helpful because she has an incredibly informed perspective, obviously given the, the dollar level that they're spending, around what made that kind of support meaningful and what they were able to do with it. And she

was also able to counter some of their concerns. So, I mean, you know, one of the things that often comes up is, well then you know, if you give them say two years or three years of this kind of support, then you know, what happens at the end of that? Are you creating dependency? That's a word that often comes up. Will other funders think that they're looked after? And so we're not choose to continue to support them. Those kinds of things. And, and what Ford's experience had been and, and the research bears this out, is that organizations that get that kind of support actually attract more dollars because they are on a solid base. They are able to work smart and effective and so they get good results. And so other funders are attracted to that success.

Cathy: And is the general operating support, is in effect for a constrained time or, or is that still, are you still figuring that out?

Laura: Well, for what we're doing right now, it's a three year pilot. I mean, our board is pretty amazing in terms of having a huge sensitivity to the, you know, sort of first do no harm kind of idea. So with both the GOS and the neighborhood grants, we had a lot of conversation about if we try this, we are trying it with the intention that it's going to continue. Right. So unless there are great whacking red flags, the idea is we're going into this for the long term, but recognizing that we need to keep checking in along the way and making sure that it's actually doing the things that we hope and believe that it will.

Cathy: Right. So it's, it's not necessarily a blank check because there are measurements and you're continuing that relationship.

Laura: Yeah, yeah, exactly.

Cathy: I just want to say for the listeners, GOS is the short hand for general operating support.

Laura: Yes. Acronyms in the social sector. Yeah, so we, you know, went from gee, I'm not really sure. That's a good idea. I don't understand what this would look like to at the end of last year, inviting three very different organizations that we had already deep relationships with to take part in a three year pilot. And so each of those organizations is receiving at different levels scale to who they are. Yeah. Six figure annual will support for three years and to a maximum of \$500,000 a year or 25% of operating budget is this sort of top end. Um, and the idea is that we will bring in a second cohort at the end of year two.

Cathy: Okay. So, and where are you in that journey?

Laura: We basically launched last November, so, okay.

Cathy: So not quite a year.

Laura: Yeah, halfway into year one. Basically.

Cathy: I mean I almost bit emotional when you were saying that like to to, to think about, you know, some of my clients that have such precarious funding and to know the kind of

impact they'd be able to make in their communities, uh, if they had this kind of general operating support that you're offering. So that is, that's amazing.

Laura: Well we're really excited about the potential for it. Yup. And already, I mean, part of the, the structure of this pilot was that the organizations we would invite initially had proven in their previous work with us a learning orientation and that they were willing to learn together with us how to do this well. So, not just, you know, will it do the things we think it will, we're pretty sure that we need to prove our hypothesis for ourselves, but also, you know, are there better ways to do it? Hmm. Are there things within the foundation's own processes that get in the way? Are there supports that help organizations be ready to go down this road? Is there work that needs to be done with boards in advance or during in order to really maximize the opportunity, those kinds of things. And so we, we meet the CEOs of the organizations and me and our consultants, Lisa Watson from Openly, we meet roughly quarterly to talk about what folks are bumping up against or how they're thinking about what they're, how they're going to do what they do, to give them a chance to learn from each other and to address whatever questions, you know, sort of are bubbling up as we go.

Cathy: Tell me something, because you know, I did a lot of research around collective impact and the role of philanthropy, collective impact. And one of the things that, that I saw in all of the research was this notion that funders had to approach the relationship with a lot of humility and that without that the power dynamic between the grantee and the funder was just gotten away of of things. So how do you, how do you approach that? I mean it strikes me what I know from you and your organization. Humility is kind of baked into your DNA, but uh, yeah. Can you talk about that a little bit?

Laura: For sure. And that it is that whole power dynamic regardless of our funding is something we're incredibly conscious of. Yeah. And I would like to think that we approach slightly differently than a lot of our colleagues. We're certainly not the only ones, but my belief is that if you don't, but if you aren't willing to acknowledge and own the power differential, you can't do anything about it. And so we need to, that it's there. We're the ones writing the checks. We have more power, not because we deserve it, not because we want to, you know, wield it with a heavy hand. But it's there. Right? So how do you mitigate that from the outset? Part of that was the selection process of who we invited into the pilot. You know, these are organizations that we know well, they have leadership that we trust that we believe trusts us. And that we were confident we could have some really frank and open discussions with on both sides of this coin. Quite frankly, the first cohort isn't the hard one. It's it's number three and four that are going to be the real challenge.

Cathy: Right. As you move further away from organizations with whom you already have a deep relationship.

Laura: Yeah. Well and, and these are the obvious candidates, right? These are the absolute rock solid rock star. You know, we're totally in this together situation. It's going to get harder the further we get away from that. But you know, we're also pretty intentional about being as transparent as we can be about our work and about our decision making process, which I think helps to build trust with the organizations. And we're all focused

on getting the work done on, on bettering the community. So we have to be really conscious of not getting in the way of that for our own ends or for our own gratification or you know, whatever may bubble up there. And I think in, in our program funding, we do things like we're really open to folks needing to change course midstream because things happen, policy shifts, the environment shifts, the problem exacerbates whatever it happens to be. If organizations underspend on a grant for which they have already received money, we've never for the rest of it back. We talk about, okay, so what else could you do with that? Hopefully more or less towards the same or similar ends. Um, but we have that conversation. So I think we have a certain degree of credibility when we say, we're really here to learn with you. This isn't about us telling you what to do with those dollars. And we had really in depth and thoughtful conversations with the board before they approved going into this pilot about what our role would and would not be in how this money was spent. And that when we said unrestricted, we meant completely and utterly unrestricted. Not unrestricted, except you can't use it to fix the foundation of the building. No, no. Cause again, that question came up. Well, no, but we mean except for these things. No we don't. And so if you are approving this, this is what you are approving. Otherwise let's not bother cause we're not really trying anything. And I'm fortunate that, you know, I said our board is very entrepreneurial. They also really like to do things that other people don't. We tell folks to bring us the projects that other people won't pay for. And so there I can, I can motivate them by pointing out that it's untapped space. Um, and that, that's quite helpful as well.

Cathy: Cool. I'm taking a quick break to let you know about a live webinar. I'm really excited about taking place on October 2nd, 2019 called the fundraiser's guide to corporate giving. I hope you'll join me and my expert guests, Chris Baylis, Heather Nelson and Mena Gainpaulsingh. We'll share what we know about corporate fundraising and answer your questions live. And we're offering a special discount for it doesn't hurt to ask listeners, when you register for the webinar, enter the promo code CorpGive, that's C O R P, G, I V E and you'll receive a 20% discount off the original price to learn more, visit fundraisinglab.ca. I look forward to seeing you on October 2nd. Now back to Laura.

Cathy: So I mean, you know, as you're talking I, the things that came up were humility, trust, relationships, impact, transparency. But those seem to be themes that permeate everything around this general operating support initiative that you have going on.

Laura: Yeah, very much so.

Cathy: Okay. I could actually ask you questions for another hour or more just about a general, there are a couple of other things that I did want to just check in with you about because I think you're doing some interesting work on, on other things. You had talked at the outset about place-based funding and I know that you're very excited about place-based funding. Can you talk about that a couple of minutes? Just talk about it cause you are so, um, I think there's just so excited about it.

Laura: I just, I mean the longer that I'm in this role, I've been in this job for just over eight years now and the longer that I'm in it, the more I believe that being place-based is the way to genuinely have impact, which is not to in any way denigrate my colleagues that work

provincially or nationally. And particularly if you're focused on the policy side, I think, you know, that's where you need to be. But because we are place based, we have really deep relationships with the organization that we work with. It influences the way in which we think about due diligence for instance, because I see these folks in the grocery store, you know, the whole like, Oh where are they actually doing what they said they were going to do? Well I know that they are because I see them at half a dozen different tables and, and other places. And it also gives us the ability as a funder to really identify interesting opportunities to leverage change because we can have a fairly intimate knowledge of most of the stuff that's going on in the areas that we care about. And, and to know that quite richly and quite deeply. And I don't know how you build the kind of trust that you need to have between a funder and a grantee. And by the way, I love the term grantee but I have never found a better one. But I don't know how you develop that kind of relationship with somebody who's halfway across the country from you. Um, you know, video conferences and things are great. You can do site visits, but you know, part of what works for us is that we are also working with these folks on other community level things that aren't driven by us [inaudible] so there's multiple dimensions to the relationship and so you really genuinely get to know each other. Right. I think that is so fundamental to actually being able to do good, interesting, creative work together.

Cathy: Okay. All right, well I'm glad I let you go on that one because highly fascinated about it. There's, there's one or two other things I want to make sure we had time for. And, and um, one of them is that a, is this notion of guiding principles and you know, I mean, I recommend to my clients that if they, they want to have a sustainable fundraising program, they need to create a, an enabling ecology in, in support of fundraising. And I, I borrow that term from collective impact where I learned it and you know, and so I believe that an enabling ecology for fundraising includes fundraising strategies, a strong infrastructure, a culture of philanthropy, but also this notion of having these guiding principles. And to me, those organizations that have translated their values into principles allows them to really live their values in an intentional way. Cause sometimes, you know, values are, so, I don't know if the word is like high minded or they're, they're, you know, they're, they're these big aspirational things and it's tough to know if you're living them, but principles are more concrete and they can really be used to help guide you and they can, they can be like the moral ballast as you, as you make decisions in your organization, especially if they're tough decisions. Um, so I'm always on the lookout for groups that have stated their principles and on your website, you have this whole page around Hallman foundation's principles. So how did that come about? What was the process and, and why, like why did you even go there? What, what led you to that?

Laura: Yeah, so that was, um, actually a process that we, that the board just went through last year in 2018. Um, so previous to that we had a mission statement and a set of value statements that were created, I'm going to say 14 years ago and had never been revisited since like many organizations. Um, and in the impetus to look at it again, largely came out of the fact that those words that we had on paper didn't actually mesh with the way we were doing our work currently. So if people said, you know, give us the synopsis of who you are or as we were, uh, we redesigned our website and we were creating new content. And I was finding that like, we had a lot of consistency in the way

that we went at things, but the words that we were using were not the words from the mission and the values. And so it was almost rather than creating a new direction, it was more a mechanism of getting the way that we talked about things in line with the way that we actually did stuff. But it also led to a really rich conversation among the trustees about how do we want to work? Like, what, what are the things that are fundamentally important that we have to hang onto, no matter how big we get, how much money we're giving away, you know, if we choose to change our geography or whatever. And what we wanted to land with was something that would actually be useful on a day to day basis. So it's almost from the approach of like a manifesto, right? This is what you can expect if you work with us. And that holds us accountable to actually behaving in that way. Cause we've told people we're going to. And it really forced us to get specific about what we meant by some of those high minded terms. And so we use that approach in just about everything that we do. Um, it informs grant making decisions if, if we're down to the last two or three. And you know, there's only money enough for one of those and it's very difficult to distinguish between them. The volunteers go back to, okay, which of these fits most tightly with all of this stuff that we said we care about. We use it in a, as a staff team, we took that set of principles and translated it into something we called the, at the time I think leadership attributes. But basically if we're recruiting people, be they volunteers, staff, whatever, the kind of person that would work in this way, what are the attributes that they would demonstrate? And we have a list of those. So we just went through a hiring process a couple of months ago. A couple of the questions were focused around those and that was part of our scoring. Did they demonstrate a, B, C, D.

Cathy: Oh, interesting.

Laura: So we, we really do genuinely use it. Uh, the principals are on a tent card that sits in the middle of the table at every board meeting.

Cathy: Oh, cool.

Laura: Which I mean, a is designed to remind the trustees of commitments that they made, but also so that the next time we're getting to the point where it's like, you know what, those aren't necessarily relevant anymore. It will be obvious sooner because they're right there. So, yeah, we very genuinely try to make it living and breathing and informing all of the ways that we work.

Cathy: I love that. That's great. Thank you so much. And so to, to the listeners, really it's worth going to the, uh, Lyle S Hallman Foundation website and checking out the uh, uh, the guiding principles. We don't have too much time left, but I do want to give you the opportunity to not talk about general operating support and not talk about the cool stuff you're doing around guiding principles. But, but now that you've been in this gig for awhile, yeah. What advice would you give to your fundraising self or to fundraisers who are still out there about foundation fundraising and how we and they are going about doing it?

Laura: Oh, um, so my big bugbear around professional fundraisers dealing with foundations and ours in particular, there is, there tends to be, I find a perception that all foundations

are the same. And yet within philanthropy, like within my colleagues at the philanthropic foundations of Canada, for instance, our sort of running joke is if you've met one foundation, you've met one foundation.

Cathy: I love that saying

Laura: Well, and I mean, think about it. Most foundations are created by wealthy individuals who generally speaking, got wealthy by being fairly driven and having a specific mindset about things. And they tend to have a specific mindset about the way their foundations are going to work too. But where that gets problematic is if folks have not done their homework to figure out what kind of foundation they're talking to. And I fully appreciate that a lot of them are hard to find out information about, but you know, if you've gotten to the point where you're having meetings with folks. You can be intentional about that. You can look at previous grantings. So I mean, in our case, we are not a family foundation. Our giving, uh, interests and intentions are very clear. They, it's not driven by any other agenda than what you see. So this is my job. Dealing with an organization that we may choose to invest in is my job. I don't need to be made to feel good. I don't need to be patted on the head for my generosity. I don't need lunch. Um, I want to know what you're doing, I want to know about the work and I want to know about the guts of the work. And, and I can understand in an initial meeting or an initial couple of meetings that you may not get that, but after that you're just being deliberately obtuse and it's kind of frustrating. Um, I, I actually, I had a, a colleague who was a senior foundation leader in the U S recently retired and I, I, when I was fairly new in the job, she said, look, the definition of a foundation executive is someone that has never had a sincere compliment or a bad meal. And I, you know, like authentic and genuine appreciation is wonderful and, and we're glad to know that folks are able to do good things with the funds that we give them and, and that they're grateful for that. But there are certainly foundations out there that are really essentially giving vehicles for individuals, right? It's, it's a tax structure, but it is that individual's interests and passions that are being recognized and they may very much want that individual major donor style of interaction? There are also a lot of other ones, even if they don't have staff who are genuinely passionate about an issue, are incredibly well informed about it. And that's what they want to know about. It's not for ego gratification. And part of my frustration comes when not only is that the way that development professionals behave and interacting with us, but that's also the way that they report. We get reports that are fluff. You know, it's a whole lot of words that don't actually mean anything about these high minded goals about children. What did you do? Yeah, I want to know what actually happened. That's the piece that I care about. And the fact that you're dealing with an organization or a, you know, a, a structure as opposed to an individual doesn't absolve you as a fundraising professional from meeting to do your homework. And figuring out what that group organization thing is looking for. There's still a lot of differentiation. And you can't presume that they're all the same.

Cathy: Right. And so, you know, I would, uh, I would invite listeners to share if nothing else, this piece of the interview with, with senior leadership, both staff and volunteers because it, it, you know, what you've just described is in fact a complex group of funders and there is no one size fits all and you have to do the research and you have to understand who they are and that requires a lot of time. That requires a lot of relationship building.

Cathy: Yup. It absolutely does. Wow. Okay. Well we've run out of time. I can hardly believe it cause it feels like it just zoomed by. Yeah. Um, listen, any words that you'd like to share with the listeners?

Laura: Um, no, I just, I'm really grateful for this opportunity. I mean I love talking about this stuff. I'm proud of what we do. I love sharing it. I, when I use to do, you know, fundraising workshops and stuff like that at AFP, I would always say anybody that actually showed up to one of my sessions got one free question. So like six months from now, if you have a question about something you can email me and ask. So I think we should, we should extrapolate that to, to listeners of the podcast. I'm, I'm pretty easy to find. So send me your question.

Cathy: All right. Where you heard it here, if you have one about a foundations or in particular the work that the Lyle S Hallman foundation is doing, you can find Laura, on the website. Yeah. Laura, this has been amazing. Thank you so much. I really appreciate that you've taken the time to share the really cool work that you're doing. I am so excited that you are leading the charge around general operating support and uh, look forward to more foundations watching what you're doing and, and seeing if they can integrate it. And I'm looking forward to doing a follow up podcast with you when you have some more insights to share around general operating support because I just think it's a game changer and I'm delighted that you're, um, disturbing shift fundraising and community.

Laura: Absolutely. Part of our intent in this is to find ways to share it. We're, we're hoping to do a series of case studies among other things, so I'd love to come back when, uh, we've got some meat on the bones and talked to you about that.

Cathy: That would be amazing. I'd love that.

Laura: Thank you.

Cathy: Thanks so much, Laura. .

Cathy: If you like what you heard and want to hear others talk, shift go on over too. It doesn't hurt to ask podcast.com subscribe on iTunes or Stitcher. This was produced by poodle party productions and Cathy Mann and associates with the ever patient podcast producer Anne Lemesurier working her magic. The music you heard was dog days by Isaac Joel, and remember in fundraising as in life, it doesn't hurt to ask.

Show Notes

Organizations Mentioned

[Lyle S Hallman Foundation](#)

[Openly](#)

[Philanthropic Foundations of Canada](#)

[AFP - Association of Fundraising Professionals](#)

People Mentioned

[Lyle Shantz](#)

Acronyms

GOS - General Operating Support