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Introduction

On February 17-18, 2011, Marguerite Casey Foundation staff convened with Native resource people to seek feedback and guidance on the foundation’s grantmaking efforts in Native communities. The resource people are highly skilled individuals with extensive experience working in Native communities. They hold jobs in nonprofit organizations, foundations, tribal government and the private sector (see Appendix A for a list of participants) and engage in various fields of interest, including the arts, community and economic development, education, youth development, and philanthropy. The meeting was planned and implemented in partnership with Native Americans in Philanthropy.

The proceedings were held in Albuquerque, N.M. The first day’s activities were conducted at the hotel site (Embassy Suites Albuquerque), and the second day’s activities were conducted at the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center. The meeting agenda (see Appendix B) was designed to achieve the following:

- Confirm Marguerite Casey Foundation’s commitment to continuing its relationship with Native America.
- Clarify the foundation’s approach to movement building.
- Reflect on the foundation’s grantmaking approach in Indian Country to date.
- Discuss ways to enhance the foundation’s grantmaking activities.

Those objectives were pursued through presentations and facilitated discussions. Kyle Smith served as the facilitator.

Marguerite Casey Foundation staff first met with Native representatives in 2003, when the foundation was young and still in the process of developing its program to support and nurture movement building. The conversation from that meeting resulted in useful ideas and information that were incorporated into the foundation’s grantmaking work, particularly as it related to Native organizations. After more than seven years of implementing its program, foundation staff determined it was an appropriate time to again convene a meeting with Native resource people to share experiences and listen to additional grantmaking advice from the Native communities. Below is a summary of the Native Gathering 2011 proceedings.
Welcome & Opening Prayer

Ron Solimon, president and CEO of the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center (IPCC), welcomed everyone to Albuquerque. He noted that philanthropy has a long tradition in Pueblo communities; it is a way of sharing resources among families and throughout the community. Everyone has a commitment to this ideal. Ron also talked about the history and role of IPCC and how it serves not only as an arts organization but also as a resource to tribes by providing policy research and advocacy support. He ended his presentation with a prayer, asking the creator to provide guidance and support for meeting participants throughout their deliberations.

MCF’s Approach to Philanthropy

Luz Vega-Marquis, president and CEO of Marguerite Casey Foundation, provided an overview of the foundation’s brand of grantmaking and what it is trying to accomplish with its grantmaking strategy. First, however, she took a moment to honor the memory and legacy of Wilma Mankiller: “Wilma is the one that initiated the first meeting between the foundation and Native people in 2003, and she has made many contributions to the work of the foundation and to me, for which I am very appreciative.”

Ms. Vega-Marquis went on to explain that, since its establishment in 2001, Marguerite Casey Foundation has made multiyear general operating support grants to organizations committed to movement building that enables families to participate in broader decision-making on issues that affect them. Within that framework, the foundation supports advocacy, activism, organizing and issue education. Foundation grantmaking is focused in states chosen because of their high concentration of child and family poverty.

The foundation believes the grantee organizations are doing an amazing job building the organizational infrastructure necessary for movement building and making public policy change. A good example of movement building is the Equal Voice for America’s Families campaign.

The foundation had determined it wanted to create a vehicle that could help families make their voices heard in the political process, i.e., to help them understand and participate in public policy choices being made. In that vein, the foundation convened a planning group made up of representatives from its grantees to explore how that could be done. The group decided on organizing a national campaign involving town hall meetings and a national convention, all designed to create a national platform representing the interests and concerns of participating families.

The Equal Voice for America’s Families campaign, which culminated in a three-city convention in September 2008, engaged approximately 30,000 families and produced a policy platform containing eight broad issues of concern to low-income families and suggested solutions. Since the campaign, families have gathered across communities to work on those issues. In some instances, the foundation supports a “network weaver” to help move the process along. The foundation intends to continue to support and build on this body of work.

In closing, Ms. Vega-Marquis encouraged everyone to share their knowledge and advise the foundation on how it could improve its efforts in Native communities.
Louis Delgado presented findings from his study on Marguerite Casey Foundation’s grantmaking to Native organizations during the period 2003–2010. The review, commissioned by the foundation, covered such items as the overall level of investment, issue areas addressed by grantees, populations served, changes in organizational capacity, policy impact, and alignment with recommendations from the 2003 meeting with Native advisers. Mr. Delgado’s conclusions were:

The foundation has made a significant investment in Native organizations, and its use of general operating support grants provides a level of flexibility and stability appreciated by the grantees.

Some Native grantees are still refining their movement building strategies, but, in general, there is close alignment between the programmatic objectives of the foundation’s grants program and the work conducted by the Native grantees.

Grantees have made considerable progress in strengthening their core competencies.

The foundation has positively responded to a number of the recommendations from the 2003 Native Gathering; however, there is still no Native representation on the foundation’s staff or board.

Based on those findings, Delgado offered six recommendations that ranged from increasing the overall percentage of total grant money to support Native communities, to maintaining flexible criteria on movement building. A copy of the full report can be downloaded from the foundation’s website (www.caseygrants.org).

The presentation generated considerable discussion among meeting participants. Statements made by participants on a few of the topics are provided below.

On the topic of the average age of organizations being high (29 years), one participant stated, “The age of the grantees shows we have community institutions. I haven’t really thought about it before, that there is that much age, that much wisdom; it means a lot.”

Data presented showed that, in pursuing change across issue areas, the grantee organizations chose strategies such as issue education and leadership development, along with direct service, more frequently than the strategies of advocacy and organizing. In response, a participant said, “What strikes me is that there is a natural progression in strategies chosen: Direct service leads most frequently, then moves into leadership education, then into actual action. It’s very similar to how I see it implemented on our reservation.”

Another participant stated, “For our organization, which does organizing and direct service, what’s challenging is that often Native people aren’t responding to the bigger movements in our country. But, we have this big police reform effort in Seattle, and peo-
people are coming out by the hundreds for this. So I think that when you have an issue that your community feels passionate about, that’s when a direct service organization can really grab on and go with it.”

The data also showed that organizations often address multiple issues; some organizations worked in as many as eight issue areas. A question was posed as to whether this was a good thing or whether it showed a lack of focus. A foundation staff member responded that when an organization is addressing multiple issues, the foundation “looks at the depth of work the organization is able to engage in. If they are not good in any one of them, they wouldn’t get funded.” Another staff member provided an additional perspective: “When an organization is tackling multiple issues, it’s an indication they are really grounded in the needs of their community … People’s lives are more complex than a single issue.”

Reflections

At the beginning of Day 2 of the gathering, participants were asked to share any reflections or lingering thoughts they had from the previous evening’s discussion. A number of items were shared, and the comments have been grouped into three broad categories: funding, evaluation and movement building.

“Of the movement building and great work [the foundation does], what crossover do you see in other communities and Indian Country?”

“In Alaska … it’s about driving solutions based on priorities established by our people … As tribal institutions, we control large sectors of our economies in geographic areas … in places where we can capture that, where we can create alliances among our people, we can leverage our voice in policies. We have an opportunity to leverage ourselves when we partner with philanthropy.”

“In the 1990s, there was a dramatic growth in the number of Native nonprofits. If the trend continues…, the number will explode … There is tension among the different sectors on the reservation, and it underpins some of what we’re dealing with now.”

movemenT BuIlDiNg
In preparation for the discussion on what activities in Native communities match Margarette Casey Foundation’s movement building focus, foundation staff were asked to describe what they mean by “movement building” and what the key elements are in the foundation’s approach. Foundation staff members’ explanations and participants’ feedback follow.

Foundation staff member: “From the foundation’s perspective, [movement building] means supporting an organization’s capacity to develop civically engaged leadership [among low-income families in the community] that can directly impact public policies at the basic level. So, organizations that support families use their voice to change policy that negatively impact low income families.”

Foundation staff member: “We’re looking for organizations that keep low-income families at the center of their work. They [low-income families] are really driving the organization and what’s important. They have low-income families in the leadership. … An organization may provide direct services, but it must be integrated with the other three strategies [issue education and leadership development, advocacy and organizing].”

“It’s been difficult to measure the impact we’ve had in the community. I believe how we define those metrics in Native communities will be unique and will be defined by those communities.”

“A dissemination plan [by Margarette Casey Foundation] of what worked or failed in Indian Country would be useful – for example, success in an urban community in terms of advocacy and how that success was achieved.”

“I would like more analysis on how those entities were able to increase their level of funding … some case studies would be helpful.”

“Regarding how revenue has been affected, Hopi is looking at how the community has stepped up in in-kind giving. It happens more frequently than cash giving.”

“Our organization has played an important role in policy, but because we do advocacy, we don’t match up well with foundation giving.”
Foundation staff member: “The bulk of [foundation] funding supports organizing and advocacy.”

One reaction to the statements above was that the foundation appears to be “seeding” movements but is not building “a” movement. Staff acknowledged that the foundation “cannot build a movement, but it can nurture it” by building infrastructure and providing long-term support to organizations working to lift the voices of low-income families.

What a movement looks like in the 21st century is unclear yet: “The movement can be across issue areas, across communities, across race, across geography.” Organizations must engage, however, at the community level. In 2009, for example, foundation grantees collectively worked with 1.5 million families, and 750,000 were actively engaged in some sort of action at the local level.

Participant: “[T]he focus is to support organizations to get stakeholders to effectively advocate for themselves, build leadership and make a difference … To be effective at that, you need to have an overarching goal. When I see Indians stuck in poverty generation after generation, I very rarely see the overarching goal being prosperity, whether it’s rich in culture, rich in money or rich in opportunity … If I had my own foundation, I would be saying this: Tell us how you’re going to do that in your community so that you make a permanent difference and don’t have to be begging for money anymore.”

Foundation staff member: “That is an aspiration of ours … This is why the dictate must come from the community. We’re not saying ‘You have to do this!’ We ask, we listen, we act. We have to hear from many communities and try to make sense of the collective [voice].”

Participant: (additional comment to the overarching goal concept) “It would be useful to think about what the next big movement in Indian Country would be. The forties and fifties, [the issue] was the right of existence; the sixties and seventies, the struggle was around legal definitions of tribal sovereignty; and the mid-seventies to 2000 has been … self-determination and self-government. So, what is the next big thing? What should this group be thinking about? Moving toward personal and family self-sufficiency, moving from poverty to prosperity?”

Finally, there was further discussion about how Marguerite Casey Foundation pushes movement building to a higher level of action. Foundation staff used the Equal Voice for America’s Families campaign as an example once again: “The foundation was heavily involved as the convener, the investor and the back office.” The outcome has been a growth, at the local level, of networks that include grantee organizations as well as other organizations. Marguerite Casey Foundation makes grants to support the expanded networks, including Native networks that have been formed.

In 2009, for example, “MCF grantees collectively worked with 1.5 million families, and 750,000 were actively engaged in some sort of action at the local level.”
Native Movement Building

Building on the idea of movements in Indian Country, the group was asked to describe the big movements in the past. The litany of examples included micro- and macro-level movement efforts.

One participant provided a rich historical perspective: “A whole new level of leadership came out of the War on Poverty in the sixties. It elevated us to positions of leadership…. We became a network of people nationally; that didn’t exist before because we were individual tribes and so forth… We took power away from them [the U.S. Department of the Interior] and spread it throughout the government; every federal agency had the responsibility to live up to the treaty responsibilities to the tribes…. The last players in have been the foundations in this movement. The corporations came in because we were attacking them over … the disservice they were doing … [what] they were paying the tribes for coal, timber, fish, all of the natural resources. They were bleeding us dry. The U.S. government was maintaining this, so we were under a colonial government for a long time. As an organization … we brought people together who had expertise in the field to do battle, and that led to the Council of Energy Resource Tribes, housing, environmental organizations and such.”

Other participants gave the following examples of what they considered to be movement building in Indian Country:

“Basically, people want dignity…. You have a whole movement for cultural and religious freedom…. [W]e had passage of the Religious Freedom [Restoration] Act and NAGPRA [Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act], but still we’re not nearly as strong as we need to be…. You have this whole movement around community gardening, food sovereignty, food systems, [in] response to the crises in health. In environmental justice, … we have communities struggling with mining and dam projects…. Tribal governments have been emerging as a force for… destroying their own environment, so there’s this neocolonial situation…there is more public dialog on it.”

“Tribal governments are going through the same thing that tribal citizens are: It’s only been thirty to forty years since they’ve really begun to build their governance structures…. We have to recognize that the unique relationship with the federal government is with the tribes, so any movement in Indian Country has to [ask] “What are we doing in this movement to support tribes as entities and make them stronger and more willing to listen to their citizens?” … [W]e’re now facing huge challenges from federal, state and local governments and the judicial system…. You have to protect the Trust relationship and sovereignty in some way.”

“Development of the nonprofit community is important. It represents the voice for cultural sovereignty…. Our movement has been largely reactive to things that come at us. At what point do we become more proactive?”

“A significant movement was the urbanization of Native people of the late sixties and early seventies.”
“There is this idea of Indian Country developing its own economy. If this happens, we can lift our own people out of poverty.”

“Young people need to be involved in this…. We need more young people to be a part of this governance process.”

“Native philanthropy as a movement… using cultural sovereignty to redefine what it means to give, and play that role in partnership with other communities.”

“The advent of gaming has had benefits but also internal negative impact. It has had spin-off effects like moving people to restrict membership roles because it means more for me, which is in conflict with our values.”

“There’s a media movement… over the last thirty-five years. A lot of young people have brought their stories to the table and are getting them made (in film)…. [O]ur American Indian Film Festival … has brought to American attention the issues we face here in the U.S. and in Canada, anything from fishing rights to abuse have been shown and disseminated….

### Elements That Drive Native Movements

Following the discussion of past movements, participants were asked to identify the key elements that help drive these movements. The key elements mentioned are below.

- **Passionate Leadership**
  - people who care strongly about the cause, in particular, grassroots leaders grounded in their community and people who bridge communities and sectors.
  - **Leading by Example**
    - people willing to actually do the work.
  - **Getting a Taste of Winning**
    - when people who suffer from oppression experience a victory, that’s very powerful motivation.
  - **A Constituency**
    - built within the cultural context of the Indian nations.
  - **Good information**
    - research that answers the questions asked.
  - **Technology and social networking**

- **Authenticity**
  - the ability to authentically engage in the community.

- **Being Proactive**
  - thinking systemically.

- **Empowerment**
  - battling internalized oppression.

- **Culture**
  - saving and enhancing; for example, maintaining a language or supporting subsistence lifestyles.

- **Alignment**
  - incorporating the tools that are used (technology, for example), particularly with the next generation..

- **Nonprofits**
  - raising the visibility of the Native nonprofit sector.

- **Technical Assistance**
  - helping nonprofits to build their capacity.

An ideological shift from deficit to asset based honoring our privileges and the strengths that we have.
Examples of Good Practice

The group was asked to share examples of good practice in the field. A Marguerite Casey Foundation staff person cited several Native grantee organizations that were doing good movement building work. What they had in common was leadership development that helped community members understand the complexity of issues and where to raise their voices – whether with state policymakers or tribal government; holistically connecting issues with family well-being; and the ability to mobilize people.

A participant shared the concept of “positive deviance,” that is, people doing things outside generally accepted practices but getting good results. The group was encouraged to be open to strategies that were not the norm.

Following are examples of good practice the group provided.

**The Native Family Center**  
**Portland, Oregan**

About five years ago, Native American Youth and Family Center in Portland, Ore. prioritized recruiting low-income individuals from the community as well as high-level professionals to serve on its board. The center has been successful in getting Native people onto boards and commissions around the city and in the Mayor’s Office. Today, they are able to bridge resources into the community where needed.

**Dr. David Beaulieu**

Dr. David Beaulieu at the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee has a program that trains people who will teach Native children, particularly urban Native children. They are to be leaders in the field, to project positive development, not remediation.

**Tohono O’odham Community Action**

Some Native organizations dedicated to revitalizing basketry as a cultural practice and economic opportunity – like TOCA (Tohono O’odham Community Action), a foundation grantee – are creating a movement to perpetuate Native languages, working with boys and girls clubs, providing connections between grandparents and grandchildren, providing economic development opportunities, and advocating for environmental justice. TOCA has been successful in its Native food sovereignty movement because it developed an understanding of systems change, which helped the organization understand where to intervene in the food distribution system.

**Additional Examples**

Four examples of tribal governmental execution of systems change were provided. First, Gila River decided they were going to regulate the quality of air on their reservation, a radical concept. Second, due to the diabetes problem, the Winnebago tribe started feeding buffalo meat to their children even though the school system initially rejected their proposal to do it. Third, due to the high dropout rate among Native youth in Alaska, the Ya Ne Dah School rejected the state educational standards and began using their own, which were more stringent and had a cultural component as well. Fourth, Zuni created the Zuni Eagle Sanctuary because they didn’t have access to enough eagle feathers for their ceremonies. Zuni struck a partnership with U.S. Fish and Wildlife in this matter. The important elements in each of these cases were: 1) they broke the status quo and were the first to do it; 2) they implemented great execution including bringing in the necessary resources; and 3) they gained the support of the grassroots people.
The Native language movement in Minnesota has really taken off: there are now thousands of people gathering around “learning tables” set up on a regular basis, and there have been resources committed to putting Native language curricula in the schools.

On the Pine Ridge reservation, people came together and created a community development corporation.

The Inter-tribal Canoe Journey, another MCF grantee, leads with culture. It is holistic: about health, environment, education, time, with no geographical boundaries. It crosses urban and reservation areas. It started small but now has 70,000 people show up. Over 150 canoes participate representing 45 tribes.

Organizing around food in Minnesota: there is a groundswell of indigenous farmers, including youth; they share seeds, and are about food restoration and food security. Tribal governments are interested in the food movement. Cooking traditional foods is taking place among the Cherokee in Oklahoma, done seasonally. Traditional food cultures are spreading to schools and other places.

Winnebago did groundbreaking work by separating its business operation from tribal government, in essence, isolating business ventures from tribal politics. They chronicled the process and procedures they followed so others were able to learn from their efforts.

The Native American Community Development Institute in Minneapolis has a comprehensive community economic development plan that has widespread community support. This plan involves many things, from business and infrastructure development, to community leadership development.

First Nation’s Oweesta Corporation helped launch the community development financial institutions movement across the country. There is now a national CDFI coalition.

The subsistence movement in Alaska continues to grow, exemplifying organizational capacity, leadership development, networking and policy impact. The movement started with the International Whaling Commission and the Alaska Natives’ right to harvest bowhead whales, so integral to cultural identity and survival. What resulted was the creation of the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, as well as many other commissions that oversee different species. However, the state and national regulatory environment is encroaching on Native subsistence rights, subsistence hunters are organizing in response.

Indigenous countries around the world are developing new indices around their quality of life indicators – air quality, food quality, etc. - but it is not happening here in Indian country, though it should be.

An interesting trend is that greater inter-tribal cooperation is addressing common problems. Another trend is that tribes are trying to work through cooperative negotiations with outside forces, whether in government or the private sector. One participant suggested that people power is still necessary to force issues to be resolved.
People are taking back their health centers and are reimagining a totally different way of doing things, a much more holistic way. Potawot Health Village in northern California is a good example of this movement; it provides a variety of medical services along with spiritual and cultural support.

The National Indian Child Welfare Association is doing excellent work. It addresses child abuse and neglect through training, research and public policy.

**Structural Barriers to Movement Building**

The group was asked to identify obstacles that serve as barriers to doing movement building in Native communities. Their responses follow.

The lack of data is a big barrier. Community based research is important to strengthening movements.

The division between urban and reservation is a factor. Things often get couched in either tribal or urban, creating divisiveness. Although some tribes are doing a good job at building bridges between tribal and urban populations, problems remain.

In the child welfare field, there is movement around the country to promote family engagement in policy change; however, there is no structure to have an effective and collective voice. In 2008, Congress passed the “Fostering Connections Act” which has significant tribal pieces in it, though other parts will affect urban populations. The Act has the potential to create more culturally appropriate practices in child welfare. Structural support to raise the voices of families in this process is lacking.

The fact that there are 565 tribes with their own political structures presents a challenge in itself to building a common vision or agenda. Is there a common theme or thread running through all the movements out there that needs to be lifted up?

“We’re communal societies in a capitalist system and so that’s why we have to think holistically. When we don’t, that’s when we have problems.” The narrow focus of many foundations (the silo effect) limits the ability of holistic oriented Native programs being funded.

College programs that are tailored more specifically to the community and do not lead to “brain drain” would be helpful. Also, enabling fluidity between sectors – nonprofit, government, private - would strengthen leadership.

Leaders in Native communities wear many hats, and burnout is a serious threat to maintaining quality leadership. Restorative support for leadership is needed.

People operating in a survival mode, having to worry about basic needs of their families, find it difficult to be involved in organizing and movements. Even accessing transportation to get to an event can be challenging.
Honoring Wilma Mankiller

Before moving on to the final portion of the agenda concerning action steps, Charlie Soap was asked to say a few words about what is being done to honor Wilma’s legacy.

Mr. Soap first acknowledged all of the wonderful notes that were received from leaders around the world, as well as Native people across the country, pertaining to Wilma. He said he heard stories from many people about how she helped them in some way. He also thanked the people in the room who worked with Wilma on many different projects.

Regarding follow-up activities, there is work going forth to create a movie about Wilma’s work, and community efforts to make positive change. Any money made on the movie would go into the Wilma Mankiller Foundation, recently established in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Funds in the foundation will be used to support women’s issues, education, and community development projects in Indian country. Funding is being sought to support these efforts.

Actions to Consider

Participants were asked to suggest what actions the MCF should consider going forward that would strengthen its work in Native communities. A number of items were suggested and are listed below.

- Be a leader on how to work with Native communities: recruit Natives for board, staff and internship positions; dedicate a board education day to native issues; get the board out to visit Native communities.
- Increase the percentage of aggregate funding to Native organizations as suggested in the report.
- Support technology usage, i.e., the Native population may be small but there is an opportunity to do creative work with it.
- A special fund, beyond the general operating grants, to support creative ideas and experimentation.
- Map Native organizations doing capacity building work.
- Write stories about the accomplishments and disseminate results in the field.
- Adjust MCF’s regions to accommodate Native organizations doing important work outside those areas.
- Leverage MCF’s leadership in the field by working with other foundations to integrate MCF’s strategy in grantmaking.
Closure

MCF staff thanked all the Native resource people for participating in the meeting. MCF shared some closing thoughts. “It is obvious that we have interconnecting interests and concerns, and after today, if other thoughts come to you about success stories in the making, or other potential groups that you think the MCF should take a look at for potential support, please keep in mind our Equal Voice framework…it is the movement building approach that MCF has always been working toward; it has simply evolved and is a bit more refined.”

“One of the Foundation’s non-grantmaking strategies is its communications effort.” MCF launched a newspaper that carries stories about the issues that grantees are dealing with. “We invite you to write for us….Several news organizations are now following us and taking our stories.”

Ms. Vega-Marquis stated: “You have given me a lot to think about….We should stay connected. Continue to send me ideas….I’m committed to doing the best I can to move a lot of what we care about today, forward….We will try to have another gathering in 2 years or so, so we can continue the conversation.”

Make long-term commitments to grantees.
 Participate in Native Americans in Philanthropy’s Institute.
 Create central repositories of reliable data.

Provide more research data on Native organizations and what is happening in the native nonprofit sector.
 Inform other foundations about the work of program officers.
 Convene all UPS created foundations to discuss grantmaking in Native communities and include Native foundations in the discussion.

Support relationship building between tribes and urban Native communities.

Encourage the philanthropic sector to develop methods that reduce the competitive nature of grants processes which interfere with collectively working together.

Convene this group of advisors more frequently to examine and discuss work in the field.

Understand the dynamics surrounding tribal enrollment: that there are Native people without sufficient blood quantum to enroll with a specific tribe, but who are Native and maintain their culture, and need to be supported, as well.

Create an award that recognizes outstanding work performed by nonprofit organizations.

Ask the Native grantees what other groups should be supported.

Keep in mind the positive deviants, those doing unusual work.

Hopi Foundation and Indian Health Service funding of census research among the Cherokee in Oklahoma may serve as examples.
Conclusion

The Native Gathering 2011 meeting provided a great opportunity for the MCF to share its accomplishments to date, and to identify new opportunities to enhance the forward movement of the Foundation’s work. As discussed, there have been many movements in Indian country that offer valuable lessons concerning practice, challenges and impact. Clearly, movement building in Native communities today is part of an ongoing process of change. There are common elements of good practice that cross communities, whether urban or rural, tribal or multi-tribal, that serve as building blocks for good movement building work. Such practices should be supported. There are also obstacles that serve as structural barriers to organizing effectively, but obstacles are not insurmountable. Finally, and most importantly, there are a growing number of Native organizations developing the capacity to effectively address issues and concerns in communities across the country that will ultimately lead to a different future, hopefully, one of prosperity for all. As MCF continues to refine its work in Indian country, it becomes a stronger partner in this pursuit.
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**Agenda**

**DAY 1 - Thursday February 17, 2011**
Embassy Suites Albuquerque - Hotel & Spa
Ocotillo meeting room
1000 Woodward Place NE,
Albuquerque, NM  87102

3:00 p.m.   Arrival and check-in
5:00 p.m.   Reception

6:00 – 8:30 p.m.   Dinner, hosted by President, Luz Vega-Marquis
Traditional Prayer
Welcome and Purpose of Consultative Session
President Luz Vega-Marquis, Kyle Smith

Desired Outcomes
Honor commitment to continued relationship with Native American community
Clarify MCF approach to movement building
Seek reflections on MCF’s approach to philanthropy in Indian Country to date and advice on moving forward

MCF approach to Philanthropy
Introduction to the MCF framework
What we mean by “movement building”?
Movement building core competencies used to assess grantees?
Share examples?  Success?
MCF intended results

Key observations and learning’s

A Review of the Marguerite Casey Foundation Native Grants Portfolio – Louis Delgado

**DAY 2 - Friday February 18, 2011**
Indian Pueblo Cultural Center
Silver Meeting Room
2401 12th Street NW
Albuquerque, NM  87104

7:15 a.m.   Breakfast – the hotel provides a complimentary cooked-to-order breakfast

8:15 a.m.   Private shuttle will pick up at the hotel and transport

8:30 a.m.   Introduction and Desired Outcomes for the day
• Do we speak the same movement-building language?
• Discuss how MCF’s movement building model is visible in Indian Country
• Identify possible ways MCF can/should improve relationships with Indian Country
• Key observations and learning’s

9:00 a.m.   Develop a common understanding of MCF’s approach to Philanthropy
• MCF pursues its Movement Building goal by supporting the following four organizational strategies: Direct Service, Issues Education & Leadership Development, Advocacy, and Organizing. Its preference is to support organizations that are highly engaged in the latter three since they have the greatest potential for policy impact. However, MCF also supports direct service organizations if they actively engage in the other policy oriented change strategies as well.
• Is there a shared understanding of these strategies? What needs translating?
• Detailed description of MCF Framework and Model
• Discuss five movement building competencies

10:30 a.m.   Break

10:45 a.m.   Can we identify more organizations that implement these desired strategies and exhibit the core competencies? What specific actions can we take to cast a wide net and identify and attract the communities, projects and organizations doing the best work?

12:15-1:00 p.m.   Lunch

1:00 p.m.   Next steps. Thank you.
Is there a future role for an advisory team?
Proceedings paper

Closing prayer

2:00 p.m.   Departure (The private shuttle will return to Embassy Suites)