

# Funding Sustainability Working Group Report

BCEOHRN Scientific Exchange & Annual  
General Meeting  
November 20, 2009  
Sutton Place Hotel, Vancouver



British Columbia  
Environmental and Occupational  
Health Research Network

Connecting and supporting people to create  
excellence in research and training in  
occupational and environmental health

Funded by



Michael Smith Foundation for  
Health Research

## FSWG

- BCEOHRN funding from MSFHR ceases  
3/31/2010
- FSWG (Dr. Hugh Davies, Dr. Tanya Wahbe,  
Pat Atherton):
  - performed environmental scan of funding model  
options
  - interviewed fundraisers
  - produced draft budgets and funding options, and
  - produced the Funding Sustainability Strategic  
Plan document



# Funding Models

1. Status Quo – find another major granting agency
2. Partnership – multiple sources of funding
  - i. fully funding all activities
  - ii. core funding + ad-hoc funding of events
3. Fully Volunteer – no core funding, ad-hoc funding of events



# Funding Models

1. Status Quo – find another major granting agency
2. Partnership – multiple sources of funding
  - i. fully funding all activities
  - ii. core funding + ad-hoc funding of events
3. Fully Volunteer – no core funding, ad-hoc funding of events



## Core Funding Model

- Identify core funding from membership fees and institutions for core functionality
- Fund additional functions/events on an ad-hoc basis, funded through event sponsorship and grants
- Benefits:
  - show commitment to future funders
  - feasible, flexible
  - easier goal to reach in a short time frame
  - gives continuity to core functionality
  - provides solid base to pursue further funding
  - organizations already support work we do



## Core Functionality?

- Nominally:
  - Website
  - Databases
  - Annual conference
  - Mentoring support
- Want membership input!
  - Fill out our survey.....

## Annual Budget?

- Dependent on core functionality

Budget Item	Cost
Website content support	30,000
Database content support	15,000
Annual Meeting	35,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$80,000</b>

## Fundraising Strategies

- Government grants (CIHR, MSFHR, etc.)
- Sponsorship (industry, government, etc.)
- Research institution support
- Membership fees



# Fundraising Strategies

- Government grants (CIHR, MSFHR, etc.)
- Sponsorship (industry, government, etc.)
- Research institution support - **\$60,000 +**
- Membership fees



# Membership Fees

Membership Type	Dues	% of membership	N	Income
Industry	\$50	6%	30	\$1,500
Government	\$50	6%	30	\$1,500
Researcher	\$50	27%	135	\$6,750
Health Authority	\$50	12%	60	\$3,000
Unions	\$50	5%	25	\$1,250
Non-profits	\$25	5%	25	\$625
Aboriginal Groups	\$25	5%	25	\$625
Student / Postdoc	\$25	34%	170	\$4,250
		100%	500	<b>\$19,500</b>



# Prioritized Targeted Sponsorship

## Priority 1: Core ✓

### Priority 2: Necessary

Seminar series  
Content-specific full-day workshops  
Research lunch seminars  
Grant-writing support

### Priority 3: Desirable

Conference travel bursaries  
Student sponsorships  
Health research projects  
Research development grants



# Change in Framework and Scope

- BCEOHRN currently exists as non-legal entity -
  - Obtain not-for-profit status
- Will be examining possibilities of mergers -
  - Could become national in scope



## What's next?

- Discussion
- Information gathering
- Revised plan
- Action!
  - Fundraising

## BCEOHRN Aims

- Enabling inter-institutional collaboration.
- Student support and mentoring.
- Improved knowledge transfer.

## Discussion

- Aims?
- Core functions?
- Fundraising?
- Membership fees?
- Collaborations?
- New networking ideas?

## Status Quo Model

- Maintain existing functionality
- Requires no adjustment of BCEOHRN goals and priorities
- Identify a single source competition to cover the current annual operating budget of \$500,000:
  - NSERC's Strategic Network Grant Program if eligible
  - MSFHR has made no announcement for a new RFA



## Partnership Model Options

1. Full Partnership Funding Model
  - a. BCEOHRN objectives and funding goal identified
  - b. Partners asked to contribute to a general fund or to fund/co-fund specific objectives
2. Assured Core Funding Model \*\* (most flexible and promising)
  - a. Identify core funding from membership fees and institutions for core functionality by 28/2/2010
  - b. Proceed with additional functions/events on an ad-hoc basis, obtaining funding through event sponsorship and grants



# Fully Volunteer Model

Based on CARWH model:

- no membership fees
- volunteer Board
- no staff
- ad-hoc event funding
- partner with other agencies to run conferences



	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Status Quo Model</b>	Maximum benefit to members	Less certainty
	Uses existing, working model; no need to change	Funding applications require much time and effort (likely volunteer Board time)
<b>Partnership – I. Full Partnership</b>	Member/inst'l contributions show commitment to future funders	No identifiable funding agency, currently; most agencies do not fund networks
	Somewhat flexible	We are new at fundraising
	Partnership with national organizations allows leveraging of funds and growth in scope	Time frame to fundraise for full support is too long for our short-term goals
	BCEOHRN may expand and evolve into sponsor-driven areas	Not focused on core functionality
	Allows for reciprocal benefits	Some items more fundable than others
	Several organizations already support work we do (e.g., WorkSafeBC)	Requires a fundraiser to meet face-to-face with sponsors and improve success of letter writing campaign; not a MSFHR eligible expense
<b>Partnership – II. Core Funding</b>	Member/inst'l contributions show commitment to future funders	We can not carry on doing everything we currently do
	Feasible	We are new at fundraising
	More flexible	A bit more certainty
	Easier goal to reach in a short time frame	Some things we do will have to change (e.g., more volunteers, less wine)
	Gives continuity to core functionality	Pursuit of further funding will require volunteer Board time due to limited staff
	Provides solid base to pursue further funding	
	Several organizations already support work we do	
<b>Full Volunteer</b>	Minimal cost requirements	No/minimal staff
		Greater pressure on volunteer Board
		Much more ad hoc work
		Requires finding partners for events



## Grant Applications

- Some budget items could be covered by a specific grant to our network
- The FSWG created a list of possible grant applications to which we could apply
- A possibility exists to partner with NEAHR, which would strengthen grant applications



## Institutional Support

- Support from universities/agencies would be solicited at \$5,000 - \$25,000 each
- Combined with membership fees, these would be instrumental in establishing a core funding stream from which to base additional targeted fundraising work using other approaches
- The FSWG created an extensive list of institutions we could solicit for support



# Sponsorship

- List of sponsors
- Menu List for sponsors to select from under the following categories:
  - Knowledge transfer
  - Networking
  - Capacity building
  - Research advancement
- Letter Writing Campaign, including:
  - Funding List – sponsors
  - Menu List
  - Template letters tailored by group

