

**Nonprofit 911 – November 3, 2009**  
**How to Build Your Nonprofit's Brand to**  
**Engage Today's Value-Conscious Supporters**  
with Mirm Kriegel  
Sponsored by Network for Good

The MP3 audio transcript can be found at  
[www.fundraising123.org](http://www.fundraising123.org) or [www.nonprofit911.org](http://www.nonprofit911.org)

**Rebecca Higman:** So without further ado, I am really excited to introduce our special guest speaker. Mirm Kriegel runs the Philanthropy and Social Enterprise practice at BBMG, which is a nationally recognized branding and integrated marketing firm that is dedicated to creating innovative brands that engage and inspire today's increasingly conscious consumers.

So with a lot of experience in both marketing and development, Mirm has managed national as well as international marketing campaigns in the nonprofit sector. So some of her recent clients include the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Interaction, Ocean Conservancy, and Interfaith Alliance.

Prior to BBMG, Mirm was the director of marketing at United Jewish Community, formerly UJA, a \$2 billion annual enterprise where she led a national branding initiative for 150 local affiliates. And in terms of her education, Mirm earned a BA from Duke University and a Master's in Strategic Communications from Columbia University.

So without further ado, I am happy to turn the floor over to Mirm to get us started.

**Mirm Kriegel:** Great. Thank you so much Rebecca, and thanks everyone so much for allowing me to join your call today. I want to share with you some thinking around elevating your brand, especially in this holiday season.

We framed this topic "From Legacy to Leadership: Is Philanthropy Ready for the New Consumer?" And the thinking behind it was that as we looked in the landscape, we noticed that a lot of the larger nonprofit iconic brands were losing market share to some smaller more nimble counterparts who were doing some innovative things in branding and reaching the new consumer in ways that other organizations weren't.

And this really spoke to the broader philanthropic landscape, and we wanted to take a look at this and see how we might be able to elevate those organizations that are losing mind share and market share, if you will, to some others in this as the competition gets all the more stiff in this new economy.

So that is the frame for today. A little bit about us and our agency as Rebecca mentioned. We are an integrated marketing agency, but we really see ourselves as a social change

agency that happens to use branding as the vehicle to deliver social impact and social good.

We see ourselves as sitting at the intersection of branding social purpose and innovation. We are about six and a half years old and we have got an office in New York and in San Francisco. You can learn a little bit more about us if you want at [BBMG.com](http://BBMG.com).

Just a little note about what we are going to cover today. We are really going to cover three sections, if you will. The first is sort of a Branding 101 through five laws of branding that we will walk you through in just a moment. Then we are going to look at some trends shaping the marketplace and the conscious consumer, as Rebecca alluded to. And then finally, we will look at a couple of case studies that put branding and looking at the conscious consumer into action so you can see how they are applied; one with a much larger and perhaps more familiar brand and one with a much smaller brand, recognizing that we have got all sizes here on the phone today.

So first I want to start with the Five Laws of Branding and our approach to branding as a whole. But before we do that and go into the laws, just a little bit about what a brand is and is not.

I will tell you that a brand is not your logo, and that is one of the first things that people seem to confuse when they think about branding. They think about a logo. And anyone who calls and says, “We want a new brand. We want a new logo,” we realize that there is a much bigger picture that they need to consider.

A brand is really what you stand for, and it is made up of three things. Your message, everything you say in the world, how you articulate your brand or your organization, your image, how you represent yourself visually in the world, and, first and foremost, your experience, how everyone interacts with your brand across every interaction, every touch point. So those are the three key things that make up a brand, message, image, and experience.

When we talk about the five laws of branding, the first law that we really adhere to is the “Law of the Word”. And this essentially says that every brand must stand for a word or idea in the mind of its audience. So when you think about your own organization, what is it at the end of the day that you stand for? What is that one word or idea?

Just to give you a quick example or two, if we were to look at the category of car and look at the word “safety”, most people know straight away that they think of Volvo, because Volvo has done an incredible job owning the word safety.

Now in fairness, unfortunately, I would say that the nonprofit landscape has done a less stellar job at owning a specific word or idea in terms of distilling it, but there are a couple of outstanding examples out there.

If we think about the international space, just international in general, and children, often what comes to mind in terms of the organization that really owns that is UNICEF. Alternatively, if we think about the space of cancer research and cure, the very first organization that comes to mind for so many people is Susan G. Komen. And interestingly enough, they have done such a phenomenal job of owning the word cure that they changed their name from the Susan G. Komen Foundation to Susan G. Komen for the Cure. They really own “cure”. So that is the law of the word.

The second is the “Law of Focus,” and this says that the power of your brand is inversely proportionate to its scope. Now simply put, that means that the more you say, the less you can communicate. And that is especially challenging for us in the nonprofit space who so often think, “OK. If I could only just articulate a little bit more clearly why they need to give. Maybe I will get them to increase their gift, or get them involved, or get them to volunteer.” But often, that is actually a deterrent, and the more we say, the less we communicate.

So this simply put is, “Less is more.” So how we focus our unique value proposition is really made up of three things. One is the organization’s strength. What is it that you do particularly well and exceptionally well, better than others in your space? How is it relevant to your target audience and what is that you are doing that other organizations aren’t addressing? What is it that you are doing uniquely?

That intersection between your strengths, what you are doing uniquely that no other organization is doing and the relevance to your target market, that intersection is that sweet spot that we call the unique value proposition.

So if you take nothing else from this hour, it would be learning how to identify your unique value proposition. That is critically important to articulating your brand message.

And one example of this, to bring it to light, is a brand becomes stronger when you narrow its focus. If you think about...I know that your phones are muted, so you can’t respond to this. But when we ask in workshops, how many people have heard of children’s super mart, very few hands go up. But then when we say, “How many of you have heard of Toys ‘R Us?” pretty much everyone in the room raises their hand. And the reason is Children’s Super Mart...actually, Toys ‘R Us used to be Children’s Super Mart. And when they realized that they were just not gaining market share and they need to focus their brand, they focused on toys, decided to own the word “toys”, and their market share, I believe, in a single year increased something like 40%; phenomenal. And now they are obviously a multi-billion dollar business.

The next law is “The Law of Leadership,” and this is really about claiming a category where you can be the first, the largest, the only, and the best. And the whole premise here is that leadership is the single most important motivating factor in consumer behavior.

So if we look at an organization, let’s say in the nonprofit landscape, the National Humane Society. Their positioning and their leadership category they claim is, “The

nation's largest and most effective animal protection organization." That is what they say on their website. Now, they may or may not be the most effective. That could be somewhat subjective, but they are in fact the largest animal protection organization in the country.

But what happens if you are not the largest, or the first, or the only? How can you claim that category of leadership? Well the trick there is then to narrow the category. If you don't have a leading brand, create a new category where you can claim leadership.

So, for instance, if we look at the North Shore Animal League in this space of animal rescue, we see that they are the world's largest no-kill rescue and adoption organization. They have narrowed the category.

We look at the Potter League, which is a shelter in Rhode Island. They are the first shelter in the country to be League certified, so that is the category they are owning. They are the first, but in this particular category, to be League certified.

And then finally, we have got the Animal Welfare League of Chicago, and their leadership category is Chicago's largest Humane Society. So you can see the narrowing of the category and the idea there.

The fourth law of leadership is what we call "The Law of Authenticity," and this is really all about walking your talk. This is backing your words by your actions. And this is so critical, especially in this day of Web 2.0 technologies and anyone being able to go online and break or build your brand in a minute. And we will talk about that in more depth later on. The Law of Authenticity is all the more critical. It is about living your values.

And just to give you an example of that in our nonprofit landscape, there is an organization called The New American Dream who was a client of ours a few years ago. When we worked with them they were really all about energy preservation, minimizing consumption, and preserving energy and the environment. And actually, their positioning was a little challenging because America is all about "More, more, more." They want to do "less, less, less." So we needed to flip the paradigm here and change their positioning to more of what matters.

And in that, to live those values of more of what matters, more time with family, more time outdoors, more time to yourself for personal fulfillment, etc, their staff gets a four day work week as part of that. So if there was ever an indication of an organization living its values, it is certainly that, in terms of enabling their own employees to live more of what matters.

And finally, the fifth law of branding is "The Law of Consistency," and this essentially says that a brand needs to stand for something clear and consistent over time. And when you change your brand, it is not about fads and chasing fads and new trends, it is that the brand really needs to build that consistency. And when you change your brand to chase a

fad, some bad things can happen. There are a couple of odd examples here where we have to wonder what they were thinking.

Harley Davidson, at one point, came out with a cake decorating kit, which does not align to seamlessly with the Harley Davidson biker brand or motorcycle brand.

Another example was Burger King, which recently, this past spring I believe, came out with Flame, which is a meat scented perfume. That doesn't seem terribly on brand with the company.

So this is something to think about, particularly when you are aligning with causes. What is it that works well and makes sense with a brand when you are aligning with corporations to create cross-marketing partnerships and things like that? This notion of consistency is critically important.

We also have five principles of branding which speak very broadly to the process of branding, and I will just touch on a couple of them that are important here.

One is that a brand is strategic. We never do branding for branding's sake. It needs to embrace an organization's goal or mission. So branding is really a means to an end here, and that is why, again, at BBMG we see ourselves as a social change agency. We are delivering on a broader proposition of social change.

And the other one that I would just speak to right now is that a brand is empowering, that it needs to be empowering, that it needs to be co-owned. It needs to engage stakeholders, donors, supporters where they are. And we will talk about that in some detail too.

So those are the five laws of branding, and we will be summing those up as takeaways. And you will also be able to follow this along as we get to the presentation.

I just want to also call attention to those of you who do have the presentation and call follow along, we are now on slide 22, I believe. Let me just double check that. Yes, slide 22, talking about the contextual moment here in the broader context.

So if we look at the trends today in the marketplace, and this is the next section where we are thinking more about the consumer, the first big trend that we are noticing out there, which is pretty obvious, is that trust in our institutions is down. With billion dollar bailouts and the return of mega-bonuses and the collapse of Wall Street, the trust, not just in our financial institutions, but also in the foundations who have been supporting nonprofits and nonprofits themselves. I mean even the Madoff scandal and Ponzi schemes have really tarnished the nonprofit landscape as well. Those that were victims in that have even become culprits. "Why weren't you doing your due diligence?" There is more of a demand for transparency and things like that.

So it is fair that we can expect more scrutiny of the organization at all levels, things to these scandals, and budget pressures, and the new 990. Now with that, of course, is a

demand for transparency, that transparency is of intense scrutiny, and again, as I mentioned, foundations associated with investments and victims becoming culprits-that type of thing. So transparency is up and we need to basically report out and measure the impact of every dollar we have.

Now I believe this is actually slide 22. My apologies. Innovation is the new imperative. As they say, "Necessity is the mother of invention," well, necessity here is the mother of innovation. Innovation has gone mainstream now with the offices of social innovation and impact.

B-Core is the integration of the nonprofit and for profit sector. The blurring of the sectors is at the table with the Obama administration, indicating how we can deliver on this with the social enterprise. So this is an absolutely critical demand. More nonprofits are expected to do more with less. That is a demand that calls for innovation.

So with that, there are five key trends that are shaping the marketplace today. The first, which Rebecca alluded to in this crowded landscape, is this notion of clutter.

In 1940 there were 12,000 registered nonprofits in the US. And today there are more than 1.5 million. So you can imagine the need to stand out and build your brand. That reflects, by the way, just in 10 years, from 1998-2008, there has been 32.7% growth. That is massive, massive growth for a single field, a single sector.

Slide 28, Fall in Crunch, is the next trend here. 80% of nonprofits surveyed are under financial stress, with four in 10 of those reporting their stress is severe or very severe. That is a quote taken straight out of Johns Hopkins study for civil society. And there is enormous strain on nonprofits today with falling revenues, increasing costs, and delays in government payments. In addition, the giving levels, incidentally, of 2007 won't be restored again until 2017. So there is a real strain, as we are all feeling, on the nonprofit landscape.

Slide 29, we are talking about this trend toward co-ownership. And as I mentioned just a few moments ago, a brand must be empowering. So when we talk about co-ownership, this is really about inviting your stakeholders, your supporters, your donors to help create content around the brand, to be your own champions and ambassadors to the brand.

And one very indicative quote of this sort of state of where we are today in terms of trends from Jonathan Greenblatt, who is a professor at the Anderson School of Management at UCLA, and he is the cofounder of Ethos Brands, he launched Ethos Water, says, "There is more computing power in our Blackberries than there was in the control room in Houston that put a man on the moon." That speaks volumes about the power that consumers have in co-owning the brand.

If we look at the next slide, we see this rise of self organized groups into cause focused swarms. You can see all of the millions of websites out there that are allowing us to talk about the brand, to start a conversation, to be influencers around the brand, whether it is

Youtube, whether it is Flickr, or whatever it may be. This is about user generated content, so there is a real opportunity there for consumers to own that brand.

And just a couple of examples to bring this to life in terms of co-owning the brand. As Obama has so often cited, his campaign is the perfect example of this, with good reason, you can see just a sample of his homepage on his site, Organizing for America, because it is about youth. The paradigm changes. It is not about the organization anymore. It is about the individual, what we would call the consumer, because at the end of the day, the consumer is your next donor. But it is your consumer, your supporter, your donor; however you choose to view them. It is about them, not the organization. And so when we talk, that is how we need to be speaking.

On the next slide we look at the challenge here. And just last week, actually, I got this email in my inbox inviting people to submit a 30 second commercial as to why our nation needs healthcare reform. So again, it is about inviting the user.

And the next slide speaks to the example of, “Nearly 1,000 excellent videos were submitted. We need you to help us narrow down to the top 20. Vote on your favorites.” So again, it is about inviting the consumer to play a role in shaping the landscape here.

Another example was The Smithsonian Museum. This talk about moving a legacy brand into a leadership position, this is a very old and somewhat conservative brand that is trying to move into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. And earlier this year in May or June, they invited stakeholders to envision, to submit their ideas for how they saw The Smithsonian’s Museums and websites going in the future, where they saw them going and how they could make The Smithsonian more relevant in a digital age.

So this was a very honest and transparent effort in inviting the broader public to help shape that vision, and then inviting them to really be a part of history.

So look at the next slide. We are talking about convergence. And this is a trend I just alluded to with B-Core. This is a very interesting phenomenon that has been happening over the past several years where there has been a blurring of the sectors, of the nonprofit and the for-profit sector. The lines have been collapsing as nonprofits look to find more revenue generating streams, and for-profits look to find or put a social promise, build a social promise, into their mission.

So those blurring lines create the for-benefit sector. And what is interesting about this is our own corporate law hasn’t even kept up with this trend. There is no real tax status yet for this blurry, murky middle of the for-benefit sector. That is one of the things that B-Lab and B-Corp are doing. They are a nonprofit that certifies mission driven companies, B-Lab, and they are looking to further define the tax structure so that these mission driven or revenue generating nonprofits can in fact function best legitimately.

Just incidentally, a lot of this work is being done on the state level. And in Vermont, for instance, they have already got some laws on the books that are intended for companies

that put their missions before their profits. So it is a slightly different tax status than for a regular for-profit company.

There has been a huge rise in this. And just in terms of the nonprofit side, the increase in commercial revenue has grown over almost 220%. And that is from 1982 to 2002. That is actually the most recent statistic I was able to find from the Social Enterprise Alliance. And if anything has anything more specific, I would welcome that. That is the most recent data I have to date.

But \$252 billion is generated as commercial revenue for nonprofits. That is a really compelling trend in looking at how nonprofits are innovating, and trying to limit overhead, and trying to maximize and diversify their funding sources.

Another example of the convergence is looking at how nonprofits are changing from critic to consultant. If we look at the next slide, we are talking about the Rainbow Alliance, for instance, which at one point would have been waving its finger and wagging its finger at Wal-Mart is now working with them to create fair trade coffee and put fair trade coffee in their stores, and to help them align with their mission that way. So that is quite a transformation over the past several years.

Another example is a business that is actually driven to do good, as if that is the intention of the business, that the mission drives the business. So if we look at Greyston Bakery, for instance, and the Do-Goodie Brownie on the next slide, you see that they say here, "We don't hire people to bake brownies. We bake brownies to hire people." And their entire mission is hiring hard to employ people, many of them formerly incarcerated individuals who have been struggling to find work. So Do-Goodie Brownies, or Greyston Bakery, which creates the Do-Goodie brownie, has been designed for that specific purpose. The mission drives the business.

The fifth trend, finally, is this idea of consciousness, that consumers are redefining value in the new economy, that it is not just about value, but also values. They are shaping their behaviors, their purchasing decisions, and how they choose to align their actions.

So if we look at the conscious consumer today, they are asking not just, "What am I buying?" but, "What am I buying into?" That is really the key question they are asking when they buy something.

So when we talk about the values that drive them, this will become quickly relevant to the nonprofit space in a moment, we see that they are health and safety, honesty, convenience, relationships, and doing good. So we have got a big mix there of some real practical benefits around convenience, health and safety, relationships. It is about connecting to a broader community and doing good, so some social benefit there, as well.

If we look at the conscious consumer and segment them a little bit, what we found was... And I am happy to provide more data and demographic details around the conscious consumer offline if anyone wants to connect with me afterward. I just don't

want to get to granular here. But when we studied them further, we found that they fall really into four categories.

The enlightened, which is 10% of the population, and they are those who would go over and above, outside the bounds of practical convenience and cost to align their purchases with their values. They will spend four or five more dollars on the purchase so they can get the one that is going to be the most eco-friendly. Aspirational- those who intend to do that where they can but are also bound by practical limitations. Practicals, who are solely focused on the practical driver- price and convenience. And then indifferents- those who just really aren't engaged in the conversation at all.

One of the things that we found quite interesting when we asked them what the most important issues were when we conducted our conscious consumers study and survey was that health, education, and safe drinking water rose to the top. Cruelty to animals, global warming, and world hunger were at the bottom.

And that doesn't mean, for those of you who are working in the animal rescue space, or environmental organizations, or humanitarian relief, that this is a lost cause. But what it does mean is that these causes were not positioned as personally relevant to the individuals. Whereas, healthcare, education, and safe drinking water, the benefit to the individual is clear and transparent. Whereas, with the others, the question of, "What is in it for me? Why should I care?" was a little less transparent. So that is how we need to focus on elevating those key issues- cruelty to animals, global warming, and world hunger in particular, and making those more personally relevant to the individual.

So what is this segmentation mean in terms of the enlightened? 10% of the conscious consumers are enlightened, so who cares? Why should we care? Well, interestingly enough, what we found through our research was that enlightened are three times more likely to be early adopters. So of a cause, of a purchase, they are three times more likely to reward or punish the brand, to shape the conversations, in other words, with their peers about how one should be thinking about a brand or not. They are, in other words, the influencers. They are three times more likely to influence in a positive or a negative way how people perceive a brand. And they are four times more likely to blog, post, and review about it.

So that is incredibly important to know when you are looking for champions of your brand. Who do we go after? We can't clearly connect to the entire donor base, so who do we really focus our energies on? And this is one example of why we need to focus on that 10%.

And so the takeaway here on the next slide is that 10 is greater than 90. That is the bottom line, that when we engage the most passionate 10% in the conversation, we provide the enlightened consumers with the platform to voice their concerns, and their needs, and their new ideas. So engaging them, providing them with a platform, basically allows and enables them to do the work for you.

So with that, all of this sets up context for what we call “The triple value proposition.” And this is an approach to branding that really delivers on three dimensions of value—personal relevance, again, we spoke about those top issues and those values of convenience and health and safety, social purpose, “What is it that we are doing good for the community?” and meaningful participation.

So this is our approach to branding, that if your brand can answer those key questions around a triple value proposition, then you are miles ahead of other people.

So I mentioned at the top of the hour about focusing on the unique value proposition, that intersection of what you do especially well, how it is important to your stakeholder, and what you are doing that no other organization is addressing. And that intersection is the unique value proposition.

So if we are going to take that one step further and elevate that into a triple value proposition, then what we really want to answer are, “What are your organization’s practical, social, and tribal benefits?” And the key questions to really ask here are, practical: “How does the brand improve my life? What is in it for me? Why should I care?”

This speaks to another trend out there that is around the idea of enlightened self interest, that no longer today can we really count on people supporting us because it is the right thing to do. That is just not enough. You saw the numbers. We are at 1.5 five million nonprofits in this country. In such a crowded marketplace, it is not enough to rely on altruism. We need to appeal to their personal enlightened self interests and make your cause personally relevant to the individual.

The second is social: “How does a brand help me make a difference in the world?” This is where, as an industry, nonprofits have always done a very good job, because that question is really imbued in the mission of the organization, sort of what we have used as a starting point to date.

So practical has been largely ignored, and that is an area that we need to focus on. Social—we need to continue to articulate, but now it’s really around impact. What kind of impact have we left? And that’s why we talked a little bit about transparency and scrutiny, and innovation and the need to innovate; how are we really delivering on this in the most effective way? The bar has been raised and so we need to address that.

Then finally, tribal, and this speaks to the whole notion of co-ownership that we just spent some time talking about; the tribal benefit. How does the brand connect me to a community that shares my value and hopes and aspirations? What kind of values are shared by this community and what is it about this organization that creates a community? How can the organization cultivate a community of believers and shared values? So what are those values, articulating them, and how can you get others to join the cause?

So that speaks first and foremost to that 10%, that passionate 10% who are going to champion your cause and use social media and other vehicles to spread the word, if you will, down to the broader platform; but again, focusing on that 10%. So that's the triple value proposition of practical, social and tribal, and the key questions that we need to ask and answer if we're really going to break through the clutter in this marketplace.

So finally I just want to look at some case studies that highlight and use the triple value proposition -two very different organizations that do this in different ways.

The first is Harvard Kennedy School. Now this is an iconic legacy institution, if you will. Call this looking back to the future, because if you think about this... Well, first of all, their challenge here at Harvard, at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, was that they were losing market share to a lot of other schools: NYU Wagner, other nonprofit management schools, public policy schools, Woodrow Wilson and Princeton, and also even other peer schools at Harvard itself: Harvard Law and Harvard Business.

They were sort of being perceived a little bit as the stepchild here and not quite getting the market share they deserved and the mind share. Those of you who have the printout of the presentation can see that the original screen shot of their website had a particularly long and confounding tag line which was, "Preparing leaders for service to democratic societies contributing to the solution of public problems."

That's a mouthful and that was really hard to say. So needless to say, they have not honed the law of the word there, so we needed to crystallize and instill what Harvard Kennedy School was about. What it came down to at the end of the day was really harnessing this historic call to service and leveraging the Kennedy name as it relates to Harvard University, which is why we came up with the rename, "Harvard Kennedy School: Ask what you can do."

What's interesting about this was that this was really about going back to the future; to owning the Kennedy name and the Kennedy legacy and embracing legacy, in a sense, because it is in fact so clearly relevant to this generation of graduate students. This is a call to service that really transcends party lines.

They had moved away from the Kennedy name and sort of intentionally sublimated it thinking that it was too partisan. You know, they were thinking about it in terms of party politics and not about this broader call to service that really transcends politics. So "ask what you can do" became the new platform.

There's some collateral around it, which when you get the presentation you can see, with the website and the Kennedy name and vision image and face; and also a simple view book with the very simple call to action up top, "Ask", which makes this case for why Harvard Kennedy School public service global good, and it extends the Harvard Kennedy

School platform from the school of government to public service. This can connect to the business sector, to the social sector.

It was too limiting to call this the School of Government because as we see these sectors blending and converging, it opens the pathways to so many more avenues of involvement here.

So finally, if we go to Slide 60 and we look at the triple value proposition, how they articulated practical, tribal and social benefits, we see practical was really all about prestige, status, resources and connections. Those are the very clear practical and personally relevant benefits to someone attending Harvard Kennedy School, or teaching at, or involved with Harvard Kennedy School.

The social benefit was pretty transparent here. It was a clear call to action. It was “Ask what you can do” and it’s about making a difference in the world through public service.

Then finally, the tribal component is really delivered through an alumni network that promises access to leading thinkers and influencers in the social sector. The real message behind this is that membership has its privileges. When you become a student, or graduate, or member of the faculty or staff of Harvard Kennedy School, you are part of an elite group that has access to leading thinkers and influencers, and can really transform the world and make a difference.

So that is one example of an organization that has embraced the triple value proposition and moved, in a sense, from legacy to leadership, ironically, in this sense, by embracing its own legacy.

On the flip side we have another initiative which is not of a single organization, but a group of organizations, the American Association of Engineering Societies and the American Society of Civil Engineers, and also WGBH Educational Foundation-that’s the public television station in Boston.

On Slide 61 you see the campaign that they wanted to do. Their effort was to move a...they wanted to transform the field of engineering, this sort of stodgy...Not so much stodgy, but really, I guess, male, white, number-crunching, die-hard male field and make it more appealing and palatable to a whole new consumer base; to reposition engineering as a creative, collaborative, lucrative and flexible career choice for a new base of young, wired women.

That was really their goal because they were not getting a diverse core of applicants pursuing engineering either as a degree or as a career. So this is about transforming an entire industry, essentially, and repositioning it. This, unlike Harvard, was a real reconnection with history.

This is about breaking from the past. So you can see some of the key messages here were really in embracing this notion. The frame became “Engineer your life” and there were really clear calls to action and why you’ll love it. The positioning as an opportunity for creativity and a lucrative, flexible career choice was a very clear, practical benefit that spoke to this cohort. They went straight for the practical here in highlighting that.

They also emphasized the social in their calls to action, talked about how an engineer can make a difference “by”...whether it was transforming the wetlands, or helping to engineer prosthetic devices for people who need limb replacement, who have lost limbs, rather. So there are all kinds of initiatives in which engineering can leave a real social impact in addition to building bridges, which of course improves society, but these were other ways to deliver on that social impact.

And then finally, there was a tribal component. If you look at Slide 63 you see this is just one of many fan sites that they created through this initiative. They actually have about 8,800 fans now across a few different fan pages around this sort of tribal idea of engineering life and cultivating this younger audience around this.

So they’ve done a fantastic job through this initiative with training, and webinars, and training engineers and educators about how to talk about engineering. They’ve reached more than 40,000 high school and college kids, really by eliminating practical, social and tribal value of engineering.

So just to summarize, for the practical benefit it was really all about opportunity for creativity, the lucrative, flexible career choice. The social value really was for empowering girls for new educational and professional opportunities; dream jobs, if you will, around how engineering makes a difference. And if you go to the Engineer Your Life website, there’s a whole section on dream jobs and how engineering can help make a real social difference in the world. And then again, this tribal component with these 8,800 fans across the social media landscape. It really repositions engineering as a cause versus an industry, if you will, or simply a career.

Those are just two examples of how organizations that, one very large and one a whole lot smaller, are using the triple value proposition to communicate and break through the clutter and deliver their message.

Just to summarize now, in terms of key takeaways then, because there are a lot that we have thrown at you in the past hour, there are really three key takeaways that I would encourage you to think through.

One is this whole idea of the five laws of branding. When you are thinking through your brand and what you stand for, those five laws are about owning a word, focusing on your triple value proposition, leading a category, walking your talk, and knowing that consistency builds brands over time; so consistent across all materials and also consistent over time.

The other piece of a checklist is when you're looking at your message, image and experience, to ask yourself these questions When you're thinking about your message, especially when you think about the law of the word, would each stakeholder in your organization describe your brand in the same way? That's a really interesting exercise. If someone ever challenges a need to re-brand and you think, "Well we could really benefit from this", that's just one very basic exercise that could speak to whether or not you need to do this. Do most people think of your organization and then think, "Oh, that means X," and that same word comes to mind, or word or idea, or are there a number of different words, many of them inconsistent or completely diametrically opposed? Then that speaks to a need and there is a real misalignment that needs to get calibrated.

The next is brand image. Is your brand image used consistently across all communications vehicles? It seems fairly obvious, but it's surprising how many organizations think that the website has nothing to do with the print collateral, which has nothing to do with the signage. And in fact, everything in terms of brand image should be consistent. That's why we know the Red Cross logo and that's why we know the Pink Ribbon so well, because they have done such a good job of adhering to that consistency.

And then finally, the brand experience. Has your brand come to life in everything you do? Whether it is speeches, whether it is speeches made by board members or staff member, are people completely aligned and in every action and interaction is the brand coming through? Those are the three key checklist questions you want to ask yourself.

And then finally, again, just reviewing the triple value proposition to be able to really answer that triple value proposition of practical value: how is the brand personally relevant to me and how does it improve my life? Speaking about your organization and your brand's social value: how does it help me make difference in the world and how does it demonstrate social impact? Which means, for instance, more than just "Our brand touched 55,000 people last year." What does that mean? How many people did you feed? How many mouths did you feed? How many people did you teach to learn to read? What have they done since then? What have they gone on to do? Really tracking the impact over time is a compelling way to articulate social value.

And then finally, the tribal benefit. How does the brand connect me to a community that shares my values, hopes and aspirations? That's the triple value proposition. And I would just conclude then with just a broader takeaway from all of this in terms of looking at the trends and the landscape.

As philanthropy moves from 1.0 to 2.0, philanthropy of today and yesterday to philanthropy of tomorrow, we're moving away from the idea of altruism, as I mentioned before, to really this idea of enlightened self-interest. So messages need to appeal to that practical benefit.

Moving away from a focus on problems to focus on solutions, which speaks to that whole idea of social impact, and the same thing below it, moving away from delivering services

to delivering impact, or moving away from single donors to a community of believers, which really speaks to that whole idea of tribal value.

And again, the Obama campaign is such a compelling example of that. His fund-raising and really engaging the grassroots, wherever you fall on party lines, it's just very clear that he knew how to tap into the tribal value.

We spoke about this trend of convergence, and we are moving away from organizations being solely donations driven, relying solely on donations, to engaging in creating sustainable revenue streams. How are we going to create earned revenue for our organization that will continue over time?

We're moving away from a top-down structure to bottom-up. And this, again, really speaks to the idea of co-ownership and owning the brand. And that, of course, leads to the final shift, which is moving away from the power of the few and the day of the mega-donor making all of the decisions and having sole influence of the brand to voices of the many. And again, this speaks completely to the whole notion of web 2.0 and being able to engage in social media to rally your passionate 10 to then influence others out there to engage in your brand.

So if you had to crystallize all of the trends and the triple value proposition in a single picture, if you will, that shows how philanthropy is moving from yesterday to today and tomorrow, this is really how we move from legacy to leadership and how you can, by following these things, emerge as a leadership brand.

That is where we are now. I would welcome any questions. Of course, if you have any questions or want to follow up individually, my information is also here in this presentation. I can be reached at [mkriegel@bbmg.com](mailto:mkriegel@bbmg.com), but I'm happy to entertain any questions now.

**Rebecca:** Wonderful, thanks so much, Mirm. So for those of you who have not sent in questions yet, I would encourage you to send them in now. The email address is [fundraising123@networkforgood.org](mailto:fundraising123@networkforgood.org). If you want a clarification about any of the laws or any of the tips that Mirm shared, or if you wanted to share your nonprofit story and find out some advice of how it would apply to an organization like yours, feel free to submit that now and we will work it into our Q&A.

With that, we might as well go ahead and get started. Our first question says, "How do you recommend innovating when our board is stuck in their ways and they want to continue kind of business-as-usual for fear of alienating the old tried and true supporters?"

**Mirm:** That's a really good and tough question. If I understand the question correctly, how can we convince our board, essentially, to understand the value of innovation and not stay tried and true?

Well one way to do that, quite frankly, I think, is to share performance. This, of course, assumes that donors are down and dollars are down. That is pretty much a clear, tangible piece of evidence, if they need it, that it is time to innovate and start thinking in new ways.

I would also consider sharing successes of other nonprofits that have done very well by innovating. One example, we talk about this in the White Paper that is related to this presentation, is this idea of Charity Water. They are such a great example of this. They have been cited a lot in leveraging social media and Twitter to get the word out to fundraise on Twitter and things like that.

But just showing a couple of specific examples of organizations that have done so well by innovating may help to sway. The other thing I might say, while we're not fundraising consultants over here, but having worked in the nonprofit community for over ten years before working specifically in branding on the agency side, is engaging in getting some new, perhaps, young blood on the board and developing them, which, of course, so many of you do through young leadership councils and things like that. But perhaps being able to get a couple of younger voices on the board in a decision-making capacity could help to change the fabric of that.

**Rebecca:** Excellent. This next one says, "Can you go into co-owning a brand in more detail? Does that just mean social networking? Are there any other avenues for encouraging user-generated content?"

**Mirm:** That's a great point. It's not simply social networking, although that is a huge part of it. I think that's why so many organizations today, before they even think re-brand, they may not even think in those terms. They think, "Oh, we need this", and they think of it as a tool, they think of it as the end goal.

But social networking is really a tool, and co-ownership is a bit broader than that. It is a bit more of an end in the sense that you want to engage consumers in every way that you can. One example I give of co-ownership that goes outside of social network, for instance, because it is not just about what you do online is the Nike Run for the Human Race. I don't know how many of you are familiar with this or if you have even participated in it. I just did this actually two weekends ago.

It was "The day the world races," I think is there tagline. And it is a day across the globe when, literally, major cities across the world all participate in the Nike Human Race: The day the world races. And Nike insists that you wear their shirt when you register. I think it is the same all over the world. It is bright red shirt.

I live in New York, in Brooklyn, and the park that we ran in was called Prospect Park. And it was peak fall foliage; yellows, golds, reds. And there were a sea of thousands of runners, literally, in these red shirts running through the park. They all said Nike on them. It was as if though we were all co-owning, or we were active participants in the brand.

You couldn't have art directed a scene better than this. We were part of the environment, part of the foliage, and that is another example of co-ownership. It is not simply about social networks or social media. It is about truly owning the brand in some way by participating in some broader event. So that is just another example of how co-branding lives real time offline.

**Rebecca:** Great. Our next question comes from Katy, who works for an arts council in Michigan, and Katy says, "How do we identify that 10% cohort and then touch them in relevant ways that they become friends and ambassadors for our organization?"

**Mirm:** That is great. That is a really key question. I didn't go into that here. I think a lot of this is tapping into the tribal. And so much of this could very well be around, "Who do you know already who is loyal to the organization, who goes to your events, who has some influence in the community? Who do you know who is passionate, who is an opinion leader?" It is really about relationship building and cultivating those individual relationships.

And I guess that would probably be a role for as much of a community engagement person on staff as it may be for a development person. I mean it depends on the structure of your organization.

But ideally, those departments and those functions are not siloed, and this is one of the key reasons why when we look at organizations and how they operate, we see so much siloing between development and marketing. They are, in fact, so integrated in terms of the need to identify these kinds of people for this very reason that they have to be integrated functionally, as well, internally.

So the first thing I would suggest is making sure that, and this may already be the case, your development and marketing department or your development and marketing staff person, and, in many cases, they are the same person, are engaged and integrated and cultivating the people who you know closest to you. That is the best place to start, is with that lowest hanging fruit.

**Rebecca:** Great. Let's see. "In part of your presentation you were talking about doing an exercise to see what your brand is and to check consistency across different people who are familiar with your organization and see how they describe your brand. So do you have any recommendations of what to do if, for instance, your staff's internal perspective of the brand and external stakeholders... What if their perspective doesn't align? What if they view your organization differently? For instance, if the organization thinks that they are friendly, and welcoming, and have a really upbeat tone, but it turns out their supporters consider them kind of scientific and distant. How can you begin to address questions like that?"

**Mirm:** Yeah. Well that means clearly that, as you mentioned, there is a real misalignment. So this is where the idea of looking at a brand's message, image, and experience comes into play. I would literally look at it that linearly, if you have to, to think through, "OK. What are the messages that we are putting out there? What is the image? Does the image of our brand feel warm, and friendly, and welcoming, and accessible or does it actually feel a little bit cold, and we just think we are warm and friendly because we have a nice warm and friendly staff?"

And then finally, and most importantly, what is the experience? I would ask how your stakeholders and how those external folk are actually experiencing the brand. What is their interaction with it? Where do they see the brand appear? How are you engaging them? What is your tone? All of that.

So when you start to break it down into message, image, and experience like that and really look at what is out there in the world versus what you perceive, it is a matter of calibrating those issues; calibrating your language, calibrating the image to match the language, and also, of course, making sure that you engage them and that this isn't a one way conversation.

**Rebecca:** Wonderful. OK. So this one, especially in the case of the case study when you were talking about the Kennedy School, this question says, "Do you feel that taglines are important to an organization's branding activities?"

**Mirm:** Yeah, the ever important tagline question. I would actually say that taglines are becoming less important. Without going into too much detail here, we have a whole other presentation on taglines alone, and in the same way that we talk about sort of Philanthropy 1.0 versus 2.0, Branding 1.0 is very much all about the logo and the tagline. Branding 2.0 is so much more about the experience and creating an empowering platform.

And all too often I think that organizations get too hung up on a tagline. In the case of the Harvard Kennedy School and "Ask what you can do," that was, in a sense, a tagline, but it was so much more than that. It was really what we call the "brand driver". It was the promise. It was the call to action.

So it was about making sure that Harvard projected that idea of "Ask what you can do" through every piece of their communication. And what that did was it, first of all, broadened the platform, again, from government to public service, and it was a call to action that way.

So we didn't see it so much as simply a tagline. And I would encourage organizations not to get bogged by taglines. In many cases it can be very helpful positioning, but I don't think that every organization has to have a tagline.

**Rebecca:** OK. And I think just to round out the call, we will finish with this question that just says, “Do you have any recommendations for getting this process started if we haven’t done any sort of branding exercises in the past, especially going into end of year and holiday fundraising? Do you have any ideas of how to get started and what folks should do?”

**Mirm:** Yeah. That is a great point. I would say first, looking at this notion, and I really glossed over it just in the interest of time, but the idea that branding is strategic, that it is intended not...we don’t just do a logo and tagline for branding’s sake, but that it needs to advance the organization’s goal and mission.

First, just putting that on paper, articulating it, making sure that everyone is on the same page with what that is. What are your goals? And I don’t mean the mission statement. I mean what are your goals for the upcoming couple of years? I mean what do you have in your strategic plan? What do you want to see accomplished? What does success look like?

Once you have been able to identify that, then the question around branding is, “How can message, image, and experience, how can our brand make that happen?”

And so the idea of starting with the “law of the word” and asking, “What is it that we stand for and what do we want to stand for?” and then repositioning and elevating your strengths to that.

I would say the best place to start after identifying your strategic goals for the coming few years is to look at that law of focus. What are the organization’s strengths? What is most important to our audience and what are we doing that no one else is? How can we elevate and really claim our sweet spot there? And then, move from there to the triple value proposition.

**Rebecca:** Excellent. Oh, and we have one more under the wire. I don’t want to cut Delilah off, so I am just going to sneak this one in too.

**Mirm:** Sure!

**Rebecca:** Thank you so much Mirm! I think this might relate to other folks on the phone who maybe are involved in membership organizations or other organizations that basically are not direct service.

So for instance, in Delilah’s case, Delilah says, “My organization is an intermediary community development organization. That means that we work with organizations that work with the community. And that makes it very difficult for us to do fundraising and other activities. So do you have any recommendations for intermediaries like us?”

**Mirm:** I certainly understand that, having worked for an intermediary organization myself for many years. I think the same rules apply. It is just that you have got a different group of stakeholders there.

If I am understanding the question correctly, where you can't actually fundraise or you are not technically suppose to fundraise because you are supported by membership dues, then the case is essentially that your stakeholders are your member organizations. How are you making yourselves relevant to them? How are you delivering for the members versus the end community?

So that is an important calibration that still applies, but who you are practically relevant to changes and it becomes relevant on an organizational level versus a persona level.

And if I misunderstood that question, or for anyone else, if I have not answered the question sufficiently, please do feel free to email me. I am more than happy to continue the conversation.

**Rebecca:** Excellent. So yeah, we do have just one or two others. I will be sure to follow up with everybody after the call. But we said this would be a one hour call, so I don't want anybody to missing out on any meetings they have scheduled.

So I just want to thank everybody who called in today. We really appreciate your participation and I really hope that you got a lot out of this. I know I learned a lot. And we encourage you to follow up with Mirm or with us after the call and we will be sure to answer any questions we didn't get to.

So with that, I also just want to tank Mirm so much for being with us today. You shared a lot of great information and relevant new research, and all that great stuff. We are really excited. So I am happy to turn the floor back over to you just for a last minute if you just have any final words.

**Mirm:** No, thank you. It was a pleasure to be with you all for the hour, and I thank you for your time and the opportunity to share some of our thinking on this. And if you have any further questions, don't hesitate to contact me at [mkriegel@bbmg.com](mailto:mkriegel@bbmg.com). Or, you can also call at (212) 473-4902 extension 207. For those of you who have the presentation downloaded and in hand already, my contact information is on slide 71. And for those of you who don't, you can find it there when you download. And I look forward to connecting with those of you who would like to connect further.

**Rebecca:** Excellent. Thank you so much Mirm, and thanks again everybody. We will be sending out copies of the presentation as well as the transcript later this week. So thanks again and have a wonderful day! Bye everybody!