

# MOMENTUM





# THE MOMENTUM 2026 SOURCEBOOK

(Updated 6.1.26)

The Momentum 2026 Sourcebook functions as a living field record that draws together foundational reference information, the voices and perspectives of participants, and newly generated, actionable models emerging from this summer's work. In spirit, it reflects other field-rooted synthesis work, grounded specifically in cultural ecosystem engagement and collective authorship.

All information included within the Sourcebook will be freely available for piloting, adaptation, and use by anyone. We ask only that when ideas, language, or models are directly utilized, credit is given to Momentum and to the Momentum partners, sponsors, contributors, and participants whose insights shaped the work.

The Sourcebook contains eight sections, which will have information added regularly from March to October 2026. A final version of the Momentum 2026 Sourcebook will be published following this cycle, and future editions including case studies on pilot activities may be updated in future years.



## SOURCEBOOK SECTIONS:

Section 1: Quotations and Media .....	4
Section 2: Overview of Identified Models and Solutions .....	6
Section 3: Modeling Details.....	9
1. Active Leadership Boards.....	10
2. Partner Boards .....	12
3. Staff-Board Mutual Accountability Structures.....	14
4. Holistic Organizations (also: Liberatory Governance) .....	16
5. Focused Boards (also: Minimally Viable Board, MVB).....	18
6. Network Boards (Version A: Central Oversight Board) .....	20
7. Network Boards (Version B: Mutual Support Board).....	22
8. Complimentary Internal Boards (Version A: Independent Power) .....	24
9. Complimentary Internal Boards (Version B: Sociocracy) .....	26
10. Community Boards (Version A: Democratically Elected).....	28
11. Community Boards (Version B: Assigned Seats) .....	30
12. Community Boards (Version C: History-Informed Legacy Focus) .....	32
13. Initiative or Project Boards .....	34
14. Licensing or Certification Boards .....	36
15. Funder Boards.....	38
16. Responsibility-Specific Board Seats .....	40
Section 4: Existing Case Studies, Articles, and Examples.....	41
Section 5: Reference Materials .....	48
Section 6: MOMENTUM Speaker Series.....	53
Section 7: Collaborators, Sponsors, and Contributors .....	58
Section 8: Other Topic Areas for Future Exploration .....	61

## Section 1: Quotations and Media

"A board will only be strong in what you recruit the members to do. If you recruit mainly for fundraising, *you can't expect them to be able to do everything else.*"

**DIANE RAGSDALE, EDUCATOR & THOUGHT LEADER**



"The board models we use now are simply the least flawed options we've been able to figure out so far."

**LAURA ZUCKER**  
CULTURAL STRATEGIST & PAST DIRECTOR,  
CENTER FOR BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT OF THE ARTS  
CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY



"We all have to acknowledge the problem and put our collective and creative brains together to redesign it. This means that we have to consider that nothing in [our] industry practices to this point should be considered sacred, beyond question, or unchangeable."

**MICHAEL BOBBITT, CEO OF OPERA AMERICA**



"Having served on boards for decades, I am eager to see what models we can create that can free governance to operate independently and alongside fundraising, rather than always wrapping them together."

**CYNTHIA HUFFMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN THEATRE**



# MOMENTUM

Additional materials and links to media will be added here after the MOMENTUM 2026 launch and in an ongoing way through the end of 2026.

## Section 2: Overview of Identified Models and Solutions



The following Models have been offered by participants so far for exploration. More will be added prior to launch in late June, with details expanding on them throughout the summer.

1. **Active Leadership Boards:** Board members devote focused, part-time leadership in specific areas such as finance, development, or partnerships, going far beyond traditional advisory roles.
2. **Partner Boards:** Instead of sitting “above” staff, this body operates as a self-contained partner, similar to common partner foundations that steward endowments or buildings or partner volunteer organizations like ushers or promotional groups, with mutual obligations and accountability flowing in both directions.
3. **Staff-Board Mutual Accountability Structures:** Board members provide oversight, evaluation, and hiring/firing for senior staff members, and the staff provides oversight, evaluation, and control over board member invitations, terms and renewals. (Alternately, an independent staff-run Board Recruitment Committee.)
4. **Holistic Organizations (also: *Liberatory Governance*):** In this model the distinction between staff, board, and artists is intentionally removed. Everyone is part of one team, with shared agreements, expectations, and compensation. Certain members as part of their job take on legal sign-off responsibilities. *Developed and practiced by Change Elemental.*
5. **Focused Boards (also: *Minimally Viable Board, MVB*):** A small group of three to five people handles only legal obligations such as budget signoff, executive oversight, and legal compliance. These members may be recruited for their expertise and compensated. Other common responsibilities are delegated to ambassador, fundraising, or advocacy groups without legal oversight roles.
6. **Network Boards (Version A: *Central Oversight Board*):** An independent oversight group of finance, legal, and community leaders, possibly supported by funders or civic



groups, that can provide efficiency and consistency across multiple organizations. Each organization maintains its own advocacy, donor, or ambassador groups.

7. **Network Boards (*Version B: Mutual Support Board*)**: A collective board for a group of organizations, made up of rotating staff from the organizations, allowing oversight and mutual strategic aid by colleagues at related institutions.
8. **Complementary Internal Boards (*Version A: Independent Power*)**: Model where multiple, mutually independent boards (such as a financial board and a mission board) have responsibility and authority over different areas of the organization, and then coordinate where those areas connect.
9. **Complementary Internal Boards (*Version B: Sociocracy*)**: A governance system in which authority is decentralized among semi-autonomous circles, each responsible for a specific domain of the organization's work. Decisions are made by consent rather than consensus: a proposal passes as long as no one has a paramount objection, which means dissenters are accountable for offering counter-proposals rather than simply blocking. Circles are connected through representatives who carry information between them, with "double-linking" used where deeper integration is needed. Practiced and documented by *SociocracyForAll.org*.
10. **Community Boards (*Version A: Democratically Elected*)**: Boards made up of elected representatives from the community being served by the organization's mission or programming.
11. **Community Boards (*Version B: Assigned Seats*)**: Boards made up of a set of defined seats, each held by a cycling representative from a particular constituency that self-selects who represents them. (Potentially including staff, served constituencies, local partners, neighbors/communities, donors, major funders, etc.)
12. **Community Boards (*Version C: History-Informed Legacy Focus*)**: Accountability and representation for the organization is led by people who have past standing in the constituent community or in the organization, and have enough time with the organization or community to provide a long-form view when considering decisions and value of collective activities.
13. **Initiative or Project Boards**: A board where membership intentionally turns over regularly around short-term initiatives. When a particular initiative or effort or cycle completes, a new cycle is defined and a new group of leaders is brought on to guide and support for maximum effectiveness in the next cycle. This can also be used to pass resources and legitimacy forward when a particular reason for the organization's existence has been achieved.
14. **Licensing or Certification Boards**: A system where board members in a community receive consistent training and certification, creating trust in governance and potentially reducing compliance burdens from partner funders.
15. **Funder Boards**: Removing layers of distance to involve and embrace funders and donors as the board members who serve as direct stewards of community resources



and how they are used - but in a directly collaborative way that builds cohesion in specific instances around specific organizational decisions.

16. **Responsibility-Specific Board Seats:** Instead of appointing general board members who are then elected to primarily hierarchical officer positions (Chair, Vice-Chair, Treasurer, Secretary), this model identifies specific responsibilities — essentially job descriptions — for each board seat, and recruits for interest, capacity, and capability to execute on those responsibilities for a defined term.

17. ...to be added

*More models and approaches will be added throughout Summer 2026.*



## Section 3: Modeling Details

Think of this section as both a menu and a user manual.

The menu: Each of the board models identified in Section 2 is laid out here in full, examined through the same lenses, so you can browse, compare, and notice what might be worth trying in your specific context. Nothing here is a prescription or a silver bullet - these are options.

The user manual: Each lens is designed to give you practical traction on a model. This outlines not just a description of what each model is, but what it actually requires, who it tends to suit, what it might free up, and what it asks of the people involved. This section will grow through the MOMENTUM 2026 convenings over the summer, filled in by practitioners working in real organizations who have tried these approaches or are thinking seriously about them.



## 1. Active Leadership Boards

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 2. Partner Boards

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### 3. Staff-Board Mutual Accountability Structures

#### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

#### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 4. Holistic Organizations (also: Liberatory Governance)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 5. Focused Boards (also: Minimally Viable Board, MVB)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 6. Network Boards (Version A: Central Oversight Board)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 7. Network Boards (Version B: Mutual Support Board)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 8. Complimentary Internal Boards (Version A: Independent Power)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

# MOMENTUM

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## 9. Complimentary Internal Boards (Version B: Sociocracy)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 10. Community Boards (Version A: Democratically Elected)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 11. Community Boards (Version B: Assigned Seats)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



## 12. Community Boards (Version C: History-Informed Legacy Focus)

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***



What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## 13. Initiative or Project Boards

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## 14. Licensing or Certification Boards

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## 15. Funder Boards

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## 16. Responsibility-Specific Board Seats

### ***Distinguishing Features***

What features make this model distinct from conventional board structures?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Purpose and Mission Fit***

What kinds of organizational purposes or missions (if any) mesh best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Values Alignment***

What values of the people involved fit best with this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Practical Resources Required***

What practical resources — physical, financial, time, space, and skills — are most needed to activate this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Newer vs. Established Organizations***

Does this approach lend itself better or worse to newer/founding organizations compared to established ones?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Organizational Size***

Does this approach lend itself better to organizations of a particular size, in terms of numbers of human beings involved?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***External Collaboration and Support***

Does this approach require the collaboration or support of others outside of the specific team or organization?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Primary Benefits***

What are the primary benefits people see being generated from this approach?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### ***Pain Points Reduced or Eliminated***

What pain points from common board models would be reduced or eliminated in this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*



### **Joy Points**

What joy points could be realized through adopting this model?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Legal and Structural Prerequisites**

Are there legal requirements, bylaw configurations, or structural conditions that must be in place before this model can be adopted?

*The IRS does not have requirements around specific board officer roles. Various states have some requirements, often requiring just a named Secretary, or at most a President, Treasurer, and Secretary (Texas). Many states do not include any explicit board officers or roles.*

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Relationship to Funders and External Stakeholders**

How does this model present to funders, regulators, and other external stakeholders? What narrative or documentation support may be needed?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Transition Pathway from a Conventional Board**

Is this model something an existing organization can evolve into incrementally, or does it require a clean break and rebuild? How disruptive is adoption?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

### **Cultural Roots and Traditions**

Does this model draw from specific cultural, community, or historical traditions? What lineage or attribution should be acknowledged?

*To be developed through Summer 2026.*

## **Section 4: Existing Case Studies, Articles, and Examples**

Section 4 includes two parts.

The first part organizes known examples, organizations, and resources by model — so if you're exploring a specific approach, you can quickly find who else has tried it and what's been written about it.

The second part is primed to feature or reference narratives about organizations that have made significant governance changes: what they did, why, and what happened.



Both parts will expand substantially through the MOMENTUM 2026 convenings as practitioners share their own organizational stories and others are contributed.

## **Part 1: Examples and Resources by Model**

Each model below lists organizations known to use or experiment with this approach, along with relevant articles and resources. When an example is relevant to multiple models, it appears under each. Entries drawn from Part 2 featured narratives are marked with ►.

### **Active Leadership Boards**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations experimenting with committee-led or active-focus board structures are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Partner Boards**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations whose boards operate as self-contained partners rather than as a body above staff are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Staff-Board Mutual Accountability Structures**

► A Contemporary Theatre (ACT), Seattle, WA — The post-dissolution board rebuild at ACT included explicit structures for staff voice and bidirectional accountability between staff and governance. See Part 2.

Additional examples to be developed through MOMENTUM 2026 convenings.

### **Holistic Organizations (also: Liberatory Governance)**

► Change Elemental — The originator and primary practitioner of Liberatory Governance, the version of this model in which a governance team replaces the board of directors and staff participate directly in decision-making. Change Elemental has documented their approach extensively on their website and in public writing. See Part 2.

Ananda Valenzuela, co-chair of Change Elemental’s board, authored the three-part “Reimagining Nonprofit Boards” series in Nonprofit Quarterly (2025) that draws directly on Liberatory Governance principles. Available at [nonprofitquarterly.org](http://nonprofitquarterly.org).

Additional examples to be developed through MOMENTUM 2026 convenings.

### **Focused Boards (also: Minimally Viable Board, MVB)**

► Never Too Late (NTL), Canada — A youth-serving nonprofit that uses the MVB model (three members, meeting primarily to fulfill legal obligations) alongside a Trusted Advisory Council of volunteers with no formal authority. NTL’s “Board Lead” Aviva Zukerman Schure is quoted in Vu



Le's book on the transformative effect of asking 'what is the bare minimum the government requires?' See Part 2.

Enspiral (New Zealand) — The network credited with originating and naming the MVB model. A video explaining the thinking behind MVB is available through Enspiral's resources at [enspiral.com](http://enspiral.com).

Additional examples to be developed through MOMENTUM 2026 convenings.

### **Network Boards (Version A: Central Oversight Board)**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations using or experimenting with independent cross-organizational oversight bodies are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Network Boards (Version B: Mutual Support Board)**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations using rotating staff or cross-organizational board service are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Complimentary Internal Boards (Version A: Independent Power)**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations using parallel or complementary internal boards with divided authority are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Complimentary Internal Boards (Version B: Sociocracy)**

► Nonprofit Enterprise at Work (NEW), Detroit, MI — CEO Yodit Mesfin Johnson is cited in Vu Le's book as describing sociocracy's capacity to disrupt power hoarding while building in accountability for dissenters. See Part 2.

SociocracyForAll.org — The primary documentation and training hub for sociocracy practice across nonprofit, education, and community contexts. Includes implementation guides, case studies, and a practitioner community.

### **Community Boards (Version A: Democratically Elected)**

► A Contemporary Theatre (ACT), Seattle, WA — The entire ACT board resigned and the organization undertook a community-centered rebuild process with explicit commitments to community representation. See Part 2.

► Rainier Valley Corps (RVC), Seattle, WA — Vu Le's former organization used an open quarterly gathering model, prioritizing community member participation and interest-based committees. Le describes it as the most effective governance structure his org ever had. See Part 2.

Additional examples to be developed through MOMENTUM 2026 convenings.



### **Community Boards (Version B: Assigned Seats)**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations using defined constituency seats for community representation are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Community Boards (Version C: History-Informed Legacy Focus)**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations centering long-term community relationships in board composition are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Initiative or Project Boards**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations using cycle-based or initiative-specific board membership are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

### **Licensing or Certification Boards**

No documented examples are in the Sourcebook at this time. Organizations using consistent board training, certification, or credentialing requirements are encouraged to share their experiences at MOMENTUM convenings.

## Part 2: Featured Narratives

The following narratives go deeper on specific organizations and governance stories — what changed, why, and what followed. These are drawn from published sources and are cross-tagged to the relevant models from Part 1. Narratives generated through MOMENTUM 2026 convenings will be added here through the end of 2026.

### A Contemporary Theatre (ACT) — Seattle, WA

*Relevant models: Community Boards ▶ Staff-Board Mutual Accountability Structures ▶ Transition Pathway*

In August 2022, after reading and discussing Michael Bobbitt's 2021 essay in *American Theatre*, "Boards Are Broken, So Let's Break and Remake Them," the entire board of A Contemporary Theatre in Seattle voluntarily resigned, with the exception of three positions required by law. ACT leadership cited two specific elements from Bobbitt's article as driving the decision: that most boards no longer represent the communities they serve, and that most have not resolved the tension between creative vision and fiduciary responsibility.

ACT undertook a deliberate process of reconstituting its governance with explicit commitments to community representation, staff voice, and bidirectional accountability between staff and board. Mike Davis's 2025 follow-up reporting in *American Theatre* confirmed ACT as a key reference case for the field.

### Never Too Late (NTL) — Canada

*Relevant models: Focused Boards (also: Minimally Viable Board, MVB)*

Never Too Late is a Canadian nonprofit serving youth who are aging out of the child welfare system. The organization uses the Minimally Viable Board model — a small board whose primary function is meeting legal compliance obligations — paired with a Trusted Advisory Council of volunteers who have no legal authority but whose expertise and time are called upon as needed.

NTL's "Board Lead" Aviva Zukerman Schure describes the mindset shift the MVB model produces: by constantly asking "what is the bare minimum the government requires from this?" the organization consistently finds itself opened up to new possibilities rather than constrained by traditional governance assumptions. Schure also notes the ongoing challenge of funder skepticism, with some funders treating the absence of a conventional board as a credibility problem despite NTL's track record.

Source: Le, Vu. *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy*. Berrett-Koehler, 2024, pp. 74–76.



## Rainier Valley Corps (RVC) — Seattle, WA

*Relevant models: Community Boards*

Before converting to a traditional board model, Vu Le's former organization — Rainier Valley Corps, a capacity-building nonprofit serving BIPOC-led organizations in Seattle — operated with what Le describes as a community board structure, though the organization never formally named it. Quarterly gatherings were open and welcoming to anyone invested in the organization and the community it served; meetings were held in the evenings with childcare and dinner provided to reduce access barriers. Work was structured to be both meaningful and relationship-building, with small group conversations about community needs leading into larger full-group dialogue, and interest-based committees meeting between gatherings. Le describes the decision to convert to a traditional board model as one that “haunts me to this day,” and uses RVC as a primary example of what community-centered governance can look like in practice.

Source: Le, Vu. *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy*. Berrett-Koehler, 2024, pp. 76–77.

## Change Elemental

*Relevant models: Holistic Organizations (also: Liberatory Governance)*

Change Elemental is a nonprofit that partners with organizations and networks to build a more just world by addressing inequity through leadership, strategy, and collaboration. They are the originator and primary practitioner of **Liberatory Governance**, the version of the Holistic Organizations model in which a “governance team” replaces the traditional board of directors, and staff and governance team members work closely together to make decisions grounded in shared values.

The organization has documented their model extensively, including a staff liaison role that recruits governance team members based on where their knowledge and connections would be most relevant — a deliberate contrast with conventional board recruitment that prioritizes wealth, fundraising capacity, and professional credentials. Change Elemental prioritizes governance team members who “already embrace and practice inner work, multiple ways of knowing, experimentation, and emergent strategy.” Resources and documentation are available at [changeelemental.org](http://changeelemental.org).

Sources: [changeelemental.org](http://changeelemental.org). Le, Vu. *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy*. Berrett-Koehler, 2024, pp. 77–79. Valenzuela, Ananda. “Reimagining Nonprofit Boards” (three-part series). *Nonprofit Quarterly*, 2025.

**Clayton, Douglas and Calida Jones. “Rethinking the Nonprofit Model.”** *Minneapolis College of Art and Design*, October 20, 2025. A foundational essay by MOMENTUM's co-founding team that traces the origins of the 501(c)(3) nonprofit structure, analyzes how it was designed primarily to protect money and prevent personal gain rather than to support the people doing the work, and argues that the model's built-in trade-offs — including the erasure of founder equity, board accountability gaps, and structural misalignment with modern organizational values — make it increasingly unfit for purpose. Calls for a broader public



conversation about hybrid structures, cooperatives, and social enterprises as viable alternatives. Published on the MCAD website and available at [mcad.edu/posts/rethinking-nonprofit-model](http://mcad.edu/posts/rethinking-nonprofit-model).

## **Nonprofit Enterprise at Work (NEW) — Detroit, MI**

*Relevant models: Complimentary Internal Boards (Version B: Sociocracy)*

Nonprofit Enterprise at Work is a Detroit-based organization that provides capacity-building support to nonprofits across Michigan and beyond. CEO Yodit Mesfin Johnson has described the organization's experience with sociocracy as fundamentally disrupting internal power dynamics: the consent-based decision-making model, in which proposals pass as long as no one has a paramount objection, builds accountability for dissenters by requiring them to offer counter-proposals rather than simply blocking. Johnson describes sociocracy as opening governance to everyone in the organization, not just the board, and notes that the model encourages dissent as a generative force rather than treating it as an obstacle. NEW is one of the more prominent mid-sized nonprofits publicly associated with sociocracy practice.

Source: Le, Vu. *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy*. Berrett-Koehler, 2024, pp. 79–80. See also [sociocracyforall.org](http://sociocracyforall.org).

## **Narratives from MOMENTUM 2026 Convenings**

Governance stories, experiments, and organizational case studies surfaced through the MOMENTUM 2026 convenings will be added here on an ongoing basis through the end of 2026. Participants are encouraged to share their own organizational experiences — whether a model is fully implemented, in early experimentation, or simply under consideration. All contributions to this section become part of the non-proprietary Sourcebook and go to the field.

## Section 5: Reference Materials

### Books

**Le, Vu.** *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2024. The chapter “Governance and Boards” (pp. 76–81) covers the Minimally Viable Board, Community Board, Evolutionary Governance, Liberatory Governance, Circle Process, Sociocracy, and Mindful Meetings models, with real organizational examples and discussion questions.

**Chait, Richard P., William P. Ryan, and Barbara E. Taylor.** *Governance as Leadership: Reframing the Work of Nonprofit Boards*. Wiley/BoardSource, 2005. A widely cited framework arguing that effective nonprofit boards operate in three modes: fiduciary (compliance and asset protection), strategic (long-term direction), and generative (creative problem framing and sense-making). The generative mode is the least practiced and, the authors argue, the most transformative. A useful counterpoint to purely compliance-focused board models.

**Carver, John.** *Boards That Make a Difference: A New Design for Leadership in Nonprofit and Public Organizations*. Jossey-Bass, 3rd ed. 2006. The foundational text for the Policy Governance model, which draws a sharp distinction between board-level policy decisions and staff-level operational decisions. Often cited as an important influence on contemporary governance thinking and, in some communities, as a model that over-centralizes fiduciary thinking at the expense of mission and relationship.

**Gordon, Seth.** *Crossroads in the American Theatre*. Smith & Kraus, 2025. Based on interviews with artistic directors and theatre leaders at major nonprofit institutions, this book asks whether the American nonprofit theatre should consider abandoning the conventional board governance model entirely, and if so, what viable alternatives exist. Written by a theatre director and longtime faculty member at the University of Oklahoma.

### Articles and Reports

**Bobbitt, Michael J.** “Boards Are Broken, So Let’s Break and Remake Them.” *American Theatre*, January 5, 2021. The op-ed that sent shockwaves through the arts sector, prompting the entire board of A Contemporary Theatre (ACT) in Seattle to resign and rebuild. Bobbitt argues that nonprofit theatre boards are unrepresentative and often oppressive, questions whether the board model was sound to begin with, and calls for artist- and staff-led governance reform. Available at [americantheatre.org](http://americantheatre.org).

**Davis, Mike.** “Taking Governance Back to the Drawing Board.” *American Theatre*, Spring 2025. A field report checking in with ACT, Mosaic Theatre, Dallas Children’s Theatre, and other



organizations that have worked to reform their governance structures in the years since Bobbitt's article. Davis concludes that boards have moved away from being elite social clubs but that change remains incremental. Available at [americantheatre.org](http://americantheatre.org).

**Theatre Communications Group.** *In Whom We Trust VI: Governing Boards Survey 2024.* TCG, April 2025. The first comprehensive survey of nonprofit theatre governing boards in over ten years, covering 141 theatres across all budget sizes. Key findings include a significant increase in racial diversity on boards (from 85–89% white in 1998–2013 to 71% white in 2024), a sharp decline in give/get policies (from 78% to 43% of theatres), and continued staff time burdens averaging 25 hours per week spent on board relations. Available at [tcg.org](http://tcg.org).

**Valenzuela, Ananda.** “Reimagining Nonprofit Boards” (three-part series). *Nonprofit Quarterly*, 2025. Three-part NPQ series tracing the history of how nonprofit boards evolved to protect wealth and class interests, proposing key mindset shifts toward accountability and shared leadership, and offering practical strategies for redefining board roles. Valenzuela is co-chair of the board of Change Elemental. Available at [nonprofitquarterly.org](http://nonprofitquarterly.org).

## Websites and Organizations

**BoardSource** ([boardsource.org](http://boardsource.org)). The national membership organization for nonprofit board leadership research, training, and support. Publishes the biennial *Leading with Intent* national index of nonprofit board practices and the Purpose-Driven Board Leadership framework (2021). A primary source for sector-wide benchmarking on board composition, practices, and culture.

**Change Elemental** ([changeelemental.org](http://changeelemental.org)). Nonprofit that partners with organizations and networks to build a more just world by addressing inequity through transformative leadership, strategy, and collaboration. Originator and practitioner of Liberatory Governance, the version of the Holistic Organizations (also: Liberatory Governance) model in which a “governance team” replaces the traditional board structure. A primary resource for organizations seeking to implement values-first, staff-integrated governance approaches.

**SociocracyForAll.org.** Comprehensive resource on sociocracy as a governance system, which in the MOMENTUM framework is documented as Complimentary Internal Boards (Version B: Sociocracy). In sociocracy, work is decentralized among semi-autonomous circles, with decisions made by consent (meaning no one strongly objects) rather than full consensus. Circles are linked by representatives who carry information between them, with “double linking” for circles that connect upward in the hierarchy. Yodit Mesfin Johnson, CEO of Nonprofit Enterprise at Work (NEW), is cited in Vu Le’s book as describing sociocracy’s core benefit as disrupting power hoarding while building accountability for dissenters to offer counter-proposals rather than simply blocking decisions. Available at [sociocracyforall.org](http://sociocracyforall.org).

**Sustainable Economies Law Center / Nonprofit Democracy Network** ([theselc.org](http://theselc.org)). SELC is an Oakland-based law and advocacy organization that originated the Worker Self-Directed



Nonprofit (WSDN) model — a 501(c)(3) in which the board formally delegates management authority to the workers collectively, who govern through semi-autonomous circles rather than traditional hierarchy. SELC launched as a WSDN in 2009 and has since built the most legally documented framework for democratizing nonprofit governance while remaining legally compliant, including bylaws templates and practitioner guides. Their Nonprofit Democracy Network, a fiscally-sponsored project of SELC, supports organizations exploring or implementing worker self-direction through peer networks, training, and an annual cohort program (Collaborate to Co-Liberate, second cohort launching 2025) led by practitioners including adrienne maree brown. The WSDN model is distinct from but related to both Holistic Organizations and Sociocracy as described in this Sourcebook: it is a resource for organizations that want to democratize governance and also need to navigate the legal architecture of the 501(c)(3) structure. Resources at [theselc.org/worker\\_selfdirected\\_nonprofits](https://theselc.org/worker_selfdirected_nonprofits).

## Governance Approaches and Philosophies

**Evolutionary Governance** (Vanessa LeBourdais / DreamRider Productions). A governance philosophy built on three principles: that all members of the organization trust in emergence and practice shared power; that the board functions as a genuine support structure for the executive leader, not as an oversight body; and that the board attends to the holistic well-being of the full field, including staff, funders, community, and even nature. Includes personal and organizational inner work as active governance practices. Draws on collective wisdom from Indigenous communities and other non-dominant leadership traditions. Referenced in Vu Le's *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy* (p. 77).

**Circle Process** (Living Justice Press). A meeting and governance facilitation method drawn from Indigenous traditions used for thousands of years. Core elements include a talking piece to structure who speaks and when, intentional conversations about values and group agreements, ceremony to open and close gatherings, and relationship-building treated as equally important as content and decisions. Practitioners describe the process as doing more than changing how meetings run—it shifts one's outlook on systemic injustice. See Living Justice Press ([livingjusticepress.org](https://livingjusticepress.org)) for full resources. Referenced in Vu Le's *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy* (pp. 78–79).

**Mindful Meetings** (The Swell Collective). A free guide offering an equity-centered alternative to Robert's Rules as a meeting methodology. Five phases: Check In (personal updates, rumors and elephants, victories, agenda additions); Calibration (grounding in purpose, adjusting agenda for emergent issues); Doing the Work (dialog and decisions, group memory practices); Check Point (reviewing decisions and time); Check Out (reflection on what worked and planning ahead). Available free from The Swell Collective. Referenced in Vu Le's *Reimagining Nonprofits and Philanthropy* (p. 80).



**Worker Self-Directed Nonprofit (WSDN)** (Sustainable Economies Law Center). A governance model in which a 501(c)(3) retains a legal board — because it must — but the board formally delegates all management authority to the workers collectively. Staff govern through semi-autonomous circles rather than traditional hierarchy, and the board’s role shifts to overseeing whether the self-management system is functioning to advance the nonprofit’s mission, rather than directing the organization. Leadership is distributed throughout: instead of flowing from the top down, small groups are empowered to lead within clearly defined zones of autonomy, with systems built to coordinate activity without placing anyone in a position of hierarchical authority. SELC launched as a WSDN in 2009 and has since built the most legally documented framework for democratizing governance within the 501(c)(3) structure, including bylaws templates and practitioner guides. The WSDN model is philosophically aligned with both Holistic Organizations and Sociocracy as described in this Sourcebook, and is most distinctive in its attention to the legal architecture that makes worker self-governance compliant — the piece that most other governance reform models leave for organizations to work out on their own. Primary resource: [theselc.org/worker\\_selfdirected\\_nonprofits](https://theselc.org/worker_selfdirected_nonprofits). Peer network and annual cohort program: Nonprofit Democracy Network ([theselc.org](https://theselc.org)).

*Additional references will be added throughout Spring and Summer 2026.*

# MOMENTUM

Materials will be added here after the MOMENTUM 2026 launch and in an ongoing way through the end of 2026.

## Section 6: MOMENTUM Speaker Series



*Throughout history, artists and cultural experiences have been our lighthouses—cutting through deep darkness, revealing truth, illuminating futures we couldn't yet name.*

*That light has never belonged to one person. A lighthouse is an ecosystem. It takes builders and visionaries to design it. Fuel to keep it alive. People willing to tend it in the harshest conditions. Smaller lights—lanterns, flashlights—to reach what the largest beams can't. And a culture of navigators who know how to recognize light, trust it, and move by it.*

*So what happens when we look at our cultural landscape this way? Who are the builders, the keepers, the fuel, the travelers? What are we actually sustaining, and what are we letting go dark? And what would it take for each of us to think differently about our roles, act differently within them, and together illuminate a future that is alive, responsive, and always becoming?*

### **National Rolling Speaker Series**

One theme, five speakers, one threaded conversation across the full summer. Each speaker responds not only to the prompt but to the ideas raised at every site before theirs. All speakers reconvene at the culminating webinar on September 8, 2026.

#### **Calida N. Jones (San Juan)**

*Co-Founder, Creative Evolutions; Musician, Social Justice Advocate, and Educator*

Calida N. Jones is a violinist, social justice advocate, educator, and Co-Founder of Creative Evolutions, the convening organization behind MOMENTUM. With more than 25 years of experience in performance, workshop and curriculum development, and equity-centered organizational leadership, she has guided arts and cultural organizations across the country in advancing inclusion, access, and community-rooted practice. A TEDx speaker and keynote at the Yale Innovation Summit, she has been honored with an Aspen Ideas Festival scholar fellowship, Grammy Music Educator Award nomination, and the Connecticut Arts Hero Award, among others. Her personal mission centers on ensuring that those with limited resources have access to arts opportunities, and on correlating the art of teaching to life skills and community building. In MOMENTUM's rolling speaker series, Calida speaks to the lighthouse metaphor



through the lens of the keeper: the sustaining practices and conditions that make continuous illumination possible.

*Speaking at the TCG National Conference kickoff, San Juan, Puerto Rico, June 10-13, 2026.*

**Dr. Lee Bynum (Oklahoma)**

*Executive Director, Maestra Music; Faculty, Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy*

Dr. Lee Bynum is a composer, librettist, dramaturg, and nationally recognized arts leader whose twenty-year career bridges creative practice, strategic nonprofit leadership, and transformative work in equity and education. They currently serve as Executive Director of Maestra Music and on the faculty at Indiana University's Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. Previously, they served as Chief Education Officer at Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, where they directed programs reaching hundreds of thousands annually, and as the founding Vice President of Impact at Minnesota Opera, where they launched the first department in classical music devoted entirely to inclusion, diversity, equity, and access. Earlier in their career they served as Associate Director at the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Dr. Bynum is a Columbia University graduate and their research on race and culture has been published by the university presses of Oxford, Harvard, and NYU, among others.

*Speaking location to be announced.*

**Heather Sauyaq Jean Kwamboka Gordon, PhD (Iñupiaq) (Bahamas)**

*Principal Consultant, Sauyaq Solutions; enrolled member, Nome Eskimo Community*

Dr. Heather Sauyaq Jean Gordon is Iñupiaq and an enrolled Tribal member of the Nome Eskimo Community. She owns and leads Sauyaq Solutions, an Indigenous minority and female-owned consulting business. With more than 13 years of experience in participatory research, she works with Indigenous Peoples and Tribes on community capacity building, emphasizing the role of self-determination in community sustainability and wellbeing. Her research and consulting spans Indigenous Knowledge and Methodologies, Historical Trauma, Futures Research, Indigenous Self-determination, Arctic Migration, Missing and Murdered Indigenous People, Restorative Justice, Indigenous data sovereignty, and Indigenous Culture as a Preventive and Protective Factor. She gives keynotes, workshops, and media interviews and is an active partner in research collaborations.

*Speaking at the University of the Bahamas, July 14-15, 2026.*

**Lanxing Fu (Minneapolis)**

*Co-Director, HERE Arts Center; Co-Director, Superhero Clubhouse*

Lanxing Fu is a Chinese-American multidisciplinary theater artist rooted in social practice. She is a writer, producer, performer, and educator, and Co-Director of Superhero Clubhouse, an interdisciplinary collective creating theater for climate justice. Her work has been seen throughout NYC in spaces such as The Public Theater, LaMaMa ETC, Brick Theater, and Baryshnikov Arts Center, and developed with institutions nationally and internationally. Previously Producing Associate with SITI Company, she has been a speaker and facilitator with



Theatre Communications Group, The New School, Virginia Tech, Columbia University, and others. Her writings on theater, climate arts, and intersectional justice have been published across multiple platforms. She currently serves as Co-Director of HERE Arts Center.

*Speaking at Minneapolis College of Art and Design, August 6, 2026.*

## **University of Oklahoma — June 26-27, 2026 – Local Panel**

### **heather ahtone**

*Director, Curatorial Affairs, First Americans Museum (Chickasaw Nation citizen)*

heather ahtone is a citizen of the Chickasaw Nation and descendant of strong Choctaw women. She currently serves as Director of Curatorial Affairs at First Americans Museum in Oklahoma City, and has worked in the Native arts community since 1993. Dr. ahtone has established a career as a curator, arts writer, and cultural researcher, and maintains service on numerous advisory boards advocating for Indigenous knowledge and scholarship. She is a board member of the Association of Art Museum Curators, Native American Art Studies Association, Clara Luper Civil Rights Center, and serves on the Smithsonian's American Art Journal editorial board. Her research explores the intersection between Indigenous cultural knowledge and contemporary arts. She earned her doctoral degree in Interdisciplinary Studies (Art History, Anthropology, Native American Studies) at the University of Oklahoma, and has published widely for institutions including the National Gallery of Art, Crystal Bridges Museum, and the Heard Museum.

*Speaking at the University of Oklahoma, June 26-27, 2026.*

### **Cliff Hudson**

*Board President, OKC Rep; Former Chairman and CEO, Sonic Corp.; Managing Director, DIA Equity Partners*

Cliff Hudson spent 35 years at Oklahoma City-based Sonic Corp., serving as Chairman of the Board and CEO of a publicly held company with more than 3,500 locations in 45 states. He currently serves as Board President of OKC Rep and is a Managing Director of DIA Equity Partners. Hudson's civic leadership has included service as Chairman of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (a Clinton presidential appointment), trustee of the Ford Foundation, past Chairman of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and Chairman of the Oklahoma City Public Schools Board from 2001 to 2008, where he led a \$530 million turnaround of a 40,000-student urban school system. He is a graduate of the University of Oklahoma and Georgetown University Law Center, and is the author of the memoir *Master of None* (HarperCollins), which challenges conventional thinking about mastery, leadership, and success.

*Speaking at the University of Oklahoma, June 26-27, 2026.*

### **Trent Riley**

*Executive Director, Oklahoma Contemporary Arts Center*

Trent Riley is an arts and culture leader, author, and advocate for expanding access to arts and arts education. As Executive Director of Oklahoma Contemporary Arts Center, he leads one of

**MOMENTUM 2026 Sourcebook (Updated 6.1.26)**

[MomentumRevolutions.com](https://MomentumRevolutions.com) | [Momentum@CreativeEvolutions.com](mailto:Momentum@CreativeEvolutions.com)



the region's most dynamic cultural institutions, overseeing exhibitions, education initiatives, fundraising, and long-term strategic growth. Under his direction, the organization has deepened partnerships with major cultural institutions, expanded statewide educational access, and reinforced its commitment to free admission. Prior to Oklahoma Contemporary, Trent spent nearly a decade at the National Cowboy and Western Heritage Museum, contributing to more than \$30 million in revenue for the institution. A 2019 Oklahoma Book Award finalist, he has received recognition from Publishers Weekly and The Wall Street Journal, and was named a 40 Under 40 honoree by The Journal Record in 2023.

*Speaking at the University of Oklahoma, June 26-27, 2026.*

## **University of the Bahamas — July 14-15, 2026 – Local Panel**

*Speakers for the Bahamas convening will be announced as the series develops.*

## **Seattle University / Cornish School of the Arts — July 24-25, 2026 – Local Panel**

### **Randy Engstrom**

*Director, Seattle Center; former Director, City of Seattle Office of Arts & Culture; Co-Founder, Third Way Creative*

Randy Engstrom has been a passionate advocate and organizer of cultural and community development for more than two decades. He currently serves as Director of Seattle Center, appointed in March 2026, following eight years as Director of the City of Seattle's Office of Arts & Culture, where he expanded investments in granting and public art while establishing new programs in arts education, cultural space affordability, and racial equity. Before city service, he founded and directed the Youngstown Cultural Arts Center in West Seattle, converting a vacant school building into a multidisciplinary community hub. He has also been Co-Founder and Principal of Third Way Creative, a collaborative consulting studio focused on cultural policy and racial equity, and has served as Adjunct Faculty at the Seattle University Arts Leadership Program. He is a graduate of the Evergreen State College and holds an Executive Master's in Public Administration from the University of Washington's Evans School. Americans for the Arts named him an Emerging Leader; City Arts Magazine called him "The Advocate."

*Speaking at Seattle University / Cornish School of the Arts, July 24-25, 2026.*

### **Brian J. Carter**

*Executive Director, 4Culture (King County's cultural funding agency)*

Brian J. Carter is the Executive Director of 4Culture, King County's cultural funding and services agency, where he provides vision and leadership for a grant-making organization that supports arts, heritage, preservation, and public art across the region. Before joining 4Culture, Carter served as Director of Interpretation at the Burke Museum of Natural History & Culture, Museum Director at the Oregon Historical Society, and was a founding staff member and Deputy Director/Head Curator of the Northwest African American Museum in Seattle. He is a graduate



of Stanford University (American history, with honors) and holds a Master of Arts in Museology from the University of Washington. He is the Immediate Past President of the Board of the Association of African American Museums and serves on the advisory board of the UW Museum Studies Certificate Program.

*Speaking at Seattle University / Cornish School of the Arts, July 24-25, 2026.*

## **Minneapolis College of Art and Design — August 5-6, 2026 – Local Panel**

### **Anne Halvorson**

*Brand Strategist and Advertising Executive; Adjunct Faculty, Creative Entrepreneurship, MCAD*

Anne Halvorson is a seasoned Brand Strategist and Advertising Executive with over 20 years working for leading independent creative agencies including Wieden + Kennedy, Fallon, PMH, and Someplace. She also teaches as Adjunct Faculty in the Creative Entrepreneurship department at MCAD. Six years living and working in China shaped her emphasis on human-centric approaches to solving today's biggest challenges, and the conviction that it always starts with empathy and stepping into the shoes of the people you serve.

*Speaking at Minneapolis College of Art and Design, August 5, 2026.*

### **Carolina Ortiz**

*Associate Executive Director, COPAL*

Hailing from Zacatecas, Mexico, Carolina Ortiz embodies the spirit of resilience and determination. Her passion for social justice is deeply rooted in her personal journey as a DREAMer. As Associate Executive Director at COPAL, her work spans environmental advocacy, coalition management, and steering key legislative initiatives. She is recognized for her expertise in legislative matters, media advocacy, and navigating Minnesota's Legislative process, having served as a key player in passing significant pieces of legislation into law. Her ability to cultivate relationships locally and nationally marks her as a distinctive voice representing both COPAL and the aspirations of marginalized communities.

*Speaking at Minneapolis College of Art and Design, August 5, 2026.*

### **Zelia Gonzalez (they/them)**

*School redesign coach; community organizer; Master's candidate, Creative Leadership, MCAD*

Zelia Gonzalez recently moved to Minneapolis from NYC and is already deeply rooted in Minnesota. By day they coach school leaders in redesigning systems to move from conventional teaching toward student-interest-led learning. By night they perform clown and improv, organize their neighborhood block party, and build community through local organizing. Over the past year, Zelia has joined neighbors in resisting Operation Metro Surge through patrols, art, and collective action. They are currently pursuing a Master's in Creative Leadership at MCAD in Whittier, Minneapolis.

*Speaking at Minneapolis College of Art and Design, August 5, 2026.*

# MOMENTUM

## Section 7: Collaborators, Sponsors, and Contributors

Collaborators and Sponsors for MOMENTUM include:

TCG Partner and University Hosts



[Theatre Communications Group](#) | *National Co-Presenter*



[Seattle University / Cornish School of the Arts](#) | *July 24–25, 2026 Host*

[Minneapolis College of Art and Design](#) | *August 5–6, 2026 Host*

[University of the Bahamas](#) | *July 14–15, 2026 Host*

[The University of Oklahoma](#) | *June 26–27, 2026 Host*

Organizational Partners and Sponsors



USA/ASSITEJ

[TYA/USA](#) | *Organizational Partner*



TRANSCENDENT  
STUDIO

[Transcendent Studio](#) | *Organizational Sponsor*



[Association Professionals of Oklahoma](#) | *Oklahoma Regional Partner*

# MOMENTUM



THEATRE PUGET SOUND

[Theatre Puget Sound \(TPS\)](#) | *Seattle Regional Partner*

Additional materials will be added here after the MOMENTUM 2026 launch and in an ongoing way through the end of 2026.



**Contributors:**

**All attending contributors will be included here once MOMENTUM launches in June 2026!**



## Section 8: Other Topic Areas for Future Exploration

Materials will be added here after the MOMENTUM 2026 launch and in an ongoing way through the end of 2026.