

LPW RFQ Questions & Answers from the April 12, 2026 submission deadline

We thank you for the thoughtful questions. As a volunteer board, we collaborate and consolidate responses outside our professional obligations. As such, please forgive any typos and formatting oversights as we worked to publish a prompt and thorough response.

- This document has been provided to those who submitted questions or expressed interest in receiving answers. This will also be posted on the Leadership Prince William website's RFQ page. We have also included budget documents to help answer questions within the Budget & Finance section below
- Questions have been grouped by subject area, and [answers provided in blue](#). If “See Other” is listed as a response, the Selection Committee has provided your answer elsewhere in the Q & A document, so please review the various responses for that information, as your question may overlap with another.
- When you see “management team” referenced in the document, it is simply our term for the successful proposer and their personnel, regardless of the proposer’s personnel, titles, structure, or operational design. It is a generic term to identify the management functions of the LPW.

Evaluations & Metrics:

How does LPW define success during the initial probationary year, and what performance metrics will be used to evaluate whether the agreement continues beyond that period?

- [Positive survey results from the next Signature Class and Emerging Leaders cohorts \(i.e., net promoter scores and other feedback measures\) and successful recruitment \(quality and quantity\) for the Signature Program Class of 2028 and the Emerging Leaders Programs \(and any other programming activities\)](#)
- [Execution of quarterly PWC Economic Development program deliverables or comparable required programming, including funding renewals for FY2028 \(assumes program is renewed for FY2027\).](#)
- [Positive feedback from Signature Program “day leads,” committee chairs, and the Board of Regents. No formal contract evaluation or performance measurement mechanism or process currently exists. Proposer recommendations for such a process are encouraged. If none are provided, LPW will develop the mechanism with the proposer within 60 days of contract execution.](#)
- [Positive Feedback from Alumni, with increased engagement in activities and events. No current formal mechanism exists; proposer recommendations are encouraged.](#)

- Progress and completion of residual projects identified by the Board of Regents during the contract model transition (e.g., gaps in website content and bylaw revisions).
- Fiscal responsibility, by first managing program expenses within the pre-approved budget; second, in retaining and growing current revenue streams to maintain stability; and third, growth of revenue streams to close the gap between operational spending from reserves.

Definition of Success in Year 1 vs. Year 3: How does LPW define success for the selected management partner in Year 1 (probationary year) versus the full three-year term? Are there specific KPIs, financial targets, or programmatic milestones that will guide performance evaluation?

- Year 1: See Other
- Years 2 – 3:
 - Sustained or improved excellence in qualitative and quantitative metrics from programming outputs. Measures include participation rates, satisfaction scores, and other mechanisms mentioned in See Other.
 - Success in meeting the proposer’s agreed-upon revenue benchmarks and budget performance.

The RFQ outlines a goal of eliminating reliance on reserves within 24 months. How does LPW define success in the first 6–12 months, particularly in balancing operational continuity with transformation and growth?

- See Other

How will performance be evaluated during the initial probationary year?

Are there specific KPIs or milestones the Board expects the selected partner to meet within that period?

- See Other

Governance & Management:

What level of authority will the selected vendor have for day-to-day operational decisions, staffing structure, vendor management, and program adjustments versus matters requiring Board of Regents approval?

- The Board of Regents prefers a management team that leads the BoR rather than the BoR leading the management team. The BoR will generally identify a need or trend that requires resolution but expects the management team to address problems or pursue opportunities with only high-level direction. The BoR is not complacent: In the absence of ongoing progress, it will increase its involvement.
- The selected management team/firm has autonomy over daily operations, including vendor management, activity/event site selections, class communication, and related tasks. The LPW Committees provide routine input as described in the RFQ,

but that input is expected to be structured and guided by the management team. The management team will need to effectively solicit and manage committee input on specific operational elements (marketing, programs, etc.).

- The Board of Regents likes to be informed about high-level operational issues, such as programming adjustments, event progress, personnel changes, and forthcoming operational challenges, as well as reports on higher-level problems encountered and resolved. Example: We are not interested in how much the price of bottled water increased at Costco unless it impacts the ability to provide sufficient water and there was an issue as a result. We expect the management team to resolve that.
- The annual budget development process and revenue targets will guide activities and expenses. As long as it aligns with the organization's mission and culture, is well received, and stays within budget, it falls within the management team's scope.
-

Board vs. Operator Roles and Decision Authority: Can LPW clarify the expected division of responsibilities and decision-making authority between the management entity and the Board of Regents, particularly in areas such as program design, partnerships, staffing, and fundraising strategy?

- See Other

How does LPW envision the day-to-day operating authority of the selected partner in relation to the Board of Regents and its committees? Specifically, what decisions are expected to remain at the Board level versus delegated to the managing entity?

- See Other

Does LPW currently have an active strategic plan or defined priority initiatives that proposers should align to, or is the expectation that the selected partner will lead the development of an updated strategic direction?

- The last Strategic Plan was developed in 2019 for the 2020-2023 period. The pandemic significantly affected timelines and activities, further exacerbated by staff turnover in 2022/2023.
- The report can be found here: https://leadershipprincewilliam.org/wp-content/uploads/LPWStratPlan_Final.pdf
- It is expected that the Management Team will guide the Board of Regents through a Strategic Planning effort, whether a segmented or a comprehensive plan. Proposers should identify their approach in their document.

When you picture LPW a few years from now, specifically in terms of revenue and programs, what do you actually want it to look like? Why do you (the Regents in aggregate) feel those are the right goals for the organization?

- Bringing in participants to the Signature and the Emerging Leaders Programs from different sectors and organization sizes. There should be class members from different parts of the community who would allow us to solve community issues and work across public → for-profit → nonprofit lines.
- There should be a level of exclusivity as part of the Signature Program, along with a selectively cultivated group of attendees. Leaders should be knocking down the door to be selected, and it should be a point of pride for an organization to have a class member included in the cohort. It is even more a point of pride to host an LPW session and have LPW spotlight those organizations.
- We expect broader and deeper revenue growth, as Prince William lacks the corporate financial presence of Tyson's Corner, the Rosslyn/Ballston Corridor, or large-area Old Town Alexandria. Penetration of the untapped market of major employers would be evident through participation in the Signature Program and Emerging Leader Programs by such organizations, followed by sponsorships and other revenues.
- There needs to be greater focus on the regularity and precision of key events, activities, and processes, which must be documented and made available to the day leads and committees. Specific examples include:
 - A Signature Program that is completely planned and ready to go at the start of September, with the vast majority of locations and speakers secured.
 - More recruitment events and higher application rates and quality for the Signature Program and Emerging Leaders Programs.
 - Advance planning without last-minute preparations for key events and milestones (Annual Meeting, Signature Program Graduation, PWC Economic Development sessions, etc.).
 - Procurement of new program sponsors and grant applications to increase funding to offer more programming, including defined formal partnerships with community organizations that can increase presence, reduce costs, or maximize impact and value.
 - More participation and presence from alumni within our local nonprofits.
- A fully staffed organization, supported by consistent revenue streams, that fulfills the organization's mission through programming, activities, and engagement. Effective branding and communication of impact to help propel LPW forward.

Looking ahead 3–5 years, what does success look like for Leadership Prince William in terms of Community impact, Financial sustainability, and Organizational structure?

- See Other.
- We have no defined organizational structure, hence the open-ended RFQ. We are open to qualified delivery of the described programs, activities, and events.

Programming:

As LPW considers evolving its management and operating model, how would the Board describe its appetite for change (e.g., incremental improvement vs. more transformative restructuring)?

- From a programming standpoint, the BoR is seeking a more incremental path to improving the core structure of the Signature, Emerging Leaders, and Economic Development Programs, as they work well. However, once there is demonstrated growth and sustained success (bookended by the requisite administrative and communication tasks), there is a more open door to transformative programming change, working with the BoR and committees.
- The BoR, however, is open to more transformational change within the organization (hence the RFQ vs. RFP). This includes: strategic planning, revenue development, how the board engages with (and leverages value for) the community, and how LPW builds its reputation for excellence. The BoR is a highly intelligent, engaged, and active board that works across Prince William's public and private sectors—a resource to be maximized. In addition, we have regional connections and the ability to reach across political borders to solve problems and leverage relationships.

To what extent is LPW open to adapting or restructuring existing programs (Signature, ELP, Business Development Series) or introducing new revenue-generating offerings, provided alignment with mission is maintained?

- See Other.
- The BoR is open to ideas once baseline needs are met and with specific examples provided. Risk must be calculated and managed; it cannot cause reputational damage or pose a significant risk to fiscal health.
- Other ways of generating revenue (special events, partner shares, golf tournaments, etc.) would be exciting and welcome. Note that we are moving away from a membership model (described below under Budget & Finance) because alumni do not feel that paying annual dues post-graduation for a member “status” is how they would like to contribute. This requires creativity to develop fiscal support from alumni.

Is LPW seeking to expand participant volume within existing programs (e.g., Signature Program, ELP), introduce new programs, or both?

Are there defined limits to class sizes or delivery capacity that should be considered?

- The BoR is open to increasing participant volume, but not to the point where the classes become impersonal. We have identified the current capacity for Emerging Leaders as 16 members and the Signature Program at 40 members under the current model. Those are in line with industry standards.
- The BoR is open to new programming options in line with mission and culture.

Budget & Finance:

Can LPW provide a more detailed breakout of the current operating budget, existing contractor costs, program-specific expenses, and the projected revenue gap the selected proposer is expected to address within 24 months?

- We have attached the FY2026 (current budget) and the yet-to-be-presented or approved FY2027 budget. They are provided to help proposers understand the revenues and expenses aligned with the core programming, overhead, and personnel demands. The \$172K allocated for the project is the FULL PERSONNEL budget, including \$55K from operating reserves.
- For the FY27 budget, the Business Development workshops have not been included in either the income or expenses, as we are waiting on the County to finalize their budget from which this funding comes. In addition, no income or expenses were budgeted for the three revenue-impacting events. For FY2026, the Evening of Excellence event netted LPW just over \$7,000 for the operating fund and \$11,500 for scholarships. The other two events, while generating very small returns, were not planned as revenue-generating events.

Given the RFQ's emphasis on fundraising, grants, sponsorships, and reducing reliance on reserves, how will LPW evaluate proposed revenue-generation plans, and what flexibility will be available if projected revenue growth requires a longer ramp-up period?

- For Year 1, the LPW BoR expects retention of current sponsors and program supporters, along with moderate incremental growth. At least a proposed plan for sponsorship and fundraising would be important. The Board would also like to see the selected vendor attend in-person community events to establish relationships within the Greater Prince William County Area that could eventually lead to financial partnerships.
- Examples include: re-establishing class applications from new and past-participating organizations; grant applications from state and local public entities and the private sector; building new relationships; and developing a board-level fundraising strategy and training, including vendors that support our key partners. This also includes increased alumni engagement and participation.
- A notable trend is that as organizations place employees in LPW programs, they tend to increase support by adding more seats at events and sponsoring activities. Building an alumni pipeline within key organizations is an effective way to organically maximize revenue streams.
- For years 2 and 3, there is an expectation that incremental progress in relationships will translate into enhanced revenue streams for key events, along with the pipeline of grants, program sponsorships, and alumni efforts to support fundraising campaigns.
- There is flexibility, but it is constrained by the reserve fund. If the reserve fund is not replenished, there are no additional resources to cover the full cost of the contract. If fundraising in year 1 yields a \$20K increase in revenue, it provides a longer runway to close the full \$55K annual revenue/expense gap; however, if revenues cannot

replenish the funds, there is no sustainable annual funding to support operating expenses over a longer term.

- To evaluate the proposed revenue growth plan, the Selection Committee will look at proof of concept: what is the proposer's approach to—and prior experience delivering upon—the methods they describe and/or prescribe?
- For example, if proposing state or local grants: what entities, under what funding cycle, in what amounts, and for how long a commitment? Is there demonstrated success in obtaining these grants? If so, provide such examples and amounts, and whether one-time or recurring revenue?
- What is the balance of the fundraising plan between retention of current sponsors and growing that base vs. growth of new fiscal relationships with new organizations and partners? Again, is this one-time or multi-year revenue?
- If revenue is to come from enhanced programming, which new markets would it enter, who would it attract, and at what revenue vs. expense? What is the demonstrated experience with this programming and does the proposer have the organizational structure and bandwidth to develop, promote, implement, and sustain these new revenue streams.

Does LPW have historical data on alumni engagement (participation, giving, event attendance), and are there any sensitivities or constraints around introducing structured alumni giving or membership-based revenue models?

- Yes, in limited capacity. Most of that information is stored in the Constant Contact information system (events and marketing materials), Sign-up Genius (for volunteer events), and QuickBooks (vendors and sponsors). It is not readily available in a single database and is an area that needs improvement, especially as part of the larger fundraising strategy.
- See Other.

Given the identified gap between current revenues and the proposed staffing budget, how does the Board of Regents prioritize the balance between short-term financial risk (use of reserves) and long-term growth investments? Are there defined thresholds or constraints on reserve utilization during the first 24 months?

- LPW does not have a formal endowment strategy. We have built an operating reserve over the program's history, which is what will fund this expanded project budget. There is an additional managed investment account that has gradually increased in value but is not used to cover the organization's operating expenses.
- Once the management team has a track record of closing the known funding gap, the BoR is open to placing additional reserve funds into that managed investment account in a strategic capacity, provided there is prior demonstrated experience generating long-term returns. As success is established and revenues are stable,

the Board may also be open to new approaches to managing any excess profits or reserve funds.

How does LPW envision the selected partner balancing the fixed \$172K contract with the expectation to generate new revenue streams? Specifically, is there flexibility for reinvestment of newly generated revenue into staffing, infrastructure, or program expansion, or are all revenues expected to flow directly back into LPW's general operating budget?

- The \$172K project budget is the organization's full personnel budget. The priority in revenue generation is to close the known \$55K gap before reinvesting in the organization. This is the largest risk to LPW, and without the closed revenue gap, there is no excess income to reinvest in staffing, infrastructure, or program expansion.
- The BoR will use the annual budget process to allocate any excess program income (over the course of a balanced budget) for expansion and investment, pending BoR approval. The budget process occurs between March and April each calendar year for the FY beginning July 1. If the management team has established a stable and recurring income stream, or specialized one-time funds, the BoR is open to mid-cycle budget adjustment and or enhancements.
- We also recognize that once the income-to-expense gap is closed and revenue streams are sustainable, the BoR is open to a fundraising-based bonus structure for the management team. This can be identified during contract negotiations with the selected proposer, as we want to incentivize and reward good work that benefits LPW and share the success with the management team.

Given the emphasis on alumni as a key asset, how does LPW currently view alumni engagement in terms of: Financial contributions, Program participation, and Volunteer leadership?

- See other

Are there existing models or expectations for expanding alumni-driven revenue?

- Historically, LPW operated on a "membership" model in which alumni paid \$100 in annual dues for the privilege of voting on officers, bylaw issues, and other matters at the Annual Meeting. This has been the subject of significant discussion for the past few years and the LPW Alumni Engagement committee has made the recommendation, supported by the BoR, to abandon this approach. The reason—the website stopped taking credit card payments, so dues ended up being arbitrary, especially when some of our most active and engaged alumni were not paying dues but were still participating on the BoR and committees. It also created a perceived financial barrier to participation, especially to recently graduated alumni who had spent a year with the program and were now expected to pay alumni dues and

without any tangible benefits. It was unsuccessful in its approach to engage membership and did not generate enough revenue to move the financial needle.

- In the next few months, LPW is expected to ratify bylaw changes to remove this paid membership requirement and instead incorporate the approach that a member in good standing is an alum who donates time, talents, or treasure, and/or maintains updated contact information with the organization.
- This does not mean LPW is abandoning the ability to generate revenue from its alumni. There is an ongoing opportunity to develop alumni financial commitments through new programs and initiatives. Successful proposers should identify how their skills and qualifications can cultivate ongoing support; proposers should outline how they can use this untapped resource to expand financial support.
- We are in the process of piloting a new program, modeled after the Clemson University “IPTAY” program of individual contributions with no defined return or benefit other than the support of the program. There may be other benefits of status, engagement, and opportunities for unique experiences (an extra drink ticket at an event; driving a bulldozer; being a guest at a luncheon), but nothing guaranteed or defined. Unlike other university or arts fundraising campaigns, our exclusivity is about getting INTO the program and being an active and engaged alumnus, not how much you individually donate to LPW.
- Many alumni in positions of influence or impact at their organization prefer to give through program sponsorships or through purchasing tickets for events such as the Evening of Excellence. They may be selective and opt to support scholarships vs. offsetting LPW program expenses.

To what extent does LPW currently rely on corporate partnerships and sponsorships, and are there target sectors or strategic partners the organization is prioritizing for future growth?

- LPW is primarily funded through program dues. There is ample room to grow current partnerships with sponsors, with careful attention to what they have been promised, and other ways they could be recognized. Historically, organizations fund the program through a pipeline of highly talented leaders with 10-15 organizations paying tuition to the program in excess of \$5000 annually.
- Additional target sectors include major employers, the Innovation District, and more small businesses at more accessible sponsor levels. An under-accessed opportunity also includes foundation grants, including those from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to support business growth. This is a key area for investigation and development by the successful management team.

Transition, Tools & Resources:

What existing systems, tools, and organizational resources will transfer to the selected vendor at the start of performance, such as donor records, CRM or database access,

sponsor information, financial systems, program calendars, marketing assets, and administrative processes?

- For donor records, CRM, etc. See other.
- All access to program emails, records, calendars, marketing assets and materials, and administrative processes will be provided, where available. One of the key areas of opportunity is to properly document and outline more regimented calendars and processes. The BoR is committed to helping the management team develop any missing timelines and information, as this is a highly supportive organization that simply wants success for everyone involved—there is no ‘hide the ball’ at LPW.
- There is limited technology hardware associated with program operations. We have identified 2 iPads, 3 payment ‘squares’, and have no formal CRM (we use Constant Contact). LPW controls its social media platforms, website domain and editing, and has a dedicated Microsoft Live account with full functionality of SharePoint, OneDrive, MS Office, etc.
- LPW does not have a dedicated office space because the prior shared-lease agreement ended, and our co-working partner relocated. There was insufficient demand for dedicated space, as we use space donated by partners (free or low-cost event space, public or private meeting rooms, etc.) to conduct meetings or events. The vast majority of programming is conducted as community-based activities and the pandemic-era work-from-home model was quickly adapted.

Existing Assets, Systems, and Transition Expectations: Can LPW provide additional detail on current operational systems (e.g., CRM, financial systems, marketing tools), key vendor relationships, and expectations for transition from the current contractors to the selected management team?

- See Other.

Transition of Current Contractors: How should proposers approach the transition of the current independent contractors (Executive Director, Executive Assistant, and ELP Facilitator)? Are these individuals expected to remain in place, Transition out, or be considered as part of the proposed future model?

- That would be entirely up to the selected proposer, as this RFQ assumes a blank slate. We encourage the successful proposer to consider the existing personnel for goodness of fit, and we can facilitate discussions if required.
- The comprehensive project and personnel budget is \$172K, and the proposer’s organizational model/structure drives the personnel.
 - All personnel/management team will be supervised and employed by the proposer, whether they are proposing: an employer (LPW) /employee (management team) relationship; a management services LLC with employees or their own subcontractors; or nesting within an established firm or agency and engaging employees or subcontractors.
 - Proposers can use LPW’s personnel, firm/agency’s current personnel, new personnel, or the appropriate blend of all of the above.

Can you provide insight into the current systems supporting operations (e.g., CRM, financial systems, alumni database, marketing platforms)?

- See Other.

Additionally, how mature and accessible is the existing data for reporting and decision-making?

- This is an area of organizational weakness. Documentation and process are key expectations of the management team.

END OF Q &A

Profit & Loss Summary													
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Total Revenue Programs	940	100,460	43,470	500	500	500	520	6,680	10,970	500	10,500	3,800	179,340
Total Revenue Events	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Other Revenue	3,150	3,050	9,300	3,150	3,050	9,300	3,150	3,050	9,300	3,150	3,050	10,550	63,250
Total Revenue	4,090	103,510	52,770	3,650	3,550	9,800	3,670	9,730	20,270	3,650	13,550	14,350	242,590
Total Expenses Programs	(200)	(200)	(2,250)	(5,500)	(18,650)	(1,550)	(1,300)	(3,300)	(2,100)	(2,100)	(12,850)	(3,750)	(53,750)
Total Expenses Events	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Operational Expenses	(18,020)	(15,470)	(17,870)	(17,320)	(17,020)	(17,820)	(18,470)	(18,270)	(18,870)	(19,220)	(18,270)	(25,095)	(228,715)
Total Expenses	(18,220)	(15,670)	(20,120)	(22,820)	(35,670)	(19,370)	(19,770)	(21,570)	(20,970)	(21,320)	(31,120)	(28,845)	(282,465)
Total Net Profit/Loss	(14,130)	87,840	32,650	(19,170)	(32,120)	(9,570)	(16,100)	(11,840)	(700)	(17,670)	(17,570)	(14,495)	(39,875)

BUDGET DRAFT

REVENUE

	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
4001.00 Signature Adult Program Revenue													
4001.10 Tuition Fees	76,000	53,200	7,600										136,800
4001.20 Application Fees										750	1,550	200	2,500
4001.30 Session Sponsors				750	700	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	6,000
4001.40 Retreat Sponsors												2,500	2,500
4001.60 <u>Class Project</u>											10,000		10,000
Total Signature Program	76,000	53,200	7,600	750	700	650	650	650	650	1,400	12,200	3,350	157,800
4003.00 Emergenetics Program Revenue													
4003.10 Emergenetics Revenue								6,000					6,000
Total Emergenetics Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,000	0	0	0	0	6,000
4004.00 Emerging Leaders Program Revenue													
4004.10 Tuition Fees			9,600						9,600				19,200
4004.20 Application Fees	60	160	180				60	160	180				800
4004.30 <u>Sponsorships</u>			750						750				1,500
Total Emerging Leaders Program	60	160	10,530	0	0	0	60	160	10,530	0	0	0	21,500
4100.00 Events Revenue													
4110.10 Evening of Excellence Tickets													0
4110.20 Evening of Excellence Sponsors													0
4110.40 Evening of Excellence Bar Sales													0
4190.10 <u>Other Events & Partnerships</u>													0
Total Events	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4500.00 Other Revenue													
4510.00 WAGTAM	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	3,600
4520.00 Fundraising/Sponsorships	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	42,000
4530.00 Grants Unrestricted												1,000	1,000
4540.00 Dividends	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	3,960
4550.00 Unrealized Gains/Losses													0
4590.00 <u>Misc. Revenue & Donations</u>	250			250			250			250			1,000
Total Other Revenue	4,380	4,130	4,130	4,380	4,130	4,130	4,380	4,130	4,130	4,380	4,130	5,130	51,560

PROGRAM & EVENT EXPENSES

	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
5001.00 Signature Adult Program Expenses													
5001.10 Program Materials			(900)		(100)	(150)		(350)	(250)			(250)	(2,000)
5001.15 Food & Beverages			(300)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(1,100)	(10,200)
5001.20 Emergenetics Profiles				(4,000)									(4,000)
5001.25 Facilitators & Speakers			(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(500)
5001.30 Venue, Transportation, & Rentals			(150)	(300)	(750)			(600)	(200)		(50)	(450)	(2,500)
5001.35 Class Project Expense											(10,000)		(10,000)
5001.40 Opening Retreat			(16,500)		(500)								(17,000)
5001.45 Closing Session & Commencement												(1,500)	(1,500)
5001.50 <u>Recruiting Event Expense</u>										(300)	(300)	(300)	(900)
Total Signature Program	0	0	(17,900)	(5,450)	(2,500)	(1,300)	(1,150)	(2,100)	(1,600)	(1,450)	(11,500)	(3,650)	(48,600)
5003.00 Emergenetics Program Expenses													
5003.10 Emergenetics Profiles								(2,000)					(2,000)
Total Emergenetics Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2,000)	0	0	0	0	(2,000)
5004.00 Emerging Leaders Program Expenses													
5004.10 Materials			(100)	(100)	(50)				(100)	(100)	(50)		(500)
5004.20 Program Admin & Staffing			(500)	(500)	(500)				(500)	(500)	(500)		(3,000)
5004.30 <u>Miscellaneous</u>					(600)						(600)		(1,200)

Profit & Loss Summary													
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Total Revenue Programs	76,060	53,360	18,130	750	700	650	710	6,810	11,180	1,400	12,200	3,350	185,300
Total Revenue Events	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Other Revenue	4,380	4,130	4,130	4,380	4,130	4,130	4,380	4,130	4,130	4,380	4,130	5,130	51,560
Total Revenue	80,440	57,490	22,260	5,130	4,830	4,780	5,090	10,940	15,310	5,780	16,330	8,480	236,860
Total Expenses Programs	0	0	(18,500)	(6,050)	(3,650)	(1,300)	(1,150)	(4,100)	(2,200)	(2,050)	(12,650)	(3,650)	(55,300)
Total Expenses Events	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Operational Expenses	(17,475)	(14,035)	(18,390)	(17,840)	(17,640)	(17,890)	(19,015)	(18,140)	(18,740)	(18,940)	(20,390)	(22,940)	(228,135)
Total Expenses	(17,475)	(14,035)	(36,890)	(23,890)	(21,290)	(19,190)	(20,165)	(22,240)	(20,940)	(20,990)	(33,040)	(26,590)	(283,435)
Total Net Profit/Loss	62,965	43,455	(14,630)	(18,760)	(16,460)	(14,410)	(15,075)	(11,300)	(5,630)	(15,210)	(16,710)	(18,110)	(46,575)