



**Better  
Care  
Network**

# City Light Church and New Hope Children's Home

A CASE STUDY OF DIVESTMENT

Partnerships **PLUS**



# Summary

This case study documents the complex process undertaken by a donor partner in Ireland\* to push for the transition of their partner residential care service provider in Ghana. It follows their journey through the early stages of transition and eventually leads to their decision to divest of their funding and partnership. It examines the various strategies the donor partner employed to try to secure buy-in for transition from their partner and the principal donor. It outlines the mixed motivations and competing interests of the organizations and individuals deeply invested in the residential care service, highlighting the contextual barriers and power dynamics that ultimately prevented transition.

The case study is structured around the three phases of transition outlined in the [Phases of Transition Interactive Diagram](#) and provides a narrative example of the elements of a divestment process, as outlined in [Divesting of Residential Care Services: Guidelines and Recommendations for Donors Supporting Residential Care Services](#).

*\* The locations and names of individuals, organizations, and religious bodies have been changed to protect the confidentiality of all those involved; however, the details represent a true account.*

## Background

### Background to the Partnership and the Role of the Children's Home

New Hope Children's Home was established in 2000 by the Covenant Church of Ghana in response to a civil war. The Covenant Church, a vast network of churches with locations all over the world, had established an office in Ghana nearly 200 years prior. The bishop tasked with the leadership of Covenant's Ghanaian office was responsible for oversight of all Covenant Church ministries in the country, including New Hope.

On the funding side, a Covenant church in Ireland called St. Mary's Church took on the role of founding and principal donor. Representing a group of fellow Covenant churches in the city of Dublin who collectively funded New Hope, St. Mary's invested heavily in buildings and infrastructure at the children's home and covered the majority of their running costs.

New Hope quickly became the signature project of St. Mary's and the Dublin churches, with the facility buildings painted in the colors of the Irish flag. For any visiting pastors, missionaries, and short-term mission teams from Ireland, the Covenant Church of Ghana arranged for New Hope to be the first stop on all travel itineraries, before

introducing them to their other ministries. Most of these visitors ended up becoming donors to the children's home, and New Hope soon became the primary ministry of the church's Ghanaian office, as well as paving a pathway for overseas donors to fund their various other ministries.

Donations collected by St. Mary's and the Dublin churches were transferred through Harvest Missions Abroad (HMA), the missions and development arm of the Covenant Church in Ireland. Although HMA's aim was to establish financial accountability, multiple intermediary points in the funds transfer process and minimal requirements for donor reporting led to certain individuals taking advantage of loopholes in the system.

New Hope thus came to play an integral role for the Covenant Church in both countries. It showcased the missions work of the church in Ireland and became closely linked with the donor identity of St. Mary's and the Dublin churches. It became instrumental as a method of fundraising for the church's other ministries in Ghana; in some cases, allowing individuals to profit from the lack of financial accountability. Twenty-four years after its founding, New Hope remains the only residential care provider in Ghana that is operated and funded by the Covenant Church.

## Initial Engagement of the Divesting Donor

Several years after New Hope was established, another Covenant church in Ireland called City Light Church came into contact with the children's home. After initially investing in building classrooms for the children, City Light launched a child sponsorship program as a way to remain involved with New Hope. They deployed annual teams of congregation members who implemented children's programming and developed long-standing relationships with the children in care.

Having secured child sponsors for the 80 children in care, City Light's annual contributions amounted to between US\$30K and \$35K, making up roughly 1/3 of New Hope's operating budget. Although this level of funding meant that City Light held the donor profile of a general donor, rather than a principal or sole donor, they would become an active donor partner throughout the course of their engagement with New Hope.

## Catalyst for Change

Not long after their initial engagement with New Hope, a City Light congregation member named Catherine became increasingly involved in their support of the children's home and soon came to serve as the primary liaison between the two entities. During one of her annual trips to New Hope, a group of young people approached

Catherine and her church members for help as they had been instructed to leave the children's home following their high school graduation, with no preparation or support.

By this time, five years into Catherine's annual trips to New Hope, she had noticed issues about the level of care the children were receiving but had attributed them to cultural differences in childrearing. Observing what unfolded with the group of young people served as a trigger for Catherine and City Light to deeply question the overall vision and strategy of New Hope. Viewing the children's home through a new lens, Catherine documented her concerns, which included the realization that the caregivers did not know the names of the children in their care and that newly admitted children were falsely portrayed as orphans to boost fundraising efforts.

Catherine made numerous attempts over the next three years to effect positive change for the children and young people at New Hope, first by repeatedly raising her concerns with both the director of the children's home and the bishop responsible for oversight of the ministry. When they failed to take her concerns seriously, Catherine stepped into an active role with New Hope by taking extended trips to equip both the administrative and caregiver staff to improve the level of care. It was then that Catherine discovered evidence of the poor standards of care, harsh physical punishment, and misappropriation of City Light funds that had been allocated for food for the children.

## Exploring Transition: Phase 1 – Learning and Engagement

### Identifying and Engaging with Others

As part of her efforts to improve the overall efficiency and coordination of their funds transfers to New Hope, Catherine reached out to Harvest Missions Abroad (HMA), Covenant's missions and development arm in Ireland. HMA introduced Catherine to their regional representative in West Africa, a Ghanaian national who was responsible for overseeing all HMA-funded ministries in the region. Through her extensive connections within the Covenant network, she facilitated

introductions to valuable in-country contacts, advised Catherine on what and how to communicate with the bishop, and encouraged her to keep pushing for change even when Catherine grew discouraged. Noting that Catherine was the only donor representative who was aware of what went on behind the scenes at New Hope, HMA's regional representative felt it was critical for Catherine to exercise her right as a donor to continue asking questions as well as uphold her responsibility to the children by speaking up on their behalf.

## Building Awareness of the Reasons for Change

After attending a conference hosted in Ireland by GCC and learning more about the transition out of residential care, Catherine became fully convinced that was exactly what needed to happen at New Hope. Although she had been exposed to the concept of family-based care several years prior, the messaging had been too broad to demonstrate how it was relevant to New Hope and could be feasible in their context. Given GCC's firsthand experience of transition as well as their intimate understanding of the geographic, cultural, and religious factors influencing New Hope's operations, they were uniquely positioned to provide both the technical support and contextual background City Light needed to fully embark on the road to transition.

Around this time, Catherine connected with a donor advocate agency based in Ireland who provided a wealth of helpful resources and coaching for donors supporting the transition of their residential care partners. Catherine familiarized herself with data from the United Nations, global trends in the shift away from residential care, and the Biblical basis for the care of vulnerable children in families.

## Exploring the Local Context for Transition

In the early years of her engagement with New Hope, Catherine had connected with Lucy, another Irish woman who was living and working in Ghana. Through her work at a small anti-trafficking NGO, Lucy served on a task force supporting the Ministry of Social Welfare to develop their national plan for deinstitutionalization. As Lucy's interaction with many children's homes in Ghana led to a granular understanding of how they operated, she was able to provide valuable insight as Catherine navigated her growing concerns about New Hope and explored what transition for the children's home might look like.

Armed with an understanding of the practicalities of transition within their specific context, Catherine initiated discussions with New Hope leadership about the shift away from residential care. Reflecting on the changes within the country since the end of the civil war, Catherine reviewed the child roster together with the New Hope director to identify which children had families and could be supported for reintegration.

While the director was open about the children's histories and conceded that many of them could return home, he maintained that it was a worthwhile sacrifice for them to remain separated from their families if it meant that they could gain an education. Although Catherine stressed that the two did not have to be mutually exclusive, the director was adamant that his responsibility was to ensure that the children in his care graduated from high school, and that it was not in his job description to worry about what happened to young people after they aged out of care.

In addition to the director's views on education, the steady flow of funds from Ireland to New Hope likely presented a strong disincentive for certain individuals to consider transition. Given HMA's lax financial reporting requirements for donations to New Hope, the prospect of transition signaled a potential disruption to the status quo and how funds could be accessed by those looking to profit.

## Engagement with the Principal Donor

Throughout this period of onboarding discussions with New Hope, Catherine had been diligently advocating with St. Mary's and keeping them updated on her findings as she spent more time in Ghana. After her initial attempts to coordinate fundraising efforts with them were unsuccessful, she shared evidence of the misappropriation of City Light funds. To her surprise, St. Mary's did not appear concerned and they justified financial mismanagement as an inevitable part of funding ministries in West Africa.

Over the next several years, Catherine employed a range of tactics to try to onboard the principal donor for transition. She shared resources on the rationale for family-based care and cited UN data. She traveled to Ireland to attend the annual gathering of Covenant churches in Dublin, where she sensed that they preferred she not tell them anything that was difficult to hear. She arranged for GCC and the donor advocate agency to join her on a call to speak to the global shift away from residential care so that St. Mary's could see that it was not only City Light pushing for transition. She shared the testimony of one of the care leavers from New Hope who struggled to know how to love her own children because she had never experienced it herself as a child growing up in residential care.

Eventually, the representative from St. Mary's admitted that he agreed with everything Catherine was saying about residential care but firmly felt that it was not his place to dictate to New Hope what their ministry should be. As the dynamic of donor influence had been highly scrutinized and criticized in the

global north, there was a palpable fear by donor churches that they could be labeled colonialist and accused of dictating the ministries of their global south partners.

St. Mary's confirmed that they would support transition if New Hope led the process, but that they would never step in to tell them they should consider a new approach. Given their own reluctance to ask questions around how their funds were spent and the type of programming or activities implemented by the children's home, St. Mary's viewed Catherine as meddling in the ministry of New Hope and informed her that the only decision City Light was entitled to make was whether to fund it.

As she compiled increasing evidence of the sub-standard care provided at New Hope, Catherine tried a new tactic and

approached St. Mary's from the angle of the safety and welfare of the children. She had assumed that they would find the reports as alarming as she had but eventually realized that there was a fundamental difference in their points of connection to New Hope.

While City Light had become involved in funding New Hope because of their emotional connection to the children in care, St. Mary's and the Dublin churches had always had a much stronger connection to the ministry itself. It was in their interest to maintain their signature project and it seemed that they were willing to go to great lengths to justify their ongoing financial support of the children's home. Catherine surmised that they probably felt they were in too deep and that it was too late to unwind what they had already invested in for the past 20 years.

## Exploring Transition: Phase 2 – Preparing for Transition

### Securing Agreement from Remaining Key Decision-Makers

Two years into broaching the subject of transition with New Hope leadership, Catherine facilitated a higher-level discussion with some of the key decision-makers tasked with oversight of the children's home. Taking advantage of the positive momentum of that discussion, the group set up a committee to begin planning for transition.

By this time, Lucy had established her own organization called Families Empowered, which focused on family strengthening services. Through a new partnership between City Light and Families Empowered, two social workers were hired to provide attachment training to New Hope caregivers and to become acquainted with the children in care with the ultimate aim of facilitating their reintegration.

Along with the two social workers, a group of key stakeholders from New Hope attended a family reunification conference organized by GCC in the neighboring country. Upon their return, accompanied by members of the GCC team who had traveled to Ghana to support ongoing buy-in discussions, Catherine secured approval from New Hope's board of directors to move forward with transition.

The bishop invited the group to a widely publicized dinner to celebrate the decision, declaring in the presence of the media and members of the Covenant Church of Ghana that transition was the right course of action for New Hope. He

then requested the group present the idea of transition to the entire Covenant network in Ghana at their annual gathering, which was received with a standing ovation. After three years of buy-in discussions, City Light had received approval for transition at every level: from the board of the children's home, the bishop, and the wider Covenant body.

Over the next few months, GCC supported Catherine to draft a plan for transition and provided family reintegration training to New Hope's social workers. When Catherine returned to Ghana to commence transition, however, she was shocked to see the bishop backpedaling on his agreement. When pressed, he admitted to Catherine that their other donors preferred to support children in a residential care setting, and that funds came quickly and easily when requested from St. Mary's.

After her meeting with the bishop, Catherine felt that there was nothing more that could be done to pursue transition. However, when the head of the social work department at the Covenant University in Ghana suggested they put together a formal proposal outlining a plan for transition, Catherine agreed to make one final push. She worked together with GCC, Lucy, and City Light leadership to articulate their commitments to support New Hope's transition and submitted the proposal to its board of directors. A few months later, their proposal was formally rejected. With the director of the children's home, its board, and the bishop unequivocally communicating their decision to continue operating residential care, City Light made the decision to terminate their partnership with New Hope.

## Divestment

### Step 1: Understanding the Funding Landscape

Given their frequent visits to New Hope and their direct involvement with administrative staff, City Light was familiar with the operating costs of the children's home. While they had contributed significantly to building projects in the past, they knew that their ongoing donations covered roughly 1/3 of the annual budget.

Recognizing that this meant their donor profile was that of a general donor, and that they would have limited influence to push for transition, City Light attempted to onboard the principal and founding donor, as outlined in the Engagement with the Principal Donor section above. However, when they were ultimately unsuccessful, City Light understood that St. Mary's would likely step in to fill the funding gap left by their divested funds.

### Step 2: Securing Internal Buy-In for Divestment

Leading up to the decision of whether to divest, Catherine had ensured the appropriate people from her church were informed and involved. From the time the first group of care leavers were instructed to leave New Hope without preparation or support, the key decision-makers and stakeholders at City Light were kept updated on the increasing list of concerns regarding New Hope. The annual visiting teams directly witnessed some of these concerns and the City Light leadership trusted their judgement on the matter.

As Catherine documented her concerns over that period, she shared everything she learned with City Light's missions pastor. As she connected with the individuals and organizations who provided contextual knowledge and technical support for transition, she passed on the information and resources to the decision-making stakeholders at her church.

City Light's global outreach team, which sat above the team coordinating involvement with New Hope, was part of making the decision to divest of New Hope and re-invest in new partnerships and services. Through consistent communication

and intentional engagement with the appropriate stakeholder groups, the process of securing internal buy-in for divestment occurred organically and resulted in a cohesive group of supporters fully committed to divestment.

### Step 3: Identifying Child Protection Risks

While New Hope was properly registered with the appropriate authorities, the level of care they provided fell well below the national minimum standards. Owing to a combination of an under-resourced government and the implicit authority given to the Covenant Church, the children's home was not subject to regular inspections by the Ministry of Social Welfare. The decision for New Hope to forego the government stipend that presumably would have facilitated such inspections further ensured that the children's home continued to operate without the oversight and involvement of mandated authorities.

As outlined in City Light's list of concerns presented to New Hope leadership, there were also several child protection and safeguarding issues at the children's home. Apart from a profound failure to adequately feed and supervise children, social worker accounts and an independent investigation substantiated allegations of physical abuse.

At an organizational level, the crisis narrative of 'war orphans' continued to be used as the basis for fundraising, long after the civil conflict had ceased and despite New Hope's knowledge that many of the children had living parents.

Catherine and Lucy worked with the social workers to document the child protection risks and violations they had witnessed during their time at New Hope, producing a detailed report they could submit to the appropriate agencies.

### Step 4: Connecting with In-Country Child Protection Organizations

Although Lucy had made several attempts to engage her primary contact at the Ministry of Social Welfare regarding their concerns at New Hope, she never received a response. Unable to involve the authorities mandated with oversight of the children's home, Catherine then reached out to global

organizations for advice on how to identify and engage with in-country child protection agencies that could assist them in the process of triaging and reporting their concerns.

Relying on the leads provided by organizations working at the global level, Catherine approached a number of in-country intermediary agencies familiar with national and local child protection laws in Ghana. However, these agencies failed to provide any concrete recommendations, citing their lack of jurisdiction over New Hope and the lack of a prior relationship with the children's home.

Although these elements are not prerequisites for child protection agencies to provide guidance on reporting and investigative processes in other contexts, Catherine noted a marked reluctance from these agencies to become involved, perhaps indicating their awareness of the power dynamics at play in the leadership and operations of New Hope. In the absence of guidance from in-country child protection organizations, Catherine filed a report with HMA, Covenant's missions agency in Ireland, and she continues to follow up on the outcomes of the investigation.

## Step 5: Determining the Divestment Timeframe and Approach

In response to various triggers, City Light progressed through three iterations of the divestment process: 1. termination of funding for food; 2. termination of funding of school fees; and 3. termination of their partnership with New Hope.

Long before making the decision to terminate their partnership, City Light was faced with evidence of the misappropriation of their funds allocated for food for the children. In response, they made the decision to gradually reduce and terminate those funds, while simultaneously reinvesting in an external partner organization to provide new services for young people living at New Hope.

Two months after providing written notification of both their intention to divest and a schedule outlining the amounts by

which they would reduce their funding, City Light commenced the first iteration of their divestment process. They reduced their funding by 25% every 3 months: in the first quarter, they sent 75% of their original funding amount, followed by 50% in the second quarter, and 25% in the third quarter.

The second iteration of City Light's divestment process was triggered by the realization that it was contradictory to advocate for transition while funding a school that continued to be a driver of family separation. Using a different approach to the one they had in the first iteration, City Light gradually reduced their funding to the school over two 6-month periods, while reinvesting in a new partner organization providing support for education.

For the reduction of their funding for school fees, City Light calculated the amount they were contributing per child: \$8 per month. During the first six months of the reduction period, any time a child or young person either aged out of care or was exited from the children's home for disciplinary reasons, City Light subtracted the \$8 per month from their funds transfer. During the second half of the 12-month reduction, they divided the remaining amount by the remaining 6 months, reducing their funding in equal decrements.

It bears noting that in this case study, onboarding discussions for transition took place throughout these two iterations. While ideally the reduction of funds would have commenced after all avenues to transition had been fully explored, the discovery of hard evidence that New Hope was profiting from the funds allocated to feed the children warranted a timely response. Despite the redirection of those funds into new services benefitting children at New Hope, it is possible that the reduction of funding may have inadvertently weakened the argument for transition.

The third and final iteration saw City Light providing formal notification of the termination of their partnership with the children's home, in response to New Hope's rejection of the transition proposal and their decision to continue providing residential care services. By this point, City Light had fully divested of their funding.

## Step 6: Determining the Redirection/ Reinvestment Plan

City Light made the decision to redirect their divested funds to Families Empowered, an organization established by Lucy to support and strengthen families. Through their reinvestment in Families Empowered, City Light supported the organization to identify a range of comprehensive services focused on addressing the root causes of family separation. Families Empowered vetted and formed new partnerships with several organizations and church associations that enabled them to provide a full package of family strengthening services, in some cases benefitting families of children who had been exited from New Hope without due process.

## Step 7: Developing a Stakeholder Communications Plan

City Light implemented a tiered communications plan that provided tailored messaging to various stakeholder groups, depending on their respective levels of involvement and personal investment in the children's home.

The core ministry team involved in New Hope, i.e., a small group of highly invested stakeholders, had been part of the entire journey from the beginning and was already aware of everything that had transpired, either through firsthand experience or frequent communications. They continued to be part of in-person discussions regarding the divestment process.

Child sponsors, i.e., a group of moderately to highly invested stakeholders, received a slightly sanitized version of the story outlining some of the concerns. City Light sent out emails and recorded videos sharing what they had learned about the rationale for shifting to family-based care, and that they had discovered that many children had families they could return to.

The wider congregation, i.e., stakeholders with low levels of personal investment, were presented with a high-level picture of the partnership changes, with a focus on reinvesting in Families Empowered following New Hope's decision to continue operating residential care services.

## Step 8: Giving Notice to the Partner

As outlined in Step 5, City Light provided verbal and written notice to New Hope of their intention to divest of their financial support. They outlined their reasons for divestment

as well as their plan for gradually reducing funding over a specified period of time. Following New Hope's rejection of their transition proposal, City Light formally terminated the partnership, ending a 15-year relationship with the children's home.

## Step 9: Implementing the Divestment Plan

As detailed in the steps above, City Light implemented a divestment process in accordance with their plan. Having produced a child protection report, City Light did what they could to document and report the child protection risks and violations they had witnessed. They reinvested their funding into services devoted to family strengthening and family preservation, in addition to support for care leavers. They rolled out a tailored communications plan for stakeholders with varying degrees of involvement and personal investment in the children's home, and notified the principal donor of their intention to divest. They provided verbal and written notice to New Hope prior to gradually reducing their funding over specified periods. Although they had hoped that the Covenant Church in Ghana would assume some financial responsibility and contribute towards their sole residential care ministry, the principal donor stepped in to fill the funding gap instead.

## Divestment Outcomes

Following the termination of their partnership with New Hope, City Light and Families Empowered redeployed their two social workers from supporting the transition of New Hope to providing family strengthening and preservation services in the community. They were tasked with supporting young people who had aged out of New Hope as well as families of children who had been exited from the children's home without due process.

City Light and Families Empowered identified the services they required to carry out their work and established new partnerships with a wide range of organizations and local church associations outside of the Covenant network. Their comprehensive services for families and their children included support for food, medical care, school fees, business skills training, financial management, and trauma healing. A savings club was launched for care leavers to establish and operate small businesses.

Catherine eventually took on a formal role with Families Empowered and now works full-time as the Director of Programs/Partner Engagement, albeit on a voluntary basis.



At the time of the writing of this case study, New Hope is facing a funding crisis and potentially reconsidering whether some of the children in their care could be reintegrated. A Families Empowered social worker is liaising with the Ministry

of Social Welfare about the situation at New Hope and exploring whether there could be an opportunity for Families Empowered to conduct assessments and provide family strengthening services to those children and their families.

## Final Reflections on Divestment

Looking back on 15 years of personal and professional engagement with New Hope, Catherine shared that by the time City Light made the decision to divest of their funding and partnership, they felt with conviction that it was the right thing to do. After spending years appealing to New Hope leadership to institute improvements within the residential setting, then pushing for transition as a solution while advocating with the principal donor, she had exhausted all possible avenues to securing better outcomes for the children and young people in care.

Although there were lingering concerns about what would happen to the children following City Light's divestment, they could see that their funds were sustaining an environment that was already harmful to children and young people. She shared that reinvesting in new partnerships with organizations strengthening families and doing good work felt like redemption for having supported residential care for so long, and that it gave them a way to stay involved in Ghana by contributing to the preservation of families.

# New Hope Children's Home

## Timeline of Transition and Divestment

Onboarding NH for transition: 4 years

Onboarding principal donor for transition: 4+ years

Divestment: 3 stages over 3+ years

2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023

### Phase 1: Learning & Engagement

### Phase 2: Preparing for Transition

### Phase 3B: Divestment

2000

New Hope (NH) established in partnership with founding/principal donor in response to civil war

Donor establishes contact with principal donor to coordinate funding to NH  
Donor continues to communicate concerns to NH leadership

#### Identifying and Engaging with Others

Donor connects with organization providing technical support for transition and reintegration

#### Building Awareness of the Reasons for Change

Donor connects with a donor advocate agency providing resources and mentoring on shift to family-based care

#### Exploring the Local Context for Transition

Donor continues buy-in discussions with NH leadership

#### Exploring the Local Context for Transition

Donor engages donor advocate agency to make the case for transition with the principal donor but they maintain their stance  
Donor facilitates higher-level discussion with decision-making stakeholders about transition and receives preliminary approval

#### Developing a Strategic Plan

Donor works with technical support agency to draft transition plan

#### Post-Divestment Outcomes

Social workers redeployed to family strengthening and care leaver support  
Family strengthening programming implemented through new partner organizations  
Missions arm hires national consultant to conduct child protection investigation  
Donor continues to follow up with missions arm on investigation outcomes

2007

Divesting donor funds school building, launches child sponsorship program, deploys annual teams

#### Identifying and Engaging with Others

Donor connects with denominational missions arm, who facilitates in-country connections for contextual knowledge

#### Building Awareness of the Reasons for Change

Donor attends technical support agency's conference on transition to family-based care

#### Exploring the Local Context for Transition

Donor reviews child roster with NH director to identify which children can be supported to return to their families  
Donor raises evidenced concerns with principal donor and advocates for transition but principal donor excuses concerns as cultural norms

Donor presents rationale for transition from various angles but principal donor remains reluctant to push for transition

#### Developing a Strategic Plan

Committee formed to plan for care leaver support and family reintegration

#### Securing Agreement from Remaining Key Decision Makers

NH leadership renege on agreement to transition  
Donor submits proposal to NH board outlining commitments to fund transition  
NH board formally rejects proposal

2014-2017

Donor raises concerns with NH leadership about quality of care and lack of support for care leavers but concerns are repeatedly dismissed

Donor decides to pursue transition and communicates decision to principal donor

Donor discovers evidence of financial misappropriation

#### Developing a Strategic Plan

Donor drafts plan for care leaver support and caregiver training

#### Organizational Level Processes: Divestment

Donor reinvests funding into external local partner organization to provide vocational training skills to young people  
12-month funding reduction concludes

#### Social Work Processes

Social workers hired through new partner organization to provide reintegration services

#### Organizational Processes: Leadership and Staff Training

NH leadership and staff attend family reunification workshop

#### Organizational Level Processes: Divestment

Donor identifies school as pull factor and communicates plans to withdraw financial support and redirect funding to families

#### Organizational Level Processes: Divestment

Donor submits report to denominational missions arm outlining child protection violations at NH  
12-month funding reduction to school concludes  
Donor terminates partnership with NH

#### Securing Agreement from Remaining Key Decision Makers

NH leadership publicly give approval for transition and invite donor to present on transition at denominational event