

Survey Report: Community Engagement & Great Christmas Sundowners 2025

From campus
to community.

22 DECEMBER 2025



London
Business
School



Contents

01 · Survey Overview & Methodology

02 · Club Purpose & Event Priorities

03 · Great Christmas Sundowners 2025 Feedback

04 · Volunteering Module (Opt-In)

Special appreciation to all 37 respondents

Martin A. · Karim A. · Delphine B. · Tracy B. · Anastasia C.
· Maëlle C. · Laurent D. · Kees D. · Victor F. · Elie F.
Guillaume F. · Joséphine F. · Philippe G. · O'Len G. ·
Patrick G. · Hervé H. · Rudy H. · France H. · Sofia J.
Kumar J. · Fab K. · Maria K. · Simon L. · Marie Denise M.
Guilhem M. · Thibaut M. · Bérengère N. · Jonathan P.
Martin P. · Plabon R. · Laura R. · Simon S. · Guillaume S.
Paul S. · Alberic T. · Benoît V. · Petra Z.

Executive Summary

This report synthesizes a survey designed to accelerate the transition “from campus to community” by:

- (i) identifying what drives engagement across the alumni base,
- (ii) capturing structured feedback on the Great Christmas Sundowners (GCS) 2025, and
- (iii) surfacing alumni willing to volunteer.

Methodology at a glance

- 37 total respondents, with a branching path separating GCS attendees (23) from non-attendees (14), and an opt-in volunteering module (9) for those open to deeper involvement.

What alumni want from the community

- Responses converge on a clear demand for a community that is both social and professional. The strongest engagement drivers point to:
 - Quality events and meaningful professional networking as core value,
 - A desire for real community-building (belonging, continuity, and a recognizable “home base” in France/Paris).
- Event format preferences reinforce this: in-person professional networking and social gatherings emerge as the highest-interest “backbone” formats, followed by career/skills content. More niche formats show polarized interest and are best treated as targeted pilots rather than default programming. Online formats attract comparatively lower demand, suggesting in-person should remain the default with online used selectively when cadence/accessibility matters more than atmosphere.

GCS 2025: strong concept, clear upgrade path

- Overall, the GCS delivered on its primary promise: reconnection, social energy, and a welcoming tone. The most appreciated elements were consistently people-centric (reconnecting, meeting new alumni, fun/vibe), with the “light and humorous” communications style standing out as a differentiator worth preserving.

- The most consistent gaps are venue-led and signal a “premium gap” rather than a concept problem. Respondents are asking to raise standards, and many explicitly indicate willingness to pay more for a better venue and smoother delivery.

The strategic implication: premium experience requires a premium operating model

- A central conclusion emerges from both in-person feedback and operating constraints: moving from heroic one-offs to repeatable, higher-standard events requires professionalisation, especially around predictability (headcount, funding, booking lead time).
- Respondents explicitly call for formalising the club as an association, which would unlock practical execution capabilities (bank account, contracting/deposits, budgeting, paid ticketing, better tooling/communications, governance clarity and continuity).

Recommended direction and near-term priorities

- Build programming around three pillars (in parallel):
 - Social belonging (repeat attendance is the prerequisite for everything else),
 - Professional networking (designed, not left to chance),
 - High-trust mutual support (small, vetted formats for transitions/relocation).
- Establish recurring “backbone” formats (networking + social) with a predictable cadence.
- Premiumise the experience primarily through venue choice and frictionless food & beverage / logistics.
- Publish events on a rolling horizon (minimum 3 months) to improve attendance reliability and unlock better venues/partners.
- Formalise as an association to enable funding, contracts, tools, and sustainable delivery, supported by a small volunteer nucleus identified in the opt-in module.

01

Survey Overview & Methodology

How to Read this Report

Purpose

- The survey serves multiple purposes:
 - identify engagement drivers and event format preferences across the alumni community,
 - capture structured feedback on the Great Christmas Sundowners (GCS) 2025, and
 - surface alumni willing to contribute and get more deeply involved.
- The survey was intentionally broad, addressing both GCS attendees and non-attendees as part of a wider community-building effort.

Response volume

- Total respondents: 37
- GCS 2025 attendees among respondents: 23 (eligible for the event feedback module)
- Non-attendees among respondents: 14 (routed directly into the non-attendee / community pathway)

Branching

- This is a dynamic, branching survey with multiple pathways:
 - Event feedback questions: eligible only for respondents who indicated they attended the GCS 2025 (most of the event or part of it).
 - Volunteering module: eligible only for respondents who opted in to getting involved beyond minimal expectations.

Data processing and metric definitions

- Distributions: reported as counts and % of the relevant base (N).
- Rating scales: Star ratings were converted into numeric 1-5 by counting filled stars.
- Data correction (single case): One particularly memorable respondent managed to select the lowest satisfaction option across every GCS aspect, triggering a concerned follow-up. It turned out nothing dramatic had happened; the selections were simply a scale misread, and the respondent confirmed the intended feedback was positive. His or her entries were manually corrected to reflect their stated intent. This incident also prompted a redesign, moving from text labels (“very dissatisfied” → “dissatisfied” → “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” → “satisfied” → “very satisfied”) to a visual 1-5 star, colour-coded, rating system to prevent further mistakes.

Limitations

- Selection bias / engagement bias: respondents are likely to skew toward more engaged alumni (or those with stronger opinions).
- Absolute values are informative (especially when extremely high/low), but the most robust insights come from relative patterns: which elements overperform vs underperform, and which themes dominate open-text feedback.

Experience with the Form

→ How would you rate your experience with this Form?

1-5 star rating system · Base (N): 37 · Answered (n): 37

How would you rate your experience with this Form?	Mean	Median	Top-2 (4-5 stars)	Bottom-2 (1-2 stars)
Overall satisfaction	4.22	5.0	30 (81%)	3 (8%)

→ Time spent completing the Form

Completion time (minutes)	Count
1-5	2 (5%)
6-10	13 (35%)
11-15	9 (24%)
16-20	6 (16%)
21-30	2 (5%)
31-45	4 (11%)
46-60	0 (0%)
Over 60	1 (3%)

Mean: 15.4 minutes · Median: 11 minutes

→ Any final comments, suggestions, or complaints about this Form?

Open question · Base (N): 37 · Answered (n): 37

🧠 Thematic analysis (indicative frequency)

- No additional suggestion (“No”, “N/A”): ~19/37
- Direct appreciation: ~7/37
- Praise for initiative: ~5/23
- A bit / a little too long: ~4/37
- It was “fun”: ~3/37
- Way too long (“Too loooong”): ~1/37

💬 Representative respondent quotes (excerpts)

- *“I completed it with great interest and pleasure. Something magic happened!”*
- *“Love the style and tone of this alumni group”*
- *“I need a drink after such a form”*
- *“A bit long but all is covered at least!”*
- *“Great initiative!”*

🔍 Observations

- The Form comes across as high-effort and is often met with appreciation and/or praise for initiative.
- Completion time ranges from less than 5 minutes to 67 minutes, which signals real variability in engagement: many respondents completed quickly, while a long tail invested substantial time, likely driven by open-text sections and the “deeper involvement” pathway.
- Complaints about length are surprisingly fewer than anticipated. Notably, the respondent who expressed the strongest “too long” feedback completed the form in only 5 minutes 24 seconds (the second-shortest completion time), suggesting the complaint may reflect perceived length more than actual time spent.

“ Creating a very strong network ”

– Respondent



02

Club Purpose & Event Priorities

- Eligibility: All respondents
- Base (N): 37

Drivers of Engagement

→ Why would you like to connect with the FAC?

Multi-select (up to 3 choices) + "Other" write-in option · Base (N): 37 · Answered (n): 37

The "up to 3" limit forces respondents to pick their top priorities, making the results more discriminating than an "select all that apply" list.

🔍 Observations

- It appears the FAC is valued as a platform for quality events, professional networking, and meaningful community-building.

Select up to 3	Selected
To participate in epic, high-quality events.	21 (57%)
To expand my professional network.	19 (51%)
To keep in touch with fellow LBS alumni in France.	16 (43%)
To make new long-term friends.	11 (30%)
To belong to an active, demanding alumni community.	11 (30%)
To get involved and help build the community.	11 (30%)
To contribute ideas and strategic perspectives (a.k.a. consulting).	8 (22%)
I'm not sure yet, but it sounded interesting.	5 (14%)
To have an excuse to go out on weeknights.	2 (5%)
Other (cf. below)	2 (5%)
To receive occasional support or introductions.	1 (3%)
I was coerced into joining by fellow classmates.	0 (0%)

Other reasons (write-in):

- pitch / present / explain financial market theory
- offer coaching / support for those who want to go deeper on self-development work

Event Format Preferences

→ Which type of events are you interested in?

4-point interest scale · Base (N): 37 · Answered (n): 37

🔍 Observations

- The highest-interest formats are professional networking and social gatherings, followed by career content and skills. These should be treated as backbone programming and translated into recurring, repeatable formats as a near-term priority.
- Some formats show more polarized demand, with respondents split between strong interest and low interest (notably cultural outings and pub crawls). These are more discriminating by nature and are better positioned as targeted pilots for smaller groups rather than as recurring core formats.
- Other formats appear comparatively less attractive (e.g., sports/wellness, community-service/impact activities). They do not emerge as immediate priorities and are better treated as later-stage options, to revisit once the engaged base is larger or to test through small, low-risk pilots.
- Online formats attract lower interest overall, suggesting that in-person connection should remain the default mode, with online used selectively where cadence and accessibility matter more than atmosphere.

Most likely to participate



Event type	Not interested	Maybe	Interested	Definitely interested
Professional networking events	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	13 (35%)	22 (59%)
Drinks and social gatherings	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	17 (46%)	17 (46%)
Career-focused sessions (e.g., panels, fireside chats, war stories)	2 (5%)	6 (16%)	22 (59%)	7 (19%)
Skills workshops (e.g., leadership, communication)	3 (8%)	6 (16%)	21 (57%)	7 (19%)
Big parties fuelled by campus nostalgia	4 (11%)	9 (24%)	13 (35%)	11 (30%)
Small, intimate dinners	3 (8%)	12 (32%)	12 (32%)	10 (27%)
Pub crawls	12 (32%)	5 (14%)	13 (35%)	5 (14%)
Cultural or museum outings	8 (22%)	11 (30%)	9 (24%)	9 (24%)
Community-service or impact-driven activities	6 (16%)	15 (41%)	11 (30%)	5 (14%)
Competitive events (e.g., contests, games, challenges)	9 (24%)	14 (38%)	11 (30%)	3 (8%)
Sports or wellness activities	6 (16%)	18 (49%)	7 (19%)	6 (16%)
Online events (e.g., webinars, remote catch-ups)	10 (27%)	15 (41%)	7 (19%)	5 (14%)

→ Are you interested in other types of events?

Open question · Base (N): 37 · Answered (n): 37

🧠 Thematic analysis (indicative frequency)

- No additional events / list already comprehensive / “all covered”: ~24/37
- Food & drink experiences (raclette, BBQ, cigar cellar, wine tasting, etc.): ~4/37
- Speakers sessions: ~2/37
- Travel / expeditions / weekends / trips abroad: ~2/37
- “Yes” but no details provided: ~2/37
- Informational sessions for alumni relocating to Paris: ~1/37
- Cross-school events with other alumni groups: ~1/37
- Outdoors / mountain activities: ~1/37
- Career change–focused events: ~1/37

📌 Comments

Many respondents indicated that the proposed event menu already feels comprehensive. The write-ins are valuable because they surface additional ideas and refinements that become relevant once the fundamentals are in place.

- Food and drink “experiences” (raclette, BBQ, cigar cellar, wine tasting, etc.): Among the most actionable suggestions. Not a new event category per se, but a straightforward upgrade of the social backbone: same ritual, higher experience.
- Speaker sessions / guest talks: Already under planning as a repeatable format. However, attracting high-profile speakers typically requires high standards and polished execution (format discipline, audience quality, logistics, and communication).
- Trips abroad / weekend trips / mountain activities: Strong ideas, but very heavy from an operational standpoint (travel, payments, logistics, etc.) for formats likely to appeal to a smaller subset. Best positioned as future flagships once a stable cadence and execution capacity are established.
- Sessions for alumni moving to Paris: Excellent proposition, currently under planning. High value and low(ish) effort. A fast path to practical usefulness and trust-building through immediate, concrete support.
- Cross-school events: Clear interest, with an important sequencing constraint. Partnerships with other alumni chapters typically require visible credibility, continuity, and consistently high execution quality. The priority is to first consolidate the FAC as a visible, reliable, recognized operator, then pursue partnerships from a position of strength.
- Career-change support: Best delivered as a repeatable micro-format. Online can work particularly well here because cadence matters more than “event vibe”, and small, vetted groups can still generate high impact in a high-trust setting.

Interpretation

i. Three pillars to sustain engagement

The survey confirms what's also observed through event "field feedback" and 1:1 conversations. Alumni don't come to the FAC for one single reason. They come because they want a place, a community that serves different needs at different moments in life. That's why the FAC should not define itself as "just social" or "just professional". Doing so would shrink the community as alumni priorities shift.

Results point to three equally important pillars (no hierarchy; the strength is in holding all three together):

- **Pillar 1: Social belonging (friendships, laughter, human continuity)**

The FAC should remain a place where people genuinely enjoy each other's company: reconnect, meet new alumni, share a drink, laugh, and feel they belong among like-minded, high-quality people. This "human glue" is what creates repeat attendance, and repeat attendance is the prerequisite for everything else.

Operational implications: preserve the lightness and tone; design events around conversation quality; be actively welcoming to newcomers and recent graduates.

- **Pillar 2: Professional networking (insights, connections, opportunities)**

Respondents express a strong demand for a professional network that isn't superficial; one that enables introductions, cross-field discovery, and concrete opportunities. Because professional networking events are strongly plebiscited, networking can't rely on drinks alone: to go beyond "just social", these events should include active prompts (themes, light facilitation, structured moments, curated conversation starters) that ease introductions and turn attendance into real professional connections.

Operational implications: treat networking as a product to design, not something that "just happens"; build a predictable cadence; announce events sufficiently in advance to maximize attendance and preparedness.

- **Pillar 3: High-trust mutual support**

Career support repeatedly surfaces in field feedback, especially around career transitions, relocation, and moments of professional uncertainty. The model should not be altruism without standards; it should be closer to a closed, vetted, high-quality mutual support circle where people can ask for help and where help is given in a way that preserves the value of the group (mutual reinforcement, not charity).

Operational implications: build small, high-trust formats with low effort and high continuity (e.g., career-change circles, "new to Paris" onboarding, a structured introduction culture).

ii. Not all alumni want the same thing (and they shouldn't have to)

Priorities vary by stage of life, personal context, and professional trajectory. Some want friends and fun; some want a professional network engine; some are in transition and need a trusted support circle. The FAC should not prioritize one audience over the others.


The core job is to keep alumni in orbit over time: when one pillar becomes less relevant at a given time, another one takes over, and the relationship continues. That's how a community avoids peaking once and fading.

iii. From momentum to high standards (without overreaching)

The survey and field feedback indicate high expectations. Alumni naturally compare with other chapters and high-standard communities; that aspiration is legitimate and should be embraced.

However, the FAC currently operates under real constraints: a base that still needs to be re-assembled through recurrence; very limited institutional infrastructure (no legal entity, no bank account, no statutes, etc.); limited visibility (no website; a LinkedIn page created just a couple months ago); and limited resources (funding relying largely on alumni generosity).

A Harvard/Bocconi-level ecosystem is not reachable without first earning three fundamentals: recurring programming, reliable execution, and a recognized structure. The near-term priority should therefore be to establish these fundamentals through lowest effort / highest impact decisions, then raise standards by iteration.

A group of approximately 20 people, mostly men in business attire, are gathered around a long table in a modern meeting room. The table is set with various drinks, including bottles of beer and water, and several bowls of snacks. The room has large windows in the background, and the lighting is bright and professional. The overall atmosphere appears to be one of a formal yet relaxed meeting or networking event.

**“Let’s organise
as an association!”**

— Respondent



03

Great Christmas Sundowners 2025 Feedback

- Eligibility: Only those who answered they attended the GCS 2025 were shown these questions
- Base (N): 23

Overall Experience

→ Overall, how would you rate your experience at the GCS 2025?

→ How did you feel about the following aspects of the event?

1-5 star rating system · Base (N): 23 · Answered (n): 23

🔍 Observations

- The core event proposition is strong and broadly meets / exceeds expectations.
- Strong performance on controllable execution items (registration, communication, check-in, timing).
- The biggest gaps are venue and food / drinks, and secondarily anything that affects talking (ease of networking).

<i>Overall, how would you rate your experience at the GCS 2025?</i>	Mean	Median	Top-2 (4-5 stars)	Bottom-2 (1-2 stars)
Overall satisfaction	4.61	5.0	22 (96%)	1 (4%)

<i>How did you feel about the following aspects of the event?</i>	Mean	Median	Top-2 (4-5 stars)	Bottom-2 (1-2 stars)
Registration process and check-in	4.87	5.0	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
Date and time of the event	4.87	5.0	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
Duration of the event	4.83	5.0	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
Communication before the event (emails, WhatsApp, LinkedIn)	4.70	5.0	21 (91%)	0 (0%)
Atmosphere and vibe	4.65	5.0	22 (96%)	1 (4%)
Location (accessibility, transport)	4.65	5.0	20 (87%)	1 (4%)
Number of attendees (crowd size)	4.52	5.0	22 (96%)	1 (4%)
Ease of networking / talking to people	4.39	5.0	19 (83%)	0 (0%)
Quality of drinks	4.09	4.0	19 (83%)	1 (4%)
Venue (space, ambiance, comfort)	3.65	4.0	12 (52%)	3 (13%)
Quality of food/snacks (if applicable)	3.48	3.0	9 (39%)	4 (17%)

Top pain points >

Most & Least Appreciated Aspects

➔ What did you enjoy the most?

Open question · Base (N): 23 · Answered (n): 23

🗨️ Thematic analysis (indicative frequency)

- Meeting / people / reconnecting: ~15/23
- Fun atmosphere / vibe / humour: ~8/23
- Contest / awards / Christmas gear: ~5/23
- Organisation / communications / preparation: ~4/23

💬 Representative respondent quotes (excerpts)

- *"Seeing old LBS friends and meeting new people"*
- *"Pleasantly surprised by the event organization and number of attendees"*
- *"It was a fun and easygoing atmosphere"*
- *"Meeting people, having a few laughs with other alumni"*
- *"Light and humorous tone in the communications and presentations :)"*
- *"Creating a very strong network"*
- *"I enjoyed how welcoming everyone was"*

🔍 Observations

- The event delivered on its central promise: enjoyable social reconnection + easy engagement.
- The "light and humorous tone" appears to be a differentiator (brand asset) worth preserving.

➔ What did you enjoy the least?

Open question · Base (N): 23 · Answered (n): 23

🗨️ Thematic analysis (indicative frequency)

- Noise / too loud / hard to hear: ~8/22
- Venue quality / below standards / not premium enough: ~6/22
- Food & drinks quality / Bar logistics (signal, ordering, lines) : ~4/22
- Not enough time to speak to everyone: ~3/22
- Adjacent karaoke: ~3/22
- Nothing / N/A: ~3/22

💬 Representative respondent quotes (excerpts)

- *"Super noisy and hard to have discussions with a group of people"*
- *"We could do a more premium venue? :)"*
- *"The food was not great."*
- *"Venue was good but not as good as Syntaxe's offices :D Sorry but some standards were set that WAC night."*
- *"Not easy to find a venue for 60 people with easy access to drinks, fun vibes, low noise for discussions, good food..."*
- *"Not having the Dean there :)"*

🔍 Observations

- The feedback converges on a venue-led "premium gap". Noise, low light and comfort are repeatedly flagged as below-standard. Food / drinks and bar friction (no signal, difficulty ordering, flow) reinforce the same value signal, even among respondents who otherwise enjoyed the event.
- Most issues appear to be environmental rather than program-related, pointing to a clear push for a more premium setting.

→ Would you like to suggest anything else about the GCS?

Open question · Base (N): 23 · Answered (n): 23

🗨️ Thematic analysis (indicative frequency)

- Keep momentum / repeat / more events: ~7/23
- “Premiumisation” / better venue / pay for more quality: ~6/23
- Direct appreciation / praise for organisation: ~5/23
- No additional suggestion (“No”, “N/A”): ~5/23
- Formalisation / institutionalisation of the Club: ~4/23
- Food & drink suggestions: ~4/23
- Contest improvement suggestions: ~3/23

💬 Representative respondent quotes (excerpts)

- *“Keep going, traction is great! Thanks for the organization and taking the time to reach out”*
- *“Collect some funds to avoid spending of your own pocket”*
- *“Different venue, making alumni pay more for quality”*
- *“Gather a team of volunteers”*
- *“It would be nice to have a piano and music with for example jazz”*
- *“Let’s organise as an association!”*
- *“Actually fine those who didn’t show up with a Christmas cloth ;-)”*

🔍 Observations

- **A dual signal stands out: celebration plus ambition.** Many responses either praise the organisation or offer no additional suggestions, while an equally visible share asks for upgrades. That combination indicates a strong baseline experience with appetite to raise standards rather than “fix a problem”.
- **“Premiumisation” emerges as the main direction of improvement.** Suggestions converge on tangible quality cues (better venue, willingness to pay for more quality), framing “premium” as better ambiance and frictionless delivery rather than more complexity.
- **Momentum is a priority in itself.** The most frequent theme is “repeat / more events”, implying that cadence and continuity are valued as much as one-off excellence. Consistency appears to be the fastest lever to build belonging.
- **Club formalisation is being explicitly requested.** Calls for volunteers, funding, and creating an association indicate that respondents see professionalisation as necessary to sustain delivery and premiumise the experience.
- **The ask is mostly “upgrade the experience”, not “change the concept”.** Food/drink, venue quality, and small format tweaks (contest improvements, light entertainment) suggest incremental enhancement around an already-liked format, rather than a push to redesign the event from scratch.
- **Tone remains a differentiator to preserve.** Even improvement suggestions are often playful (e.g., suggestion about fining those who did not show up in a Christmas sweater – under consideration), which signals that professionalisation is compatible with maintaining a fun, informal cultural signature.

Interpretation

i. Intended role of the event

The GCS was designed as a reconnection catalyst: reactivating alumni ties by leveraging WAC 2025 momentum, while expanding reach beyond the usual WhatsApp “inner circle”.

ii. “As good as it gets” under the current informal model

Under the current operating approach, the GCS represents ceiling delivery. Attendance expectations were modest (max 10 attendees, already very ambitious compared with prior events), yet 56 registrations were ultimately handled (despite the long form and high commitment required). That’s exceptional execution under informal constraints, but it’s not realistically repeatable at higher standards without professionalising the operating model. In addition, counterintuitively, higher barriers to entry can increase perceived value, by signalling exclusivity and quality.

iii. The hidden investment behind the kick-off

Record turnout at the GCS was not accidental: it relied on high-touch acquisition (including direct outreach to hundreds of Paris-based alumni) and several hundred euros of personal, out-of-pocket logistics spend (on top of a couple of thousand euros of personal investment for the WAC 2025). This kind of individual effort and personal funding can catalyse momentum once, but it is structurally not sustainable as the default model for recurring, higher-standard events.

iv. Attendance uncertainty closes access to premium venues and partners

Premium delivery depends on reliable headcount. A venue that works at one attendance level does not work at another. Higher-end venues also require commitments (minimum spend, deposits, guarantees, confirmed numbers). Late registrations, drop-offs, and no-shows are not simply minor inconveniences; they directly block access to better venues and service conditions.

Predictability is also a prerequisite for credibility with third parties (sponsors/partners, high-profile speakers), because serious counterparts expect disciplined planning and dependable numbers.

v. Advance programming is a requirement

A longer planning horizon improves both attendance reliability and experience quality. Busy alumni need calendar visibility; non-Paris and overseas alumni need time to plan travel; premium venues require booking lead times. Publishing events on a rolling horizon (at least three months ahead) is therefore a direct enabler of premium execution.

vi. An association is necessary to unlock quality, scale, and tools

The feedback pattern and operating constraints converge on the conclusion that premium experience requires premium operating discipline, and that requires a non-profit association (a French “*association à but non lucratif*”). A legal structure enables a bank account, contracting, deposits, budgeting, and third-party credibility.

It also unlocks practical infrastructure and tooling that materially improves execution and member experience, including:

- a website and durable online presence
- online registration and paid ticketing (with early/standard/late tiers)
- member-only tools and spaces (directory, gated content, resources)
- stronger event notification workflows (email systems, CRM-style lists, segmentation)
- clearer governance and continuity beyond individuals

This is not monetisation for its own sake; it is the operational foundation required to move from heroic one-offs to consistently high standards without relying on personal out-of-pocket risk.

vii. Other LBS alumni clubs have already formalised as legal entities

- LBS Alumni Sailing Club ([UK Companies Registry](#) – registered in Oct. 2024)
- LBS Club of Singapore ([Singapore Business Directory](#))
- LBS Alumni Club of Hong Kong ([Hong Kong Companies Registry](#))
- LBS Alumni Association of Germany ([registered association in Munich](#))
- American Friends of the LBS ([New York Companies Registry](#))

There’s no reason whatsoever not to set up our own independent, brand-new, high-standard association from the ground up.

“Keep going,
traction is great!”

— Respondent



04

Volunteering Module (Opt-In)

- Eligibility: Only those who answered they wanted to get involved beyond minimal expectations were shown these questions
- Base (N): 9

Summary

- In your view, what makes an alumni community successful?
- In which ways would you be willing to contribute to the FAC's activities?
- Are you interested in contributing in other ways?
- How comfortable are you with taking short-notice responsibilities if the FAC needs assistance?
- What would you personally like to bring to the FAC?
- What do you hope to gain from being part of the FAC?

Mix of open questions and scales · Base (N): 9 · Answered (n): 9

🧠 Thematic analysis (indicative frequency)

- **What drives success**
 - Cadence / tradition / momentum via regular events: ~6/9
 - Community culture: openness, welcoming newcomers, relationship reinforcement: ~4/9
 - Solidarity / mutual help among members: ~2/9
 - Quality of people: ~1/9
 - Visibility / active communication: ~1/9
 - Appropriate governance: ~1/9
- **How respondents are willing to contribute**
 - Programming / organising events (themes, speakers, professional topics, cross-school coordination, venue sourcing): ~5/9
 - Bringing energy / creating belonging / giving back: ~3/9
 - Bringing connectivity within and outside the community: ~2/9
 - Career support (CVs, advice, transitions): ~2/9

- **What respondents hope to gain**
 - Fun / enjoyment / social energy: ~4/9
 - Support / solidarity / sense of belonging: ~3/9
 - Networking / making connections: ~2/9

💬 Representative respondent quotes (excerpts)

- *"I believe the momentum is essential"*
- *"It starts by setting the right culture of exchange and openness. A sense of community and solidarity"*
- *"Being very welcoming to newcomers, onboard them very generously"*
- *"Make the FAC an effective professional networking platform that people can tap into in times of transitions"*
- *"Continuing to enjoy the LBS experience: exchanging views with likeminded professionals, getting support and new perspectives in a fun but structured environment"*
- *"I can imagine turning the FAC into the LBS embassy in France"*

🔍 Observations

- A committed volunteer nucleus is present. The opt-in module surfaces a focused pool of respondents ready to volunteer and get involved. This is a strong depth signal, while remaining a limited resource by design. Community success is defined in practical terms. Respondents emphasize cadence, momentum, openness, and welcoming culture more than grand concepts, implying that repeatable rituals and norms matter most.
- Next steps will be discussed in 1:1 sessions with identified volunteers.



→ **Connect with the FAC** ←