

The Foundation Review

Volume 2
Issue 4 *Open Access*

2011

Editorial-Open Access

Teresa Behrens

Johnson Center for Philanthropy, Grand Valley State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/tfr>



Part of the [Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Behrens, T. (2011). Editorial-Open Access. *The Foundation Review*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1072>

Copyright © 2011 Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy at Grand Valley State University. The Foundation Review is reproduced electronically by ScholarWorks@GVSU. <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/tfr>

DEAR READERS

This issue includes a special focus on international grantmaking. Three of the articles focus on this topic and raise questions about how domestic grantmaking concepts from U.S. funders translate into international grantmaking. The remaining articles raise questions about some of the strategies currently being used by U.S. grantmakers in their domestic funding.

On the global philanthropy front, **Pendleton and Moon** argue that it is both important and difficult to assess grantee perceptions of funders in an international context. Concepts such as “effectiveness” and “evaluation” need to be carefully translated – not just the language, but the ideas.



Hansford and Thompson discuss the W. K. Kellogg Foundation’s major investments in Northeast Brazil between 1997 and 2007. While there are many successes, building sustainable relationships with the private sector was a missed opportunity. Given the limited number of examples of success in foundation-corporate partnerships, this is an interesting example of exporting some of the weaknesses of U. S. grantmaking strategies.

Petersen and McClure review the current status of international grantmaking by U. S. foundations. About two-thirds of grants intended to benefit international populations are given to U. S.-based organizations, in large part due to restrictions after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. While there are many examples of successful global philanthropy, they argue that better coordination among the increasing number of global funders is needed to have a significant impact on issues confronting the poorest populations.

While **Frost and Ybarra’s** focus is on how evidence-based practice (EBP) can be adapted to different cultures within the United States, the application to global philanthropy is clear. The good news is that there is some evidence EBPs can be adapted to be implemented in culturally appropriate ways without sacrificing effectiveness.

Backer and Smith review the evaluations that have been done of the peer networking efforts of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. They suggest that peer networking can be an effective tool to increase impact in communities, but that it is time-consuming and costly.

McGonagill and Reinelt present a framework for funders to consider in supporting leadership development programs. Leadership development occurs at a variety of levels and is intended to have impact at a variety of levels, too. As leadership development is a common strategy (both domestically and internationally), this tool has broad-based applicability.

Smyth provides a critique of the individually focused, commoditized and professionalized delivery of human services. The central role of social networks in promoting well-being is often overlooked when funders choose how to support programs. Smyth makes a compelling case for

funding that takes into account the importance of these networks. Socioeconomic and cultural differences in the role of social networks are significant; again, this issue has relevance in both domestic and global grantmaking.

Gopalakrishnan and Preskill describe a new kind of relationship between a funder and grantees. The “adaptive-consultative” approach that they describe was based on the Ball Foundation’s observation that grantees with a closer relationship with the funder were often more successful.

While the articles in this issue span the globe and a wide gamut of strategies, an underlying theme is the importance of relationships in the grantmaking process. This includes relationships between beneficiaries and their own cultural communities, among funders, among nonprofit organizations, between leaders and their communities, as well as the more frequently discussed funder-grantee relationship.

I hope that reading the articles in this issue with the “global” and “relationship” lenses creates new insights for you.



Teresa R. Behrens, Ph.D. EDITOR IN CHIEF