

# The Foundation Review

---

Volume 2  
Issue 1 *Open Access*

---

2010

## Executive Summaries

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

(2010). Executive Summaries. *The Foundation Review*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1102>

Copyright © 2010 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>



VOL. 2 ISSUE 1

## RESULTS

### 10 Enrolling the Eligible: Lessons for Funders

*Beth Stevens, Ph.D., Sheila Dunleavy Hoag, M.A., and Judith Wooldridge, M.A., Mathematica Policy Research*

This article describes the results of The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s work to increase enrollment in social programs. The primary strategies employed were outreach, simplification, and coordination. Simplification included making application forms less complex and allowing for mail-in renewal. Examples of coordination activities included creating one application for both Medicaid and SCHIP and instituting processes that simultaneously assessed eligibility for both programs. The authors suggest that the life cycle of the program – start-up, maturity, or perpetuation/death – must be considered by funders in both what is funded and how it is evaluated. doi: 10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-09-00050

---

## TOOLS

### 24 Demonstrating the Value of Social Service Programs: A Simplified Approach to Calculating Return on Investment

*Herbert M. Baum, Ph.D., REDA International; Andrew H. Gluck, M.B.A., ICF Macro; Bernice S. Smoot, Saint Wall Street; and William H. Wubbenhorst, M.B.A., ICF Macro*

The authors demonstrate that it is possible to calculate “Program Return on Investment” for at least some social programs. Using an example of programs whose primary beneficiaries are fatherless youth, they use a combination of state- and federal-level data to monetize the costs of not having a father in the home. Combined with evaluation results that demonstrate outcomes, these data enable the authors to compute the return on investments in these programs. Their experience in training program staff to use these measures suggests that they are useful to both funders and program operators. Many more types of programs may be amendable to this type of analysis. doi: 10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-09-00051

---

#### 40 Learning-Circle Partnerships and the Evaluation of a Boundary-Crossing Leadership Initiative in Health

*Claire Reinelt, Ph.D., Leadership Learning Community; Dianne Yamashiro-Omi, The California Endowment; and Deborah Meehan, Leadership Learning Community*

Boundary-crossing leadership is leading across differences of culture, race, gender, age, etc. The authors used learning circles to promote both the development of, and learning about, this style of leadership. They created learning circles as part of the evaluation of leadership programs that were designed to have an impact on health disparities. The use of learning circles enable foundation staff and community members to engage together in a more trusting climate to address the underlying issues. doi: 10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-10-00002

---

#### 53 Constructing Collaborative Success for Network Learning: The Story of the Discovery Community Self-Assessment Tool

*Angela Frusciante, Ph.D., and Carmen Siberon, M.P.H., William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund*

Collaboration continues to be an important strategic element of community change efforts. This tool is designed for community members to conduct their own assessment of their collaborative efforts. The common language of the tool seemed to help various members of the collaborative groups engage on a more equal footing than when there is professional jargon in the tool. The power of such a self-assessment tool comes not from comparing communities to each other, nor from using numerical ratings to establish funding decisions, but rather to gauge community progress in terms of their change over time. The process also encourages communities to make more accurate accounts of their own functioning and thus their own readiness or need to take up grant or capacity building opportunities. It encourages shared accountability. doi: 10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-10-00003

---

#### 72 Assessing Nonprofits' Communications Capacity: An Online Self-Assessment Tool

*Anne Reisinger Whatley, M.Sc., and R. Christine Hershey, Cause Communications; Julia Coffman, M.S., Center for Evaluation Innovation; and Andre Oliver, B.A., Communications Strategist*

This online tool can be used by nonprofits to assess their own capacity, and by funders to help identify technical assistance needs. This article describes a self-assessment tool that allows organizations to compare their practices to those who participated in the national survey, and to the approaches identified in the index. The six indicators are: involvement of organization leadership in communications, communications planning and organization-wide planning, staffing and the use of outside expertise, donor understanding and support for communications, managing the communications basics, and the role of evaluation in communications. doi: [10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-09-00043](https://doi.org/10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-09-00043)

---

## 87 Philanthropy: Are We a Profession? Should We Be?

Karl Stauber, Ph.D., President and CEO, Danville Regional Foundation, Danville, VA

This provocative piece challenges the notion of foundation grantmaking work as a profession. What makes a profession and how does philanthropy stack up? The author compares philanthropy to seven hallmarks of being a profession, such as having a specialized body of knowledge and methods of training/disseminating this knowledge. He finds that philanthropy doesn't – and shouldn't – be a profession. Instead, he argues for the application of rigor and wisdom to the grantmaking process. doi: 10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-10-00026

## 100 Foundation Evaluation Startup: A Pause for Reflection

Jill M. Yegian, Ph.D., California HealthCare Foundation

This article describes the challenges of creating an evaluation function within a foundation, including deciding what to evaluate and who should do it. Different tools were developed to address each of three key areas: *performance assessment*, *organizational learning*, and *program evaluation*. In the fast-paced foundation environment, time spent on learning and evaluation need to be seen as valuable to the program staff, not just as another demand on them. Support from leadership and the efficient use of IT are two of the factors that are important to consider. doi: 10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-10-00004



This publication is printed with soy ink.

This publication is mailed domestically without a bag in order to reduce waste.

Printed in USA



b-e-f.org

### PHOTOCOPIES AND COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transaction Reporting Service, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Permission may also be requested by contacting the CCC at [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com) or [info@copyright.com](mailto:info@copyright.com).

Please contact [shalett@foundationreview.org](mailto:shalett@foundationreview.org) with any questions.