

The Foundation Review

Volume 9 | Issue 4

12-2017

Back Matter

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



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

Recommended Citation

(2017). Back Matter. *The Foundation Review*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1396>

Copyright © 2018 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>

executive summaries

Results

7

Community Foundation-Led Giving Days: Understanding Donor Satisfaction and Philanthropic Patterns

Benjamin S. Bingle, Ph.D., DeKalb County Nonprofit Partnership

Philanthropic giving days have gained popularity as opportunities for community foundations to engage new donors, create excitement about organized philanthropy, and democratize charitable giving. This article examines Give Local America 2016, a giving day beset by a technology failure that created challenges for donors and community foundations throughout the United States, and explores the experiences of donors as giving day participants. Data suggest that giving days are not crowding out donations at other times of the year, but instead are viewed as a supplementary option for the public to engage philanthropically. The article concludes with practical recommendations for community foundations that are considering hosting a giving day.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1384

20

Transforming Coalition Leadership: An Evaluation of a Collaborative Leadership Training Program

Jung Y. Kim, M.P.H., Todd Honeycutt, Ph.D., and Michaella Morzuch, M.P.P., Mathematica Policy Research

Effective coalitions need leaders who are able to reach beyond individual, group, and sectoral boundaries to advance a shared vision for healthy and thriving communities. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation partnered with the Center for Creative Leadership to create a one-year pilot, the Community Coalition Leadership Program, to test a new approach to providing training in collaborative leadership. This article discusses the program, whether and how it improved participants' individual and coalition leadership skills, and the implications for foundations and other entities seeking to increase interdependent leadership capacity within community coalitions.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1385

Tools

41

Considerations for Measuring the Impact of Policy-Relevant Research

Megan Collado, M.P.H., Lauren Gerlach, M.P.P., and Caroline Ticse, B.A., AcademyHealth, and Katherine Hempstead, Ph.D., Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Philanthropy, and the research and analysis it supports, has an important role to play in informing policy and making government more effective. Yet all too often, foundations and other research funders struggle to understand whether and how their investments have affected policy. This article highlights the findings of an 18-month pilot project conducted by AcademyHealth to help the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation better understand the impact of a subset of the foundation's research grants, across investment types, on health insurance coverage and health reform, and to help inform how the foundation may more systematically track and measure the impact of the research it funds.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1386

Sector

54

Inside the Black Box: Investigating Philanthropic Foundation Strategies in a Dynamic Environment

Amanda J. Stewart, Ph.D., North Carolina State University

Foundations have been described as black boxes – implying that we know very little about what happens between inputs and outputs. We do know that they operate in dynamic environments and must adopt strategies to be effective in the face of change. This article, which examines the strategies of 29 foundations operating in one southeastern state, provides fresh insights into how foundations fulfill their missions. The article is based on a research study that used semistructured interviews to explore how foundations approached grantmaking. Further, understanding the motivations and adaptations of these strategies helps explain the collective work of the sector.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1387

65

Philanthropy: Evidence in Favor of a Profession

Heather L. Carpenter, Ph.D., Notre Dame of Maryland University

Philanthropic employees have been cautious in implying that they are pursuing a career in philanthropy. And in this journal, Karl Stauber (2010) presented an argument in support of such caution: that philanthropy failed to meet all seven standards posited by Burton J. Bledstein, that when met, define a profession. This article presents a literature review and findings from a survey of 500 members of the Council on Foundations that offer evidence for the counterargument that philanthropic work requires specialized education and training to master a set of core competencies. While this article does not argue for or against the question, determining whether philanthropy as a field can rightly be considered a profession has important consequences.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1388

Reflective Practice

76

Funder Collaborations – Flourish or Flounder?

William Porter, B.A., Kelly James, J.D., and Robert Medina, M.A., Education First; and Barbara Chow, M.P.P., William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Funders regularly collaborate to leverage their influence, channel their funding, and mobilize grantees in the same direction. Our sector's default assumption is that more collaboration is better. Why do some funder collaborations flourish, and others flounder? The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and Education First participated in a half-dozen joint funding efforts to support the success of the Common Core State Standards in the nation's K-12 public education system. Looking critically at these efforts, we learned lessons about why some collaborations are more effective. Funder collaborations work best when participants recognize key milestones in a partnership and make decisions at distinguishing stages to set up success.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1389

Looking in the Mirror: Equity in Practice for Philanthropy

Ashlee Young, M.P.H., and Jaime Love, M.Ed., *Interact for Health*; Nancy Csuti, Ph.D., *The Colorado Trust*; and Christopher J. King, Ph.D., *Consumer Health Foundation*

Philanthropy still needs to be reminded that there is no such thing as a post-racial America, and that systemic racism continues to underlie the problems foundation funding attempts to address. While many foundations have found it challenging to address equity in their grantmaking, they have found that process far more comfortable than addressing equity within their own organizations. This article describes the efforts of three foundations in various stages of seeing themselves through an equity lens: the Consumer Health Foundation, The Colorado Trust, and Interact for Health. It is impossible for a foundation to effectively fund with an equity lens unless it commits to doing the necessary internal work around the same issue, and embarks on its own journey toward equity.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1390

Generative Philanthropy: Long-Term Investments in Economic Opportunity

Robert Giloth, Ph.D., *Annie E. Casey Foundation*

Generative philanthropy is a collaborative investment practice that tests prototypes and identifies new opportunities that, over time, can focus direction and generate momentum for change. It is an incremental, decentralized approach to investment in communities. This article clarifies the theory and practice of generative philanthropy and contrast it with other approaches. It provides an in-depth discussion of the meaning of generative philanthropy, offers five examples of the approach related to economic opportunity, and draws lessons for future practice. Generative philanthropy can hopefully inspire and guide new foundation practices that pay attention to what comes next after the first or second investment of time, money, knowledge, and leadership.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1391

Book Review

Review of *Generation Impact: How Next Gen Donors Are Revolutionizing Giving* by Michael Moody and Sharna Goldseker.

Review by Elenore Garton, Ph.D.

Generation Impact begins with a bold claim: that rising major donors will be the most significant philanthropists ever. The authors make a compelling argument that Generation X and millennials will change philanthropy for the better, but that getting there could get messy. By understanding these donors and their innovations, the social sector as a whole can evolve to be more effective. Leaders of nonprofits, social entrepreneurs, philanthropic advisors, and philanthropic families and institutions themselves have much to learn from this groundbreaking work.

DOI: 10.9707/1944-5660.1392

call for papers

FOR VOLUME 10, ISSUE 4

Themed Issue on Inclusive Community Change

Abstracts of up to 250 words are being solicited for Volume 10, Issue 4 of *The Foundation Review*. This issue, sponsored by the California Endowment and the Colorado Health Foundation, will focus on what has been learned about creating inclusive change in communities, with both the process and the outcomes reflecting the range of stakeholders in communities. Submit abstracts by February 28, 2018 to submissions@foundationreview.org. The issue will be published in December 2018.

Some of the issues that might be addressed include:

- How do equity considerations influence strategy, including leadership of the work, identifying desired outcomes, and building power in communities?
- What do we know about what it takes to create long-term sustainability, especially around resident engagement and policy change and its implementation?
- What is the dosage of a concerted community-led intervention that is required to achieve population or community-wide impact? What do we know about how long it takes to achieve change?
- What different roles can foundations play in supporting community change and what commitments, mindsets, and capacities do they need to play these different roles effectively?
- Foundations typically design their own community change initiatives and then try to leverage other funders' investments in them. What are the advantages and disadvantages of alternative scenarios, such as building on other funders' existing investments or designing investments collaboratively with other funders and community partners?
- What are the pluses and minuses of a focus on a specific community issue — education, economic development, etc. — vs. a broad community development approach?
- Are different approaches needed in rural and urban communities?
- What are models for engaging the whole range of stakeholders, including residents, community leaders and policymakers?

Abstracts are solicited in four categories:

- **Results.** Papers in this category generally report on findings from evaluations of foundation-funded work. Papers should include a description of the theory of change (logic model, program theory), a description of the grant-making strategy, the evaluation methodology, the results, and discussion. The discussion should focus on what has been learned both about the programmatic content and about grantmaking and other foundation roles (convening, etc.).
- **Tools.** Papers in this category should describe tools useful for foundation staff or boards. By “tool” we mean a systematic, replicable method intended for a specific purpose. For example, a protocol to assess community readiness and standardized facilitation methods would be considered tools. The actual tool should be included in the article where practical. The paper should describe the rationale for the tool, how it was developed, and available evidence of its usefulness.
- **Sector.** Papers in this category address issues that confront the philanthropic sector as whole, such as diversity, accountability, etc. These are typically empirically based; literature reviews are also considered.
- **Reflective Practice.** The reflective practice articles rely on the knowledge and experience of the authors, rather than on formal evaluation methods or designs. In these cases, it is because of their perspective about broader issues, rather than specific initiatives, that the article is valuable.

Book Reviews: *The Foundation Review* publishes reviews of relevant books. Please contact the editor to discuss submitting a review. Reviewers must be free of conflicts of interest.

Questions? Please contact Teri Behrens, editor of *The Foundation Review*, with questions at behrenst@foundationreview.org or call (734) 646-2874.

thanks to our reviewers!

We'd like to thank our peer reviewers for Volume 9 of *The Foundation Review* for their time, expertise, and guidance. The peer-review process is essential in ensuring the quality of our content. Thank you for your contributions to building the field of philanthropy!

If you are interested in peer reviewing for Volume 10, send an email to Teri Behrens, editor in chief, at behrenst@foundationreview.org.

Thomas Adams, M. Div.
Missouri Foundation for Health

Ivye L. Allen, Ph.D.
Foundation for the Mid South

Gale Berkowitz, Dr.P.H.
Gale Berkowitz Associates

Katie G. Brisson
Community Foundation for
Southeast Michigan

Kelly Brown, M.B.A.
D5 Coalition

Prudence Brown, Ph.D.
Prudence Brown Consulting

Hanh Cao Yu, Ph.D.
The California Endowment

Jennifer Chubinski, Ph.D.
Interact for Health

Julia Coffman, M.S.
Center for Evaluation Innovation

Whitney Gustin Connor, M.P.A.
Rose Community Foundation

Lyz Crane, M.P.A.
ArtPlace America

Jara Dean-Coffey, M.P.H.
Luminare Group

Susan J. Erenrich, Ph.D.
Cultural Center for Social Change

Lori Fuller, M.S.W., M.B.A.
Kate B. Reynolds Charitable Trust

Ericka Harney, M.A., C.F.R.E., G.P.C., C.V.A.
Accounting & Financial Women's Alliance

Amada Holm M.B.A.
The Boston Foundation

Mae Hong, A.M.
Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors

Della M. Hughes, M.S.S.W., M.Div.
Brandeis University

Deidre Johnson, M.P.P.M.
Center for African American Health

Lyn Kathlene, Ph.D.
Spark Policy Institute

Thomas Kelly, M.P.H.
Hawai'i Community Foundation

Colin Knox, Ph.D.
Nazarbayev University

Sally Leiderman, B.A.
Center for Assessment and
Policy Development

Katelyn P. Mack, M.S.
FSG

Dara Major
Dara Major Consulting

Judith Millesen, Ph.D.
Ohio University

Faith Mitchell, Ph.D.
Grantmakers In Health

Char Mollison
Johns Hopkins University

Michael Moon, Ph.D.
California State University, East Bay

William P. Moore, Ph.D.
REACH Healthcare Foundation

Pamela Nipolt, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota

Clare Nolan, M.P.P.M.
Engage R+D

Tamaki Onishi, Ph.D.
The University of North Carolina
Greensboro

Michael Quinn Patton, Ph.D.
Utilization Focused Evaluation

Clotilde Perez-Bode Dedecker, M.Ed.
Community Foundation for Great Buffalo

Anne C. Petersen, Ph.D.
University of Michigan

Susan D. Phillips, Ph.D.
Carleton University

Nicholas G. Randell, M.A., M.B.A.
The Peter & Elizabeth C. Tower Foundation

Janet Rechtman, Ph.D.
J.W. Fanning Institute for
Leadership Development

Shelley C. Scherer, Ph.D.
The Pittsburgh Promise

Andrew Schwalm, B.A.
FMA

Jay Wade, M.A.
Loyola University Chicago

Wendy C. Wehr, M.A.
www.wendywehr.com

Sherece West-Scantlebury, Ph.D.
Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation

THE FoundationReview®

The Foundation Review is the first peer-reviewed journal of philanthropy, written by and for foundation staff and boards and those who work with them. With a combination of rigorous research and accessible writing, it can help you and your team put new ideas and good practices to work for more effective philanthropy.

Our Mission: To share evaluation results, tools, and knowledge about the philanthropic sector in order to improve the practice of grantmaking, yielding greater impact and innovation.

Published Quarterly by the Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy at Grand Valley State University

www.thefoundationreview.org

ISSN 1944-5660 | eISSN 1944-5679