

ADVANCING ACCOUNTABILITY: A TOOL FOR TRANSPARENT FOUNDATION GRANTMAKING



DEBBIE GREIFF AND HARRY SNYDER

EDITED BY ELIZABETH IMHOLZ
CONSUMERS UNION OF U.S., INC.

III ADVANCING ACCOUNTABILITY: A Tool For Transparent Foundation Grantmaking

Debbie Greiff and Harry Snyder



Edited by Elizabeth Imholz
Consumers Union of U.S., Inc.

This paper was prepared for the West Coast Regional Office of Consumers Union of U.S., Inc.

Consumers Union is a not-for-profit membership organization chartered in 1936 under the laws of the State of New York to provide consumers with information, education, and counsel about goods, services, health and personal finance; and to initiate and cooperate with individual and group efforts to maintain and enhance the quality of life for consumers. Consumers Union's income is solely derived from the sale of *Consumer Reports*, its other publications and services, and from non-commercial contributions, grants, and fees. Consumers Union's publications and services carry no outside advertising and receive no commercial support. Consumers Union advocates on behalf of consumers in legislatures, administrative agencies, and the courts, and regularly works in coalition with other groups in public education campaigns.

© 2003 Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. Permission to copy, disseminate, or otherwise use this work is normally granted as long as ownership is properly attributed to Consumers Union.

III ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was made possible by a generous grant from the Ford Foundation. Since 1997, the Ford Foundation has supported the national efforts of the Community Health Assets Project (CHAP), a joint effort of Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. and Community Catalyst in Boston, Massachusetts. CHAP seeks to protect nonprofit charitable assets, to foster creation of health foundations accountable to the communities they are designed to serve, and to ensure that health needs are addressed in the change of nonprofit health care institutions to for-profit status, transactions referred to as "conversions."

Many individuals who embrace the importance of philanthropic accountability lent key support for this undertaking. The commitment of Christopher Harris, Program Officer at the Ford Foundation, to the important role of philanthropy in society provided us with inspiration and steadfast support. We are grateful for his vision and thoughtful contributions to our overall work on philanthropy. Dr. Robert Ross, President and CEO of the California Endowment (TCE), opened the door for this project by his ready agreement to have TCE cooperate with Consumers Union on it. TCE's Alicia Lara, Julie Tugend and Becky Martin each spent countless hours describing to us TCE's grantmaking data and practices, helping us struggle through conceptual framing, and reviewing drafts. Mitchell Singer of TCE as well provided invaluable support. Our deep appreciation to all at TCE who helped with this endeavor.

Our data maven Josh Senyak, played a critical role in compiling the TCE Case Study's supporting data. At Consumers Union, Scott Benbow joined in our initial foray into the world of grantmaking data, and Laurie Sobel provided thoughtful comments on drafts and conceptual framing. Carolina Rivas Pollard, Josephine De los Reyes, Evaluz Barrameda, and Minerva Novoa patiently brought the written work to fruition in printed and web site documents. Their skill and good cheer form a strong foundation for our work. We are most grateful for their contributions.

III TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
■ The Healthcare Conversion Tidal Wave	3
■ Why Put the Assets of a Converting Nonprofit in a Foundation?.....	4
■ Accountability – About What and To Whom?	6
Goal And Methodology	7
■ Instrument Development	7
■ Instrument Testing & Refinement.....	8
■ Application.....	9
Grantmaking Accountability Template.....	9
■ Data Fields	9
■ Data Analysis	11
■ Limitations of the Template for Accountability Purposes	11
Recommendations.....	13
■ For the Philanthropic Field.....	13
■ For Community Groups	14
Conclusion	14

APPENDIX

Grantmaking Accountability Template

COMPANION DOCUMENT at www.consumersunion.org

Grantmaking Accountability Template: The California Endowment Case Study

III INTRODUCTION

Endowed foundations are essentially self-regulating and answer to no outside body, unless they break the law. Philanthropy is struggling to sharpen its own responsibility for the use of charitable assets and, at the same time, searching for better ways to incorporate public guidance into foundation decision making. These two different, but related endeavors – improving internal monitoring and fostering public input – are efforts to strengthen accountability.

Too often, attention directed at foundation accountability is prompted by events that shine a light on questionable practices. This, unfortunately, frames the accountability conversation from the liability side: What do foundations have to do to avoid negative attention or government regulation?

Our efforts come at accountability from the other side: What can foundations do in the course of their everyday work to begin to ensure ongoing effectiveness and accountability to their stakeholders?

The premise of this paper is that philanthropy will be more credible, efficient and effective if foundation staff and boards have accurate, up-to-date information on foundation functions. And making that information public will encourage healthy, evidence-based dialogue about foundation performance.

A working relationship between foundations and the communities they serve is the cornerstone of philanthropic accountability.

A working relationship between foundations and the communities¹ they serve is the cornerstone of philanthropic accountability. Establishing that relationship requires two key components: 1) transparency of foundation operations; and 2) meaningful access to foundation staff and board to review past and current operations and future plans.² The two are intertwined. Transparency provides the data and information that make access effective. And access to key decision makers renders data acquired through transparency useful as a basis for conversation.

This paper describes a practice-based tool, the Grantmaking Accountability Template (“Template”), devised by Consumers Union to help foster the twin goals of improved internal monitoring and public partnering between foundations and the communities they serve. We have been aided by the enthusiastic cooperation of The California Endowment

¹ “Community” as used throughout this paper refers to the intended beneficiary of a foundation’s largesse, set forth or implicit in its articles of incorporation. For example, the articles may define the intended beneficiary by geographic scope such as a city, specified counties, a region, a state, the United States or the international community.

² The Council on Foundations has proposed eight criteria for accountability, many of which can be subsumed under “transparency” and “access”: honoring the donor’s charitable intent; stewardship; responsiveness; transparency; accessibility; disclosure; honesty; and fairness.

(TCE) as we designed and tested the Template describing foundation grantmaking. We are grateful for the countless staff hours and assistance TCE put at our disposal to improve philanthropic effectiveness and accountability.

We have developed the Template as a concrete way for foundations consistently and systematically to provide grantmaking information. We focus on grants made as

This paper describes a practice – based tool, the Grantmaking Accountability Template . . . to help foster the twin goals of improved internal monitoring and public partnering between foundations and the communities they serve.

grantmaking is the primary strategy most foundations employ to fulfill their missions. The quantitative descriptors of grants standardized by this Template offer foundations and community stakeholders an objective way to judge whether the foundation's grantmaking is consistent with its mission, goals and strategic plans.

A foundation is responsible for a broad range of activities. This Template covers solely the foundation's profile and its most basic function: the decisions about who and what will get funded. Other important responsibilities, such as treatment of grant seekers and investment practices and returns, are not addressed here. Our purpose is to provide, as a first building block of philanthropic accountability, a systematic way to describe a foundation's grants in order to assess whether it is meeting its goals. The Template is not meant to examine the effectiveness of individual grants, the entire grantmaking process, or other foundation functions.

With this data communities can begin to provide feedback on the relevance of the foundation's grants to their needs. Although this Template was developed with the assistance and customized to the needs of a health conversion foundation³, the Template or a facsimile thereof would be applicable to any foundation. Our hope is that this paper and introduction of this tool will spur discussion and progress among all stakeholders aiming to improve philanthropic accountability and health for underserved communities.

³ These foundations are created from the assets of a charity, such as a nonprofit hospital, when it converts to a profit-seeking business.

III BACKGROUND

The Healthcare Conversion Tidal Wave

In 1985, Consumers Union learned that a nonprofit California health plan wanted to become a privately-held corporation. Consumers Union advocated for the net worth of the health plan to be preserved for the benefit of the public because the plan was a nonprofit and, therefore, consisted of charitable assets. As a result, a new foundation to fund health-related projects was established.

As defined by law, the boards and staffs of charitable nonprofit organizations are the custodians, not the owners, of the organization's assets. They are accountable for ensuring that the assets are used to fulfill the nonprofit's mission. Almost all nonprofits have articles of incorporation requiring that if they choose to stop operating their assets must be turned over to a nonprofit with a similar mission. A basic level of accountability is to preserve the full value of these assets and assure that they are used for the public good, not private enrichment.

The trend of health plans and hospitals converting from nonprofit agencies to privately-held businesses has continued since 1985, and Consumers Union continues to advocate for the preservation of nonprofit assets. There are now more than 160 health conversion foundations in more than 35 states with endowments totaling over \$16 billion. In 1996, Consumers Union joined with Community Catalyst to create the Community Health Assets Project (CHAP), a national effort to strengthen community participation in conversion transactions through collaboration with community advocates and public interest coalitions.⁴

New philanthropies have become the primary repositories for the saved charitable assets resulting from the conversion of nonprofit health organizations to for-profit corporations. A new conversion foundation is charged with a mission to carry out, as closely as possible, the purposes of the converting nonprofit. The legal process for protecting charitable assets generally has become more effective over time, resulting in the capture of almost all of the assets' value for these conversion foundations.

The CHAP goal of preserving charitable assets to address the public's health needs is founded on the principle that a community, through its representatives, must have the resources to advocate effectively for solutions that meet those needs. CHAP has worked to help community groups, regulators, the courts and elected officials design

⁴ Consumers Union has also worked to preserve the assets of other nonprofits as well, such as student loan organizations when they convert to profit-making businesses. As indicated in the Appendix to this report, the Grantmaking Accountability Template we have developed could be modified to examine the grantmaking

and encourage responsive conversion foundations based on structured community participation, representative staff and boards, transparency, evaluation, and goal setting with community participation. The premise of accountability in meeting community needs is tempered by recognition of the need for philanthropic independence.

In the earliest conversions, Consumers Union's advocacy centered on protecting the assets for the organization's original mission, and preventing them from falling into the hands of management and board insiders of the new for-profit corporations. But preserving these assets was never an end in itself. Our goals were to: 1) ensure that the assets were used to help communities meet their health needs, and 2) build community capacity to advocate for those needs in every possible forum. With a number of conversion foundations reaching maturity, a track record of grantmaking now exists to examine whether, and to what extent, the public funds are directed to meeting community health needs.

Why Put the Assets of a Converting Nonprofit in a Foundation?

The assets of a converting nonprofit must remain dedicated to a public purpose in line with the original agency's mission. While there is no requirement for exactly how those assets must be held, the weight of precedent is to place them in a foundation or supporting organization.⁵ Doing so has these advantages:

1. No single need or program gets the money;
2. The mission of the nonprofit can be continued, albeit in a different fashion, by foundation grants;
3. Long-term health needs can be addressed, rather than depleting the funds on one-shot uses;
4. Politicians cannot seize the money for their own purposes;
5. Policymakers, regulators and community members may coalesce around creating a new institution to address pressing needs; and,
6. A presumably neutral foundation board, representing the broad interests of the community and assisted by a professional staff, can be held accountable for the highest and best use of the funds, with the ability to shift priorities as the community's needs change.

patterns of any foundation, whether resulting from a conversion or not, focusing on health care or not, and regardless of its mission.

⁵ The wide variety of suggestions for how assets of a converting nonprofit should be held includes: starting a new nonprofit HMO or hospital; giving the money to a nonprofit dedicated to fighting a particular dread disease; creating an endowment for a community clinic; and using the fund to balance the state budget. To date, we have found the advantages of placing the assets in a foundation —including meeting requirements of state law—to outweigh the benefits of other possible options.

However, placing these funds in a foundation out of public control raises important questions: Who decides where the money goes? How is the community voice heard and how does it influence the decisions of the foundation? In other words, who can hold the conversion foundation accountable for following its mission and meeting community needs, and how can an assessment of that accountability be made?

Endowed foundations are unique. Unlike government or business, there are no voters or shareholders to whom the foundation must report. And unlike most nonprofits, there is no need to be relevant and effective in order to raise funds and continue to exist. A state attorney general may not be inclined to assert jurisdiction over how an endowed foundation operates, unless it is flagrantly mismanaged, publicly violates its mission, or uses funds to meet personal needs.

Creating a foundation on the bedrock of accountability to the people to be served is the most effective way to assure its relevance and effectiveness.

Creating a foundation on the bedrock of accountability to the people to be served is the most effective way to assure its relevance and effectiveness. Community input from the earliest stages is a critical component, for example, in defining the mission statement; drafting the articles of incorporation and by-laws; and specifying requirements for the transparent disclosure of information, access to the decision makers through public meetings with board and staff, and a formal community advisory board for the foundation with authority to nominate board members.

Accountability to the public is created by building in structured community input, dialogue and participation, representative staff and board, measures to insure transparency of foundation operations, and access to foundation decision makers. At the same time, the independence of the foundation is essential and must be protected. Foundation boards ultimately have the legal and practical responsibility for the foundation's functioning. That responsibility should be carried out in a reciprocal and respectful relationship with the communities they serve.

An established foundation that does not have accountability built into its structure can still gauge itself against effective practices in philanthropy. Communities can make such comparisons and engage the leaders of their foundations in discussions on improving accountability and the effectiveness of foundation efforts on their behalf. Communities have the greatest stake in ensuring the foundation's relevance to their needs; they should, thus, shoulder the responsibility for bringing their questions and concerns to foundation staff and board. A threshold request could be that grantmaking data, such as those the Grantmaking Accountability Template provides, be made publicly available. That is a topic that could be used to start a constructive, sustained dialogue between a foundation and community groups.

Accountability - About What and to Whom?

Myriad philanthropic experts, foundation board and staff members, academic institutions, trade organizations, the United States Congress, and even the media have become immersed in examining, debating and attempting to define and ensure philanthropic accountability and effectiveness. This paper and the Template do not address the complex issue of evaluating philanthropic effectiveness.

We define an accountable foundation as one that provides the opportunity to impact foundation functions through discourse leading to suggestions for continued, as well as redirected, efforts.

Rather, we have the more circumscribed goal of seeking to ensure that conversion foundations fulfill their responsibility to work “on mission” in response to community needs. Community members, groups and leaders are the rightful parties to hold a conversion foundation, or any foundation, accountable because they are the intended beneficiaries of these charitable trusts. Even from this perspective though, defining and measuring philanthropic accountability can be an elusive task. We define an accountable foundation as one that provides the opportunity to impact foundation functions through discourse leading to suggestions for continued, as well as redirected, efforts.

The Grantmaking Accountability Template is offered as a tool for achieving transparency about foundation characteristics and grantmaking. It can be used as one element to frame the larger discussion of philanthropic accountability to communities by providing a standardized way to gather and disclose information about a foundation and its grantmaking to answer the question: Where did the money go and how did it get there? It can provide an objective way to gauge the degree to which a foundation's grantmaking is aligned with its mission, goals and strategic plan. For example, if a goal is to increase access to services, the Template would show what strategies the foundation is funding to improve access. If a foundation seeks to address disparities in health or basic services, the Template data can help assess whether its grants are allocated in ways that accurately target those who are underserved.

Foundation accountability is dependent on shared information; engaged, knowledgeable representation by community stakeholders; and avenues for engagement between the community and foundation staff and board.

But the data's usefulness will be limited unless there are also mechanisms in place to assure meaningful discussions about it between foundations and the communities they serve. That is, foundation accountability is dependent on shared information; engaged, knowledgeable representation by community stakeholders; and avenues for engagement between the community and foundation staff and board.

[D]eveloping a set of uniform, meaningful, publicly available grantmaking data is an essential first step in analyzing foundation performance and providing a basis for conversation.

A robust picture of overall foundation accountability, of course, requires a much more comprehensive set of data and corresponding measures. The distribution of funds through grants does not address other factors that impact foundation accountability such as: customer friendliness and accessibility; management effectiveness; governance; financial stewardship; and success in achieving goals. Nonetheless, developing a set of uniform, meaningful, publicly available grantmaking data is an essential first step in analyzing foundation performance and providing a basis for conversation.

The Template is intended to fulfill that role.

III GOAL AND METHODOLOGY

Our goal was to develop and test a new tool for categorizing a foundation's grantmaking to provide an objective basis on which communities and foundations could engage in sustained and meaningful dialogue about meeting community needs. This section describes the process and methodology we used to develop the Template.

Instrument Development

The data fields contained in the initial Template were derived from many philanthropy sources and from the experience of the principal investigator on the project.⁶ The draft was then distributed to a group of experts in the field for review and comment, and their comments were incorporated into the Template.

In order to further develop, test and refine the instrument, The California Endowment (TCE), a California-based conversion foundation, agreed to allow us to test it using two years of TCE's available data. TCE was created as a result of the conversion of Blue Cross of California to a for-profit corporation in 1996. We selected TCE because it is the largest conversion foundation in the country (approximately \$2.9 billion in assets) and from its inception has committed itself to community accountability. Besides providing background information and data about how its resources were allocated, key management staff from TCE reviewed and provided feedback on the data instrument. As a result of the information that surfaced in the TCE pilot and subsequent discussions, TCE made significant improvements in its coding and data collection protocols in order to gather the most accurate and meaningful information on its grantmaking.

Instrument Testing and Refinement

⁶ Many foundations, of course, already track their grantmaking with off-the-shelf software such as MicroEdge's GIFTS software. Many of the fields we suggest are found in those products. Our Template, however, adds new fields and categories that would be particularly useful from the accountability perspective.

Once the Grantmaking Accountability Template was drafted, we collected quantitative data from TCE's grants management database program and from some other internal sources for two recently available fiscal years of grantmaking – FY 2000 (March 1, 1999 – February 29, 2000) and FY 2001 (March 1, 2000 – February 28, 2001). TCE's quantitative data were converted into an Access database in order to analyze the information in data fields that corresponded to the draft Template.

Concurrently, extensive interviews with key management staff at TCE about its formal and informal grantmaking processes and procedures supplemented the quantitative information available from TCE's database program. We also conducted a desk review of key corporate documents including articles of incorporation, by-laws, annual reports, IRS form 990s and strategic and program plans.

Once TCE data were compiled and classified according to our data fields, the information was analyzed, both in terms of what the data indicated and how they reflected on TCE's stated mission and goals. "The California Endowment Case Study," which summarizes TCE's grantmaking for FY 2000 and FY 2001 using this initial version of the Template, is available as a separate document on our web site at www.consumersunion.org.

In November 2002, we presented a draft version of the Template to community advisory committees, staff and boards of several conversion foundations at a gathering convened by the CHAP project in St. Louis, Missouri. Based on feedback from that convening, our learnings from the TCE Case Study, and input by philanthropic experts and practitioners, we further refined the Template. We clarified definitions, added several data fields, and refined some of the recommended categories within data fields. The data instrument appended to this paper, therefore, reflects our most comprehensive work to date. It is not identical to that used in the TCE Case Study, which is based on the original draft Template.

Application

Based on the phased work on the Template and related research, we have developed recommendations about its use. In addition, we have developed recommendations to promote enhanced access, transparency and disclosure of information about grantmaking. These recommendations can be found in pages 13-14 of this report.

III THE GRANTMAKING ACCOUNTABILITY TEMPLATE

Data Fields

Some of the data fields suggested in the Template are obvious and commonly found in off-the-shelf grantmaking software, e.g., grantee and target population profile, subject area, sector of impact. Some of the fields we suggest are novel, e.g., grantmaking process, grants made to re-granting intermediaries, reason for using re-granting intermediary. Together, the fields provide access to important information about a foundation's grantmaking. To the extent possible, the Template gathers similar profile information about the foundation and the nonprofit grantees they support.

The data fields recommended in the Template are outlined below. The Appendix to this paper contains a complete explanation of the Grantmaking Accountability Template, including definitions of the terminology and why we chose the particular data fields for collection.

With information generated using the Template's recommended data fields, staff, boards and communities can assess a foundation's grantmaking against its mission, goals and strategies as well as compare its grantmaking to that of other foundations.

Template Data Fields

Foundation Profile

- 1.Age of Foundation
- 2.IRS Foundation Classification
- 3.Asset Size
- 4.Payout Percentage
- 5.Financial Management
 - a. Administrative Expense Ratio
 - b. Ratios of Staff to Proposals Received and Grants Made
 - c. Investment Expense Ratio
 - d. Investment Management Policies
- 6.Board Profile
 - a. Size
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Ethnicity/Race
 - e. Experience
 - f. Geographic Diversity (if relevant)
- 7.Staff Profile
 - a. Size
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Ethnicity/Race
 - e. Experience
 - f. Geographic Diversity (if relevant)

Proposals Received, Funded, Withdrawn, Declined by Rationale

Spending by Grantmaking Programs

Grants by Size

Grants by Term

Grantmaking Method

Grantmaking Process

- 1.Community Input Opportunities
- 2.Guidelines
- 3.Competitive/Non-Competitive Process

- 4.Community-Driven/Foundation-Driven

Grants Made to Re-Granting Intermediaries

- 1.Reason for Using Re-Granting Intermediary
- 2.Grants Broken Out by Function

Foundation Goals

Primary Sector of Impact

Subject Area

Role of Foundation Support

Type of Activity of Grantees

Grantee Profiles

- 1.Age of Organizations
- 2.Type of Organizations
- 3.Size of Organizations by Annual Budget
- 4.Board Profiles
 - a. Gender
 - b. Age
 - c. Ethnicity/Race
- 5.Staff Profiles
 - a. Size
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Ethnicity/Race

Target Population Profiles

- 1.Target Populations
- 2.Gender
- 3.Age
- 4.Ethnicity/Race
- 5.Income Level
- 6.Rural/Urban
- 7.Geographic Diversity

Data Analysis

With information generated using the Template's recommended data fields, staff, boards and communities can assess a foundation's grantmaking against its mission, goals and strategies as well as compare its grantmaking to that of other foundations.

The Template allows an examination of sets of questions about a foundation's grantmaking in particular areas. For example, questions that could be answered from information found in the Template in the public policy arena include:

- Are the foundation grants focused on goals such as changing government policy?
- Is the foundation funding specific advocacy efforts and/or providing general, operating support for advocacy groups?
- How is it prioritizing its resources for funding research, policy development, public education and/or organizing strategies?
- If a large amount of resources are being spent on research, is the foundation also funding strategies to implement the research recommendations?

"The California Endowment Case Study," is an example of the type of analysis that can be done by foundations and community stakeholders using the data fields contained in the Grantmaking Accountability Template.

Limitations of the Template for Accountability Purposes

The Template is one tool that can be used to evaluate a foundation's accountability to the community it serves. Conducting a more comprehensive assessment of a foundation's accountability – its responsiveness, transparency, accessibility and disclosure practices – would also require examining structural and procedural issues about grantmaking including:

- the process by which foundations define grantmaking goals, priorities and strategies;
- avenues for and disclosure about community input; and,
- qualitative components related to customer service.

Fully assessing philanthropic accountability and responsiveness to community needs requires both qualitative information and quantitative data about a foundation's grantmaking and other charitable activities, its fiduciary stewardship, and its structure and practices.

That is, fully assessing philanthropic accountability and responsiveness to community needs requires both qualitative information and quantitative data about a

foundation's grantmaking and other charitable activities, its fiduciary stewardship, and its structure and practices.

The California Endowment Case Study was a laboratory for developing and testing the usefulness of the Template. What we have learned from the TCE pilot study is that the Template can be a valuable tool to provide objective, albeit self-reported, information about where the resources of a foundation are going and whether the foundation's grantmaking generally reflects its mission and goals. As with the introduction of any data analysis tool, we have also learned about some of the shortcomings to developing and utilizing it:

- **Potential Data Weaknesses:** Because of the novelty of the endeavor and because the data sought are not gathered for the purposes we propose or frequently analyzed, there are apt to be some difficulties with data reliability. Some of the reliability issues we encountered include duplication or overlap between data fields and lack of consistent coding.
- **Need for Longer Period of Review:** Analyzing the information over a one or two year period, as we did in the TCE Case Study, is useful simply to learn where the money went. However, in order to understand trends and strategic direction, four to five years of grantmaking data should be analyzed. Two years is too short a period, relative to the time it takes to make a grant. From inquiry to award, many foundations' average time to make grants is between three and six months, depending upon the complexity and amount of the grant. In addition to reviewing yearly data for a close-up picture of grantmaking, analyzing four to five years of such data would allow the reviewer to identify trends and patterns and to get a feel for the priorities of the foundation in practice.
- **Lack of "Industry" Standards:** Because generally accepted philanthropic accountability standards or norms do not exist, currently there are no bases of comparison for the information in the Template. Nonetheless, our hope is that this tool, along with other accountability efforts underway, will help jumpstart development of such standards. In any case, the data alone should prompt dialogue about community-responsive and accountable philanthropy among all stakeholders dedicated to improving health for the underserved.

III RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our experience conducting The California Endowment Case Study, on our phased development of the Template, and on the need for an informed public to help develop and monitor the principles of philanthropic accountability, we offer the following recommendations regarding grantmaking information.

For the Philanthropic Field

Foundations should collect, regularly publish and provide venues to discuss data describing their grantmaking. They should provide standard grantmaking information and definitions, such as those contained in the Template, that can be further customized to the size and focus of the foundation, as well as to the character and needs of the community they serve.

- The information collected should be prospective and retrospective, reporting on the intention of the efforts funded as well as what actually occurred, and encompassing information garnered from two critical vantage points of a foundation's stewardship of community resources – grantmaking and grant monitoring.
- Where re-granting is utilized as a strategy, comparable information should be collected and reported on re-grants as on grants made directly by the foundation. If it is not possible to collect all of the same data, the following data fields are recommended at a minimum: proposals received, funded, withdrawn and declined by rationale; grants by size; grants by term; grantmaking process; subject area; type of support provided by foundation; type of activity of grantee; and target population.
- Foundations should use the most transparent, responsive and accessible processes for determining the priorities for and the distribution of their resources. This will usually include published guidelines; the most competitive process feasible; community-solicited priorities within the general goals and guidelines of the foundation; and meaningful community input and feedback about a foundation's goals, strategies and programs.

Where these practices are not employed, the potential return in effectiveness should exceed the loss in community access and transparency. The decision to employ a grantmaking process that significantly limits community access should be informed by research, community input and independent verification and the wider community should be informed of these grantmaking programs, even if the public cannot access the funds directly.

- Discretionary funding processes should be used only where absolutely necessary to provide foundation staff and board with those resources needed to run an efficient and responsive organization, e.g., contingency funds, resources for charitable activities other than grantmaking, etc. For example, small grant and fast-track grant programs, often included as part of CEO or President's discretionary programs, should be separated out and established as such, with published guidelines, process and timeline.
- Staff training and oversight should be provided to assure maximum uniformity of coding.

Philanthropy, in collaboration with community stakeholders, should identify benchmarks or standards for the data fields contained in the Template. These standards can serve as a yardstick against which a foundation's grantmaking can be measured and compared to its peers and to good practices in the field.

For Community Groups

Community stakeholders should regularly review and analyze the grantmaking information published by foundations and take advantage of venues provided to regularly engage in dialogue with foundation staff and boards about the effectiveness of their grantmaking.

Where a foundation does not collect, regularly publish and/or provide avenues to discuss information about its grantmaking, community stakeholders should advocate that the foundation provide grantmaking information, such as that found in the Template, and opportunities for dialogue about the information.

III CONCLUSION

The Grantmaking Accountability Template lays a cornerstone for philanthropic

With access to decision makers, community groups can work from the same data to engage foundation staff and board members in dialogue – in itself a radical change from current practice.

accountability by providing a way to gather and publish reliable data on grants that have been made. Foundation boards and staffs will be able to judge if they are fulfilling their missions, goals and strategic plans. Community groups can examine the data and make their own independent judgments.

With access to decision makers, community groups can work from the same data to engage foundation staff and board members in dialogue – in itself a radical change from current practice. By using the Template, individual foundations seeking assurance of

their relevancy can now provide a clear view of their operations. Once sector-wide measures and standards are developed for foundation practices, foundation boards and staffs and community groups will be able to assess how a foundation's grantmaking compares to that of its peers and to standards for those additional practices. We hope that this paper, and our introduction of the Template, will help spur the development of such standards.

III GRANTMAKING ACCOUNTABILITY TEMPLATE

III TABLE OF APPENDICES

Introduction	A-1
Data Fields At-A-Glance	A-1
In-Depth Descriptions Of Data Fields.....	A-6
A. Foundation Profile	A-6
1. Age of Foundation	A-6
2. IRS Foundation Classification.....	A-6
3. Asset Size.....	A-10
4. Payout Percentage	A-10
5. Financial Management	A-11
a. Administrative Expense Ratio.....	A-11
b. Ratios of Staff to Proposals Received and Grants Made.....	A-11
c. Investment Expense Ratio.....	A-12
d. Investment Management Policies.....	A-12
6. Board Profile	A-13
a. Size	A-13
b. Gender	A-13
c. Age	A-13
d. Ethnicity/Race.....	A-14
e. Experience	A-14
f. Geographic Diversity (if relevant)	A-14
7. Staff Profile	A-14
a. Size.....	A-14
b. Gender.....	A-14
c. Age	A-15
d. Ethnicity/Race.....	A-15
e. Experience.....	A-15
f. Geographic Diversity (if relevant)	A-16
B. Proposals Received, Funded, Withdrawn, Declined By Rationale	A-16
C. Spending By Grantmaking Programs	A-17
D. Grants By Size.....	A-18
E. Grants By Term	A-18
F. Grantmaking Method	A-19

G. Grantmaking Process	A-19
1. Community Input Opportunities	A-20
2. Guidelines.....	A-21
3. Competitive/Non-Competitive Process	A-21
4. Community- Driven/Foundation-Driven Process.....	A-21
H. Grants Made To Re-Granting Intermediaries.....	A-22
1. Reason for Using Re-Granting Intermediary.....	A-23
2. Grants Broken Out by Function	A-24
I. Foundation Goals	A-24
J. Primary Sector Of Impact.....	A-25
K. Subject Area.....	A-25
L. Role Of Foundation Support.....	A-26
M. Type Of Activity Of Grantees	A-27
N. Grantee Profiles	A-28
1. Age of Organizations	A-28
2. Type of Organizations.....	A-29
3. Size of Organizations by Annual Budget	A-30
4. Board Profiles	A-30
a. Gender	A-30
b. Age	A-31
c. Ethnicity/Race.....	A-31
5. Staff Profiles	A-31
a. Size	A-31
b. Gender	A-32
c. Age	A-32
d. Ethnicity/Race.....	A-32
O. Target Population Profiles	A-33
1. Target Populations.....	A-33
2. Gender	A-34
3. Age	A-35
4. Ethnicity/Race.....	A-35
5. Income Level	A-35
6. Rural/Urban	A-36
7. Geographic Diversity	A-36

III INTRODUCTION

The Grantmaking Accountability Template (the Template) is intended to be a practical data collection and reporting instrument that contains standardized data fields to describe basic information about the foundation and the quantitative component of foundation grantmaking – simply put, it is a way to answer “where did the money go?”

Analyzing the information contained in the Template requires an understanding of the terminology and why we chose these particular data fields for collection. What follows are, first, summary definitions and then annotated descriptions of the data fields. Within each data field are categories.

Although the data fields are universally applicable to all grantmaking foundations, the Template was developed from working with a health conversion foundation. Therefore, some of the categories listed within the data fields are customized to health-related work. They could, however, easily be customized to accommodate philanthropic work in varying issue areas.

III DATA FIELDS AT-A-GLANCE

This section contains an overview of the data fields in the Template with abbreviated descriptions.

- A. **FOUNDATION PROFILE:** basic information about a foundation related to grantmaking.
 - 1. **Age of Foundation**
 - 2. **IRS Foundation Classification:** the IRS status of the foundation (e.g. 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4)) and the type of foundation that it is, e.g. private foundation, public charity, social welfare organization, etc.
 - 3. **Asset Size:** the dollar assets of a foundation, used as shorthand for a foundation's size.
 - 4. **Payout Percentage:** the ratio of a foundation's payout to its assets. In general, a private foundation must pay annually not less than 5 percent of the twelve-month rolling average of net assets used to generate income for charitable activities. The payout percentage can be derived from information found on the foundation's 990-PF form filed annually with the IRS.
 - 5. **Financial Management:** this section contains several ratios and investment-related inquiries, providing information about the efficiency and financial management of a foundation. Some of the ratios can be derived from information on the 990-PF; some of the ratios, as well as the investment policies, require information from the foundation.

- a. **Administrative Expense Ratio:** a ratio between administrative expenses on one hand and total grants, other charitable activities, and administrative expenses on the other.
 - b. **Ratios of Staff to Proposals Received and Grants Made:** these two ratios show, first a comparison between the number of all staff to the number of proposals received, and secondly the number of all staff compared to the number of grants made.
 - c. **Investment Expense Ratio:** a ratio between annual investment-related expenses and the fair market value of total assets.
 - d. **Investment Management Policies:** a set of questions about a foundation's investment objectives and policies.
6. **Board Profile:** these data fields, taken together, provide a picture of the foundation's board.
- a. **Size:** how many board members are currently sitting on the governing board; how many are allowed under the by-laws; and how many are required under the by-laws.
 - b. **Gender**
 - c. **Age**
 - d. **Ethnicity/Race**
 - e. **Experience:** professional expertise and/or community-based experiences which qualify board members for board service.
 - f. **Geographic Diversity (if relevant)**
7. **Staff Profile**
- a. **Size:** number of full-time equivalents.
 - b. **Gender**
 - c. **Age**
 - d. **Ethnicity/Race:** the number in management, program/direct services, clerical/administration categories.
 - e. **Experience:** professional expertise and/or community-based experiences which qualify staff for foundation employment.
 - f. **Geographic Diversity (if relevant)**
- B. **PROPOSALS RECEIVED, FUNDED, WITHDRAWN, DECLINED BY RATIONALE:** total proposals received classified by whether they were funded or not, and the decline rationale for those that were not funded.
- C. **SPENDING BY GRANTMAKING PROGRAMS:** the foundation's content areas to be funded and, in some cases, the way(s) the grantseekers are able to access the resources.

- D. **GRANTS BY SIZE:** the dollar amount of the grant.
- E. **GRANTS BY TERM:** length of the grant.
- F. **GRANTMAKING METHOD:** distinguishing between grants made directly to a grantee and those made indirectly to a grantee through a re-granting intermediary. This field may not apply to all foundations as some may not use intermediaries at all.
- G. **GRANTMAKING PROCESS:** the process by which foundations make resources available to the community, focusing on the level of accessibility and transparency.
 - 1. **Community Input Opportunities:** whether there were structured opportunities for community input into and feedback on the goals and strategies guiding the funding programs under which the grant was made.
 - 2. **Guidelines:** whether there were published guidelines that outline the process and timeline to apply for the grant.
 - 3. **Competitive/Non-Competitive Process:** whether the process by which the grant was received was competitive and with open access. For example, invited proposals and board discretionary grants generally would be deemed made through a “non-competitive process”.
 - 4. **Community-Driven/Foundation-Driven Process:** whether the community or the foundation generated the issue and strategy being funded within the foundation’s broad goals and objectives. For example, grants made pursuant to a prescriptive “request for proposal” would be a “foundation-driven process.”

H. **GRANTS MADE TO RE-GRANTING INTERMEDIARIES**

- 1. **Reason for Using Re-Granting Intermediary:** i.e., issue expertise; geographical reach; program-related, value-added services; administrative capacity; insulation.
- 2. **Grants Broken Out by Function:** i.e., administration, value-added services such as technical assistance, and re-grant amount.

- I. **FOUNDATION GOALS:** the broad goals the foundation has articulated that guide most, if not all, of their grantmaking. A foundation's goals should relate directly to the broader mission of the organization. Grantseekers generally are required to show how the efforts described in their proposals meet one or more of a foundation's goals.
- J. **PRIMARY SECTOR OF IMPACT:** the primary sector the grant program or activity seeks to impact, i.e., systems, communities, families & individuals, organizations.
- K. **SUBJECT AREA:** the issue or problem the grant's program or activity addresses.
- L. **ROLE OF FOUNDATION SUPPORT:** e.g. capacity-building, core operating support, evaluation, etc.
- M. **TYPE OF ACTIVITY OF GRANTEES:** the type of activity or strategy the grantee will employ to address an identified problem, e.g. community organizing, capital development, direct services, mentoring, etc.
- N. **GRANTEE PROFILES:** to provide a picture of the organizations that receive funding from a foundation.
 - 1. **Age of Organizations**
 - 2. **Type of Organizations**
 - 3. **Size of Organizations by Annual Budget**
 - 4. **Board Profiles**
 - a. **Gender**
 - b. **Age**
 - c. **Ethnicity/Race**
 - 5. **Staff Profiles**
 - a. **Size**
 - b. **Gender**
 - c. **Age**
 - d. **Ethnicity/Race**

O. TARGET POPULATION PROFILES

- 1. Target Populations:** describes the population targeted by programs and activities funded by the foundation's grant.
- 2. Gender**
- 3. Age**
- 4. Ethnicity/Race**
- 5. Income Level**
- 6. Rural/Urban**
- 7. Geographic Diversity**

III IN-DEPTH DESCRIPTIONS OF DATA FIELDS

A. FOUNDATION PROFILE

This grouping of data fields creates a picture of the foundation, filtered through the lens of grantmaking and community accountability, using basic quantitative information about the foundation.

1. Age of Organization

2. IRS Foundation Classification

The following, discussed in greater detail below, are categories for this data field:

■ 501(c)(3) Private Foundation

- Independent Foundation
- Family Foundation
- Conversion Foundation
- Corporate Foundation

■ 501(c)(3) Public Charity

- Community Foundation
- Conversion Foundation
- Public Foundation
- Supporting Organization

■ 501(c)(4) Social Welfare Organization/Advocacy Organization

- Conversion Foundation

The Template focuses on grantmaking organizations and not on entities that directly conduct charitable activities. In the glossary below, “foundation” means a tax-exempt organization formed to hold assets and make grants.

According to the 2003 “A Profile of New Health Foundations” by Grantmakers in Health, of the 165 health care conversion foundations surveyed the most common tax status was public charity (52%), followed by private foundation (43%). Six were classified as social welfare organizations, and two were classified as “other” with funds administered by state or local government.

501(c)(3) PRIVATE FOUNDATION: A "private foundation" is an entity exempt from tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code that is not a public charity (defined below). Private foundations are non-governmental, nonprofit organizations typically having a principal fund managed by their trustees that aid charitable, educational, religious, and other activities serving the public good. Usually, they derive their principal fund from a single individual, family, or corporation, and do not solicit contributions from the public. Donations to private foundations have stricter percentage limitations on income tax deductibility than those to public charities. Overall, the law regulates private foundations much more heavily than public charities. For example, private foundations are required to make qualifying distributions annually of at least 5% of the value of their noncharitable assets. See "Payout Percentage" below. They are required to file a Form 990-PF with the IRS annually.

Set forth below are descriptions of several types of private foundations. The distinctions among them carry no legal significance. Rather, the labels tell us how they are funded and controlled, and the focus of their grantmaking. While most private foundations focus on grantmaking, there is an exception under the tax law for a small subset of private foundations known as "private operating foundations." Private operating foundations do little if any grantmaking and instead run charitable programs of their own. Examples of well-known private operating foundations include The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Getty Trust.

There are several types of foundations that have private foundation status including:

Independent Foundation: Like other private foundations, independent foundations derive the bulk of their income-producing corpus from limited sources such as a single bequest, or annual contributions from an individual, group of individuals, or family members. They are governed by boards comprised of community, business and academic leaders rather than the original donor. Some "flow-through" their assets soon after they receive them, while others have substantial and long-lasting endowments. Examples of independent foundations include the Ford Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Family Foundation: Family foundations typically derive their funds from members of a single family and are controlled by the benefactor or the benefactor's family. At least one family member generally continues to serve as an officer or board member of the foundation, and as the donor, they or their relatives play a significant role in governing and/or managing the foundation throughout its life. Most family foundations concentrate their giving locally, in their communities.

Conversion Foundation: A relatively new type of foundation, conversion foundations have become the primary repository for saved charitable assets resulting from the conversion of non-profit organizations to for-profit corporations. According to a survey by Grantmakers in Health, less than one-half of health conversion foundations have gotten IRS tax-exempt status as private foundations, while greater than one-half have gotten IRS status as public charities and a half dozen are 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations.

Corporate Foundation: A corporate foundation typically derives its funds from one company, and may share a name with the company or have overlapping board members. The sponsor corporation usually sets philanthropic priorities by controlling the board of the foundation. A corporate foundation is nevertheless a separate legal organization devoted to charitable purposes that the corporate donor cannot use for its own benefit and is subject to the same rules and regulations as other private foundations.

501(c)(3) PUBLIC CHARITY: Public charities are tax-exempt, nonprofit organizations that are either a certain type of organization (church, school, or hospital that meets specific IRS requirements), or receive their financial support from a broad segment of the general public. A public charity that qualifies by virtue of having a broad public base of financial support must continue to seek money from diverse sources in order to retain its public charity status, which the IRS ascertains by very specific mathematical tests. The tests' purpose is to ensure that the public charity is responsive to the general public, rather than a limited few. There is also a kind of public charity called a "supporting organization", discussed below, that benefits and supports other public charities. Charitable organizations that are not public charities are private foundations, which are subject to more stringent regulatory and reporting requirements.

Most public charities are not primarily grantmaking organizations, but rather work directly in operating charitable programs (e.g. schools, scientific research organizations). This Template, however, focuses on the relatively narrow class of public charities that make grants, sometimes referred to as "foundations." Apart from supporting organizations, which the tax law defines and treats differently, the distinction among types of foundations that may qualify as public charities carries no legal significance, but rather may tell us about the kind of work they do, how they operate, or how they are funded. Donations to public charities qualify for maximum income tax deductibility. Public charities are required to file Form 990 with the IRS annually.

There are several types of foundations that can have public charity status, including:

Community Foundation: A tax-exempt, nonprofit, autonomous, publicly-supported philanthropic institution, a community foundation is composed primarily of permanent funds established by many separate donors. A community foundation typically focuses its charitable giving in a defined geographic area, usually not larger than a state. Community foundations usually provide an array of services to donors who wish to establish charitable funds without incurring the administrative and legal costs of starting new private foundations.

Conversion Foundation: see description above.

Public Foundation: Like other public charities, public foundations receive their assets from multiple sources, which may include private foundations, individuals, government agencies, and fees for service. The term “public foundation” tends to be a “catch-all” phrase, referring to public charities that do grantmaking, but not necessarily focused on a particular community or cause.

Supporting Organization: A charity that is not itself required to meet a mathematical public support test because it supports a public charity or a group of public charities. To be a supporting organization, a charity must meet one of three complex legal tests that assure that the organization being supported has some influence over the actions of the supporting organization. Although a supporting organization may be formed to benefit any type of public charity, the use of this form is particularly common in connection with community foundations. Supporting organizations are distinguishable from donor-advised funds because they are distinct legal entities. While some supporting organizations operate programs, many engage in grantmaking and thus are included in this list of grantmaking entities.

501(C)(4) SOCIAL WELFARE ORGANIZATION/ADVOCACY ORGANIZATION: These tax-exempt organizations are given looser restrictions on lobbying and participation in advocacy activities and political campaigns than organizations exempt from tax under 501(c)(3). They are not obliged to spend any portion of their assets on charitable activities, or to report the same detailed information as private foundations. To assure independence from business and government, however, donations to these types of foundations are not tax-deductible. Note, however, that it is possible for a foundation to receive 501(c)(4) designation from the IRS with 501(c)(3) restrictions set forth in its by-laws. This is the case, for example, with the California HealthCare Foundation, a conversion foundation. Social welfare organizations are required to file Form 990 with the IRS annually.

Conversion Foundation: see description above.

3. Asset Size

This data field identifies the dollar assets of a foundation, information generally used as shorthand for a foundation's size. In general, the "fair market value of all assets at end of year" is used to identify the asset size of a foundation. (This can be found on the 990-PF, Part II, column (c), line 16.) There is a direct relationship between asset size and grantmaking/ charitable activity because of the payout requirement (see "Payout Percentage" below.)

4. Payout Percentage

The Internal Revenue Code (section 4942) requires private foundations to make "qualifying distributions" annually of at least 5 percent of the fair market value of the foundation's noncharitable assets. In common usage, these qualifying distributions are known as the foundation's "payout". Generally, "payout" is the amount a private foundation expends for charitable purposes, including grants, charitable activities, and necessary and reasonable administrative expenses.¹ Federal tax law does not require public charities to distribute a particular percentage of their assets.

The "payout percentage" here is the ratio of a foundation's payout to the net value of its noncharitable-use assets. This percentage can be derived from information found on a private foundation's 990-PF report filed with the IRS. (Adjusted qualifying distributions, Part XII, line 6, divided by Net value of noncharitable-use assets, Part X line 5.) Upon request, foundations are required to make available a copy of their 990 or 990-PF. 990/990-PFs for foundations are also available on the nonprofit GuideStar's website (www.guidestar.org).

5. Financial Management

This section contains financial ratios and investment-related inquiries, providing some information about the efficiency and financial management of a foundation. This information can be useful to monitor and compare a foundation's financial management to that of other foundations over time. Keep in mind two important caveats regarding this information. First, these ratios should not be viewed in isolation. Rather, multiple factors such as a foundation's size or geographic reach may affect the reasonableness of its administrative costs. Secondly, generally accepted standards for reasonable ratios and investment policies do not currently exist, making assessment of this information difficult.

¹ The Charitable Giving Act, or HR 7, introduced in the House of Representatives this year, is aimed at increasing charitable giving through several changes in the federal tax code. Included in this legislation is a proposal that would exclude administrative expenses from counting toward a private foundation's payout.

Some of the information from which to derive these percentages can be found on a foundation's Form 990 or 990-PF filed with the IRS; other information needs to be provided by the foundation. It is important to note, however, that due to a lack of common definitions and standards for reporting, there may be significant inconsistencies in entries on the IRS forms. Nonetheless, they are the only required publicly available filings for foundations and, as such, are a critical source of data that allows a foundation's community stakeholders to assess and compare the foundation's financial management performance.

- a. **Administrative Expense Ratio:** this is a ratio between annual administrative expenses and adjusted qualifying distributions. (990-PF, Part I, column (d), line 24 divided by Part XII, line 6.)

This ratio provides a way for stakeholders to track how much of a foundation's resources go to operations and administration against how much goes directly to grantmaking and other charitable activities. The administrative expense ratio is one indicator of a foundation's efficiency in administering its program activities and can be useful to both monitor a foundation's efficiency over time and to compare it to other foundations. As stated, above, this information must be considered in the context of the size, geographic reach and types of program activities of the particular institutions.

- b. **Ratios of Staff to Proposals Received and Grants Made:** these two ratios show, first, a comparison between the number of all staff to the number of proposals received and, secondly, the number of all staff compared to the number of grants made. To derive the first ratio, divide the number of proposals received by the number of paid staff. Likewise, to get the second ratio divide the number of grants made by the number of staff. (This data field requires two values, one for each ratio.)

These ratios are critical to placing the administrative expense ratio in context. They are indicators of workload and have a direct relationship to the administrative expense ratio. For example, if the administrative expense ratio of one foundation is slightly higher than another's, but the former foundation receives and makes significantly more grants in many more geographic locations, then one might conclude that it compares favorably with the other in terms of the efficiency of its programmatic operations.

- c. **Investment Expense Ratio:** this is a ratio between annual investment-related expenses, and the average of the end of year fair market value of total assets of the current year and the previous year. Generally speaking, this ratio reflects the amount spent to generate capital gain or loss during the period under study. The investment expense ratio is an indicator of a foundation's efficiency in overseeing its investments. It does not provide information about a

foundation's investment *performance*, only its efficiency in overseeing its investments. In order to track and compare foundation investment performance, a series of investment management inquiries are needed, as discussed in the next section.

To derive the investment expense ratio for a particular year, take the figure on Part I, column (b), line 26 and divide it by the average of Part II, column (c), line 16 for the current year and the previous year's 990-PF.

d. **Investment Management Policies:** this data field is a series of questions about a foundation's investment objectives and policies. The answers to these questions will provide community stakeholders with some of the information needed to understand a foundation's investment-related performance. They will also provide a basis of comparison to other foundations.

- (1) Do you have an investment policy with stated objectives? If so, please provide. If not, what policies, procedures, goals and/or objectives guide the management of your investments?
- (2) Please explain how your investment policies and objectives facilitate and further your foundation's mission, goals and objectives?
- (3) What is your strategic asset allocation?
- (4) Please explain how this asset allocation supports your investment objectives?
- (5) For your last full fiscal year, how has the performance of your investments compared to the market performance for like investments?

6. Board Profile

These data fields taken together seek to describe the board of a foundation for the purposes of assessing and monitoring its diversity and community representation. Generally, boards should reflect and be able to represent the needs of the communities served by the organization. If a foundation also has a community advisory committee, as is the case with some conversion foundations, the same information about it should be collected and reported in this template.

a. Size

This field asks the foundation to list how many board members are:

- currently sitting on the governing board;
- allowed and required under the by-laws; and,
- term length and maximum number of terms.

b. Gender

This field asks the foundation to segment its board members by gender:

- Female
- Male

c. Age

This field asks the foundation to segment its board members by age. The following are suggested categories:

- Less than 30 years of age
- 31 – 45 years of age
- 46 – 60 years of age
- More than 61 years of age

d. Ethnicity/Race

This field asks the foundation to identify its board members by ethnicity/race.

The following are suggested categories:

- African American/Black
- Asian/Asian American
- Caucasian/White
- Latino
- Native American/
American Indian/Alaska
Native
- Native Hawaiian/Other
Pacific Islander
- Other Ethnicity/Racial
Minority
- Two or more races

e. Experience

This field classifies board members by the professional expertise and/or the community-based experiences by which they are qualified for board service.

Categories for this field need to be provided by the foundation under study.

f. Geographic Diversity (if relevant)

This field classifies board members by geographic diversity. Categories for this field need to be provided by the foundation under study.

7. Staff Profile

These fields taken together seek to describe the staff of a foundation for the purposes of assessing and monitoring its diversity.

a. Size

This field classifies the size of a foundation's staff in terms of full time equivalents (FTEs) per functional categories. The following are suggested categories:

- Finance & Administration: (fill in number of FTEs)
- Program/Grantmaking: (fill in number of FTEs)
- Other: (please indicate and fill in number of FTEs)

b. Gender

This field classifies a foundation's staff by gender within functional classifications. The following are suggested categories:

- Management
 - Female
 - Male

- Program/Direct Service
 - Female
 - Male
- Clerical/Administration
 - Female
 - Male

c. Age

This field classifies a foundation's staff by age. The following are suggested categories:

- Less than 30 years of age
- 31 – 45 years of age
- 46– 60 years of age
- More than 61 years of age

d. Ethnicity/Race

This field classifies a foundation's staff by ethnicity/race within functional classifications. The following are suggested categories:

- Management
 - African American/Black
 - Asian American
 - Caucasian/White
 - Latino
 - Native American/ American Indian/Alaska Native
 - Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander
 - Other Ethnicity/Racial Minority
 - Two or more races
- Program/Direct Service
 - African American/ Black
 - Asian American
 - Caucasian/White
 - Latino
 - Native American/ American Indian/ Alaska Native
- Clerical/Administration
 - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
 - Other Ethnicity/Racial Minority
 - Two or more races

e. Experience

This field classifies staff members by the professional and personal experiences by which they are qualified to do their job. Categories for this data field need to be provided by the foundation under study.

f. Geographic Diversity (if relevant)

This field classifies staff members by geographic diversity. Categories for this field need to be provided by the foundation under study.

B. PROPOSALS RECEIVED, FUNDED, WITHDRAWN, DECLINED BY RATIONALE

This data field classifies total proposals received by whether they were funded or not, and provides the decline rationale for those that were not funded. This information is important to understanding the demand on the foundation's resources, as well as the reasons why applications are denied. Understanding the reasons a foundation declines applications can assist community organizations to prepare more successful proposals in the future.

The suggested categories are:

- Proposals Received
- Proposals Funded
- Proposals Withdrawn by Applicant
- Proposals Declined

Ineligible

- Incomplete Proposal
- Outside Program Guidelines
- Out of Qualifying Area
- Not Qualifying IRS Status
- Other (foundation to provide specific threshold funding eligibility criteria)

Eligible – Not Meritorious

- Programmatic
 - Program Approach/Strategy not Clearly Demonstrated
 - Need for Services not Demonstrated
 - Duplication of Services/Strategy
 - Lack of Coordination
 - Lack of Clear Outcomes
 - Limited Impact on Target Population
 - Lack of Cultural Competency
 - Community Involvement not Demonstrated
- Organizational
 - Lack of Organizational Capacity
- Funding
 - Inadequate Plan for or Chances of Sustainability
 - Not Cost Effective
 - Funding Not Crucial to Program
- Other (foundation to provide specific merit criteria)

Eligible – Meritorious (Internal Foundation Criteria And/Or Considerations)

- Limited Foundation Resources/No Available Funds
- Funding Program Imbalance
- Geographic Imbalance
- Already Receiving Foundation Support
- Other (foundation to provide specific internal criteria)

C. SPENDING BY GRANTMAKING PROGRAMS

In order to implement its mission and goals, grantmaking foundations generally create programs and categories of funding. Understanding where a foundation's dollars go relative to its grantmaking programs is critical to getting a picture of the foundation's priorities and how it intends to fulfill its mission and goals.

Foundation grantmaking programs usually describe the content areas to be funded and, in some cases, the way the public will be able to access those resources. For example, one of The California Endowment's (TCE) grantmaking programs is its "Responsive Grantmaking Program." The primary Responsive Grants sub-program is "CommunitiesFirst," a general grantmaking program in support of TCE's three overarching goals: access, health and well being, and multicultural health. It is also a competitive grantmaking program – there are published guidelines and the community has access to those resources based on a competitive application process.

Each foundation defines its grantmaking programs differently, but many foundations have:

- some sort of "responsive" grantmaking program reflecting the foundation's general goals and allowing the applicants to define the issues and strategies for funding;
- some sort of "strategic" program that targets foundation resources to specific areas of impact;
- grantmaking under which the foundation defines the issues and strategies and, in many cases, the eligible applicant pool; and,
- some sort discretionary fund for the President or CEO. This often functions as a combination of a contingency fund allowing for rapid response to emerging issues on a small scale, a fast-track small grants program, and a source of funds for non-grantmaking charitable activities, e.g., convenings and conferences.

Generally, responsive grantmaking is accessible to the public with published guidelines; strategic grantmaking is more narrowly targeted; and discretionary funding programs are just that – discretionary. The foundation being studied needs to provide the categories within this data field as each foundation defines them differently.

D. GRANTS BY SIZE

This data field categorizes grants made by their size in order to understand the level of investment that a foundation is making in an organization or project. Size of grant, combined with information about the age and size of the grantee organization by staff and budget, can also be an indicator of the types of projects and organizations to which a foundation is giving in terms of complexity, size, and maturity. Generally, start-up, grassroots projects and organizations seek and receive grants for smaller amounts of money. Larger, more mature, and in some cases, more complex organizations often garner more substantial foundation investments. Large grants to intermediaries may skew the picture by masking smaller sized re-grants intermediaries make to organizations. That is why it is critical to collect for re-grants the same information collected for grants made directly by a foundation to a grantee.

For a large foundation, suggested categories for this data field are as follows. If the foundation under examination is small, tends to give out smaller grants, or is employing a strategy of using re-granting intermediaries in order to make smaller grants, the categories at the smaller end should be broken down further:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ \$0 – 99,999■ \$100,000 – 249,999■ \$250,000 – 499,999■ \$500,000 – 999,999 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ \$1,000,000 – 2,499,999■ \$2,500,000 – 4,999,999■ \$5,000,000 – 9,999,999■ \$10,000,000 and over |
|--|---|

E. GRANTS BY TERM

This data field categorizes grants made by the length of the grant. This information is important to understand the types of investments the foundation is making in a project or organization – shorter- versus longer-term. Grants by term, combined with the size of the grant and information about the age and size of grantee organizations by staff and budget, can also be an indicator for the types of projects and organizations to which a foundation is giving in terms of complexity, size, and maturity. It also can reflect a foundation's philosophy about building the capacity of grantees – through shorter-term "seed" grants and/or through longer-term commitments.

The suggested categories for this data field are:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ 0 – 6 months■ 7 – 12 months■ 13 – 24 months■ 25 – 36 months | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ 37 – 48 months■ 49 – 60 months■ 61 months or more |
|--|---|

F. GRANTMAKING METHOD

This data field is designed primarily to distinguish between grants made by a foundation directly and those made indirectly through a re-granting intermediary (hereinafter “intermediary.”) This information is important to track the path by which nonprofits access foundation dollars.

The following are the recommended categories for this data field:

- Grants Made by Foundation:
 - to Provider of Goods and/or Services
 - to Intermediary
- Re-Grants Made by Intermediary

G. GRANTMAKING PROCESS

These data fields are designed to analyze the process by which the non-profit community accesses foundation resources and whether there were structured opportunities for community input into the foundation’s determination of the goals and strategies guiding its funding programs. Taken together, these data fields provide information about the process by which foundations make resources available to the community, focusing on the level of accessibility and transparency.

Categorizing the grantmaking process in terms of community accessibility and transparency is novel. Therefore, while the data fields and categories within them are recommended, we realize that they may need to be refined.

The categories within the grantmaking process data fields represent a continuum, from the most accessible and transparent process to the least. As the grantmaking process becomes less transparent, less accessible, less open to the public and more at the sole discretion of foundation boards and staff, it moves from one side of the grantmaking process continuum to the other.

Except for grantmaking that is done by the most closed processes, i.e., truly discretionary programs where the public has no information about the funding program, the degree to which a foundation’s grantmaking resources are responsive to community needs *does not* necessarily correlate directly with the grantmaking process. Over time, foundation staff and boards gather significant experience about what works and what does not. As well, foundation staff tend to stay informed about emerging needs. Therefore, grantmaking done by a less accessible process (i.e., no published guidelines, non-competitive, limited access), but carefully planned and researched, with opportunities for community input and feedback, may in fact be the most responsive and effective process to meet the community’s needs.

When foundations choose more “closed” processes, the potential returns from this choice should exceed the loss in community access and the choice should be informed by research (academic and practice-based), community input, and independent verification. In addition, a foundation should publish its intention regarding grantmaking, regardless of whether the public at-large has equal access to those dollars.

Therefore, the four guiding questions that informed the development of these data fields are:

- did the community have the opportunity to provide input into the goals and strategies to influence the prioritization of how the dollars would be spent;
- did the foundation inform the public about the availability, process and timeline by which to access resources through published guidelines;
- were the funds accessible to all potential eligible applicants on an equal basis, i.e., via a competitive process; and
- did the community or the foundation determine the issues and strategies eligible to be funded, within the broad foundation goals and objectives.

1. Community Input Opportunities

This data field asks a foundation to categorize its grants by whether there were structured opportunities for community input on the goals and strategies guiding the funding program under which the grant was made. This could include techniques such as community mapping, needs assessments, listening tours, etc. This describes one aspect of accessibility and responsiveness of the grantmaking process.

The recommended categories to describe this data field are:

- Widespread community input
- Some community input
- No community input

2. Guidelines

This data field asks a foundation to categorize its grants by whether there were published guidelines that outline the availability, process and timeline by which to access grants. This data field speaks to the transparency of the grantmaking process.

The recommended categories to describe this data field are:

- **Broadly Published Guidelines:** made available widely to the public

- **Narrowly Published Guidelines:** made available to a sub-group of the public determined by the foundation
- **Unpublished Guidelines:** internal foundation guidelines, not available to the public

3. Competitive/Non-Competitive Process

This data field asks a foundation to categorize its grants by whether the process by which the grant was received was competitive with open access. This data field speaks to one aspect of the accessibility and transparency of the grantmaking process.

The recommended categories to describe this data field are:

- **Competitive Process:** a process with open access to a wide universe of eligible applicants who compete against one another for funding.
- **Semi-Competitive:** a process by which the universe of eligible applicants has been significantly narrowed and/or competition for funding is limited.
- **Non-Competitive Process:** a process to which the general public does not have access and generally applicants do not compete for funding.

4. Community-Driven/Foundation-Driven Process

This data field asks a foundation to categorize its grants by whether the community or the foundation drove the issue and strategy being funded within the foundation's broad goals and objectives. This data field speaks to one aspect of the accessibility and responsiveness of the grantmaking process.

The recommended categories to describe this data field are:

- **Community-driven:** applicants generate the issues and/or strategies for funding.
- **Foundation-driven:** the foundation generates the specific issues and/or strategies for funding.

H. GRANTS MADE TO RE-GRANTING INTERMEDIARIES

This data field further analyzes foundation grants made to intermediaries that re-grant funds, and also in some cases run programs on behalf of foundations. Intermediaries place an additional “layer” between the community and the foundation. It is important, therefore, to understand why a foundation is using an intermediary, how much of a foundation’s resources are absorbed by the intermediary, and how much of those resources are distributed through the intermediary.

An intermediary is an organization that carries out a programmatic function that a foundation would otherwise have to perform for itself. Intermediaries are a common vehicle used by larger foundations to make resources available to communities, sometimes to meet payout requirements. Some intermediaries are funded by foundations to provide value-added services only (e.g. technical assistance, evaluation, etc.). Others re-grant funds. Many do both. We use the term “intermediaries” here to refer to those that are funded solely to make re-grants or to make re-grants as an explicit part of their funded activities.

From an accountability perspective, the question is whether the outsourcing relationship increases community responsiveness, accessibility and transparency. Are the administrative resources that go to intermediary organizations rather than going directly to the public, or being kept by the foundation to enhance its grantmaking capacity, justified?

Accountability requires that foundations monitor and assess grants to re-granting intermediaries relative to their ability to reflect the foundation’s mission, values, and its commitment to accessibility, transparency, community engagement, and quality.

In order to make such an assessment, at a minimum, foundations need to tag those grants made to re-granting intermediaries (see section F, “Grantmaking Method”) and to indicate why the intermediary was employed and the functional purpose(s) of the resources given to them.

Therefore, it is recommended that the following additional data be collected about grants made to intermediaries.

1. Reason for Using an Intermediary

Foundations generally use intermediaries for one or more of the following reasons:

- An intermediary has familiarity with and credibility on a particular issue;
- An intermediary has relationships and credibility with a full range of local, community-based organizations and/or geographical representation or reach in an area that the foundation does not. Giving the program a familiar face, the intermediary establishes a local identity and often induces a greater measure of local responsibility for change.
- An intermediary has expertise in the field that will add value to the program or build the capacity of a grantee organization to realize its mission and program-related goals. Some types of value-added services that intermediaries provide are: capacity building/technical assistance (programmatic, MIS, etc.), evaluation, advocacy, research, facilities/housing development, strategic/program planning and design, building multi-system or cross-discipline partnerships and collaboratives, and work related to organizational development;
- An intermediary has administrative capacity that the foundation either does not have or does not want to dedicate for the particular purpose. That is, the intermediary has the ability to do grantmaking in a designated timeframe and may be able to do so less expensively or more efficiently than the foundation. Intermediaries are sometimes employed for administrative capacity when the activity is being funded by a collaborative of funders;
- An intermediary is used to provide “insulation” or a buffer when the activity, group or topic supported is a risky or controversial, or if there is a legal or other practical impediment to the foundation making the grant directly to the ultimate grantee.

Some of the recommended categories for this data field are:

- Issue Expertise/Credibility
- Geographical Reach
- Program-Related/Value-Added Services
- Administrative Capacity
- Insulation

2. Grants Broken Out by Function

As discussed above, intermediaries often have two roles – re-granting dollars and providing program-related services, usually technical assistance geared to building

capacity. It is important on the front end to break out grants to intermediaries by the functions they are to serve. This will also provide critical information in the larger process of assessing the success of the re-granting strategy on the back end. In other words, it will allow an assessment of whether there was value added sufficient to offset the impact of an extra organizational level between the community and the foundation, and the attendant additional administrative costs incurred. (One could argue that the administrative costs of intermediaries should be added to a foundation's administrative overhead calculation.)

The following are recommended categories by which to identify the functional purpose of grants to intermediaries. Depending upon the circumstances, additional categories may be useful to describe the functions of intermediaries.

- Administration
- Program-Related/Value-Added Services (e.g. capacity building/technical assistance, evaluation/research, facilities development, strategic/program planning, organizational development for the ultimate grantee, etc.)
- Re-Granting Dollars
 - Re-Grants Made/Allocated
 - Re-Granting Dollars Remaining to be Allocated

I. FOUNDATION GOALS

Foundations generally have broad goals that guide their grantmaking. A foundation's goals should relate directly to the broader mission of the organization.

Applicants are usually required to show how the efforts described in their proposals meet one or more of a foundation's goals. The degree to which a foundation's grantmaking falls into each of its goals is important in understanding the relative priority it places on those goals and the degree to which the community sees those goals as critical, as shown by their seeking grants that embody them.

Although outside the main focus of the Template, which focuses on quantitative information about grantmaking, a critical component of a foundation's accountability to the community it serves is whether and how it involves the community in determining its goals and the priorities, strategies and grantmaking programs that emanate from them. Under data field G.1, "Grantmaking Process/ Community Input Opportunities" above, a piece of this information is requested.

The categories within this data field need to be provided by the foundation under examination as each foundation determines its own goals.

J. PRIMARY SECTOR OF IMPACT

This data field identifies the primary sector the grant-funded program or activity seeks to impact.

The recommended categories for primary sector of impact are:

- **Systems:** seeks to affect a system that administers, regulates, or sets policy related to the foundation's grantmaking goals (e.g. provider reimbursement mechanisms, Medicaid eligibility regulations and processes, etc.)
- **Communities:** seeks to affect a defined community (e.g. organizing, community-building, disseminating information to a population, providing services to a particular geographic or otherwise defined community -- i.e. people that share a common identity, experience or problem)
- **Families & Individuals:** targets interventions to individuals and families.
- **Organizations:** seeks to affect an organization (e.g. improved technology infrastructure, capacity building, changing organizational structure, etc.)

K. SUBJECT AREA

This field identifies grants by the subject of the grantee's work -- the issue or problem the grant-funded program or activity is addressing. This information is critical for community stakeholders to understand the issues being addressed and whether they "match" the stated mission and goals of the foundation and the community's needs.

The following are some suggested categories for subject areas for a health-related foundation:

- Access to Care
- Addiction Prevention & Treatment
- Aging/Senior Issues
- Alternative Health
- AIDS/HIV
- Cancer
- Census
- Chronic Disease
 - AIDS/HIV
 - Allergy-related diseases
 - Asthma
 - Cancer
 - Diabetes
 - Genetic diseases
 - Heart disease
 - Hypertension
 - Diseases of other specific organs, e.g. liver, etc.
 - Other
- Dental
- Disaster Relief
- Domestic Violence
- Education
- Employment
- Environmental Health
- Health and Human Services
- Health Care Financing
 - Affordability of Care
 - Cost Containment
- Health Coverage
- Homelessness
- Hospice/Bereavement
- Hospitals, Clinics and Medical Care
- Emergency
- Inpatient
- Nursing Care
- Outpatient
- Housing
- Information Technology
- Injury Prevention
- Medical Error Prevention
- Medical Quality Improvement
- Mental Health
 - Counseling/bereavement
 - Mental Health treatment & services
 - Psychiatric/primary care
 - Specific mental health disorders
- Nutrition
- Outreach/Information & Education
 - Peer-based
- Patient Safety
- Physical Activity
- Primary Care
- Public Health/Wellness/Health Promotion
- Rehabilitative Health
- Reproductive Health
- Substance Abuse
- Urgent Care
- Violence/Crime Prevention
- Vision
- Welfare Reform
- Workforce Health

L. ROLE OF FOUNDATION SUPPORT

This data field describes the role the foundation intends its support to provide. This information is very important to community stakeholders in developing their understanding of the means a foundation is using to meet the community's needs.

The following are suggested categories for types of support that could be used:

Grants

- Capacity Building/Technical Assistance
- Capital/Facilities Support
- General Operating Support (Core Organizational Support)
- Media Communications
- Program/Project Support
 - Exhibitions
 - Performance/Productions
 - Program Delivery
- Program/Curriculum Development
- Program Expansion
 - Services/Strategies
 - Geographical
 - Population
 - Replication
- Program Evaluation
- Seed Money
- Research/Scholarship

Loans/Program-Related Investments (Pri)

- Capital/Facilities Support
- Planning/Feasibility

M. TYPE OF ACTIVITY OF GRANTEES

This data field describes the type of activity or strategy the grantee will employ to address an identified problem, e.g. community organizing, capacity building, policy/advocacy, etc. In general, this describes how the grantee intends to use the funding to meet the grant objectives and goals. This information is critical to community stakeholders in building their understanding of the strategies being funded to meet their needs.

The following are suggested categories of types of activity that could be used:

- Capacity Building/Organizational Development
 - Board Development and Training
 - Budgeting/Finance
 - Conferences/Seminars
 - Cultural Competency
 - Faculty/Staff Development and Training
 - Fundraising
 - Program Evaluation
 - Program Planning
 - Strategic Planning
 - Other organizational development
- Capital Support
 - Building Construction/ Rehabilitation
 - Capital Campaign
 - Endowment
 - Equipment
- Information Technology
 - Non-Information Technology
- Feasibility/Pre-Development
- Land Acquisition
- Community Organizing
 - Faith-based
 - Issue-based
 - Geographically/Neighborhood based
 - Population based
 - Secular
 - Issue-based
 - Geographically/Neighborhood based
 - Population based
- Direct Services
 - Care coordination
 - Health Education
 - Health Promotion/Disease Prevention
 - Health Services/Patient Care

- Information & Referral
 - Outreach & Engagement
- Evaluation
- Information/Education
- Leadership Development
- Media/Communications
 - Electronic media/online services
 - Film/Video/Radio productions
 - Performance productions
 - Publications
- Mentoring/Peer Support
- Planning
- Policy/Advocacy
- Program Design/Development
 - Public Education
 - Re-Granting
 - Research
 - Applied Research
 - Other
 - Scholarships/Awards/Stipends
 - Special Events
 - Community fairs/festivals
 - Conferences
 - Convenings/Retreats
 - Exhibitions
 - Performances
 - Training

N. GRANTEE PROFILES

The data fields in this section, taken together, provide an aggregate picture of the organizations that receive funding from a foundation. This is important as nonprofit organizations are the primary “vehicle” by which grantmaking foundations serve community needs. That is, nonprofit organizations are generally proxies for the “community” both in terms of reflecting its needs and implementing strategies to meet them.

1. Age of Organizations

This data field classifies grants by the age of recipient organizations. The age of an organization is one measure that can indicate maturity, experience and success of an organization. On the flip side, nascent organizations can be signs of a community’s responsiveness to emerging needs, striving to meet longstanding needs, as well as building its own leadership capacity. Because seeding new ideas and being on the “cutting edge” of tackling difficult social problems are often among the goals that foundations identify, supporting young organizations can reflect a foundation’s success in fulfilling those roles.

The following are suggested categories within this field:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 0 –1 Year ■ 2 – 5 Years ■ 6 – 10 Years | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 11 – 15 Years ■ 16 – 25 Years ■ 26 + Years |
|--|--|

2. Type of Organizations

This data field describes the type of organizations to which grants are going. Note that private foundations are only permitted to use their grant/charitable activity funds for organizations with nonprofit, tax-exempt status. Administrative monies are not similarly restricted.

The following are suggested categories/sub-categories of types of organizations that could be used:

Private Secular

- Community-Based Organization (CBO)
- Collaborative
- Educational Institution
 - College/University
 - College/University Research Institute
 - Schools (Primary/Secondary)
- Evaluation Organization/Institute
- Foundation
 - Community Foundation
 - Conversion Foundation
 - Operating Foundation
 - Public Foundation
 - Supporting Organization
- Other (please provide)
- Foundation Collaborative
- Health Care Provider
 - Community Clinic
 - Hospital
 - Other Health Care Provider
- Intermediary
 - Locally-Based
 - Out-of-Locality
 - National
- Neighborhood Organization/Association
- Research Organization/Institute
- Trade or Professional Organization/Association
- Other (please provide)

Private Religious/Faith-Based

- Community-Based Organization (CBO)
- Collaborative
- Educational Institution
 - College/University
 - College/University Research Institute
 - Schools (Primary/ Secondary)
- Evaluation Organization/ Institute
- Foundation
 - Community Foundation
 - Conversion Foundation
 - Operating Foundation
 - Public Foundation
 - Supporting Organization
 - Other (please provide)
 - Foundation Collaborative
- Health Care Provider
 - Community Clinic
 - Hospital
 - Other Health Care Provider

- Intermediary
 - Locally-Based
 - Out-of-Locality
 - National
- Neighborhood Organization/Association
- Research Organization/Institute
- Trade or Professional Organization/Association
- Other (please provide)

Public Agency

- Collaborative
- Educational Institution
 - College/University
 - College/University Research Institute
 - Schools (Primary/Secondary)
- Health Care Provider
 - Community Clinic
 - Hospital
 - Other Health Care Provider
- Other (please provide)

3. Size of Organizations by Annual Budget

This data field classifies grants made by the size of the organizations' budget.

The following are suggested categories that could be used in this field of inquiry:

- \$0 – 99,999
- \$100,000 – 249,999
- \$250,000 – 499,999
- \$500,000 – 999,999
- 1,000,000 – 2,499,999
- \$2,500,000 – 4,999,999
- \$5,000,000 or more

4. Board Profiles

These data fields taken together describe the boards of the grantee organizations for the purposes of monitoring board diversity.

a. Gender

This data field classifies grantee organizations' boards by gender representation. The following are the suggested categories for this data field:

- Predominantly female (75% or more)
- Predominantly male (75% or more)
- Majority female (56% - 74%)
- Majority male (56% - 74%)
- Approximately equal male/female representation (45% - 55% mix)

b. Age

This data field classifies grantee organizations by the average age of their board members. The following are suggested categories for this data field:

- Average age less than 30 years
- Average age 31 - 45 years
- Average age 46 - 60 years
- Average age more than 61 years

c. Ethnicity/Race

This data field classifies grants made by the ethnicity/race of the organizations' board of directors. Many low-income and disadvantaged communities served by nonprofits are comprised primarily of ethnic and racial minorities. Therefore, the ethnic/racial composition of the board, the decision-making and oversight body of an organization, can be critical to an organization's sensitivity to the community it serves.

The following are suggested categories for this data field:

- Board predominantly comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (75% or more)
- Board predominantly comprised of Caucasian/Whites (75% or more)
- Board majority comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (56% - 74%)
- Board majority comprised of Caucasian/Whites (56% - 74%)
- Board comprised of approximately equal representation of ethnic/racial minorities and Caucasian/Whites (45% - 55%)

5. Staff Profiles

These data fields taken together seek to describe the staff of grantee organizations for the purposes of monitoring their diversity.

a. Size

This data field classifies grants made by the size of the organizations' staff in full time equivalent positions or FTEs.

The following are suggested categories that could be used in this field of inquiry:

- 6 FTEs
- 7-15 FTEs
- 16-24 FTEs
- 25 or more FTEs

b. Gender

This data field classifies grantee organizations' staff by gender representation within functional classifications. (This data field requires three values -- one for each functional classification of staff.)

The following are the recommended categories for this data field:

(1) Management

- Predominantly female (75% or more)
- Predominantly male (75% or more)
- Majority female (56% - 74%)
- Majority male (56% - 74%)
- Approximately equal male/female representation (45% - 55% mix)

(2) Program/Direct Services

- Predominantly female (75% or more)
- Predominantly male (75% or more)
- Majority female (56% - 74%)
- Majority male (56% - 74%)
- Equal male/female representation (45% - 55% mix)

(3) Clerical/Administration

- Predominantly female (75% or more)
- Predominantly male (75% or more)
- Majority female (56% - 74%)
- Majority male (56% - 74%)
- Equal male/female representation (45% - 55% mix)

c. Age

This data field classifies grantee organizations by the average age of their staff.

The following are suggested categories for this data field:

- Average age less than 30 years
- Average age 31 - 45 years
- Average age 46 - 60 years
- Average age more than 61 years

d. Ethnicity/Race

This data field classifies grantee organizations' staff by ethnicity/race categories within functional classifications e.g., management, program/direct service and clerical/administration. (This data field requires three values -- one for each functional classification of staff.)

The following are suggested categories for this data field:

(1) Management

- Staff predominantly comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (75% or more)
- Staff predominantly comprised of Caucasian/Whites (75% or more)
- Staff majority comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (56% - 74%)
- Staff majority comprised of Caucasian/Whites (56% - 74%)
- Staff comprised of approximately equal representation of ethnic/racial minorities and Caucasian/Whites (45% - 55% mix)

(2) Program/Direct Service

- Staff predominantly comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (75% or more)
- Staff predominantly comprised of Caucasian/Whites (75% or more)
- Staff majority comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (56% - 74%)
- Staff majority comprised of Caucasian/Whites (56% - 74%)
- Staff comprised of approximately equal representation of ethnic/racial minorities and Caucasian/Whites (45% - 55% mix)

(3) Clerical/Administration

- Staff predominantly comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (75% or more)
- Staff predominantly comprised of Caucasian/Whites (75% or more)
- Staff majority comprised of ethnic/racial minorities (56% - 74%)
- Staff majority comprised of Caucasian/Whites (56% - 74%)
- Staff comprised of approximately equal representation of ethnic/racial minorities and Caucasian/Whites (45% - 55% mix)

O. TARGET POPULATIONS

These data fields when taken together provide a profile of the populations to be targeted and/or those that have been served directly by the programs and activities funded by the foundation. This information is very important in order to understand whose needs are being addressed.

1. Target Populations

This data field describes the beneficiaries targeted by the programs and activities funded by the foundation. For example, if a faith-based nonprofit service provider is funded to train health workers to serve homeless people, the target population would be "homeless." The "Type of Activity", Section M above, would be "Training" and the "Grantee Profile – Type of Organization," Section N above, would be "Faith-Based CBO."

Note that, in general, categories specific to age are not included here, e.g. senior citizens, children & youth, etc., as this identification is to be made in the target population age data field set forth in section 3 below. So, if a program is serving a cross-section of disabled children and youth, this data field would be filled out as

“disabled” and the target population age data field would be filled out as “children & youth.” Likewise, categories for gender and ethnicity/race are picked up below under the fields set forth in sections 2 and 4 respectively, and not here under the basic target population field.

The following are suggested categories that could be used in this field of inquiry:

General Underserved Populations

Nonprofit Sector

Population-Based

- At-risk
- Caregivers
- Chemically Addicted
- Chronically Ill
 - People with HIV/AIDS
 - Other Chronic Disease
- Disabled
 - Developmentally disabled
 - Drug & Alcohol addiction
 - Physically disabled
 - Mentally disabled
 - Multiple disabilities
- Disaster Victims
- Disease Specific
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Families
 - Single-Parent families
 - Multi-Generation families
- Frail Elderly
- Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals, Transgenders
- Health Professionals
- Homeless
- Immigrants & Refugees
- Incarcerated/Ex-offenders
- Institutionalized
- Medically Indigent/Uninsured
- Pregnant Women/New Mothers
- Refugees
- Students
- Terminally Ill
- Unemployed/Underemployed
- Veterans & Military
- Victims of Crime/ Violence/Abuse
- Workers
 - Agricultural/Seasonal Workers

2. Gender

This data field describes the gender of the population targeted by the programs funded by the foundation.

The following are the recommended categories for this field of inquiry:

- Both Female and Male
- Female
- Male

3. Age

This data field describes the age of the population targeted by the programs funded by the foundation.

The following are suggested categories for this data field:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ General: All Ages■ Infants & Toddlers (0 – 5)■ Children (6 – 12)■ Youth (13 - 18)■ Children & Youth (0 – 18) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Young Adults (16 –25)■ Adults (18 – 54)■ Seniors (55+)■ Adults and Seniors (18+) |
|--|---|

4. Ethnicity/Race

This data field describes the ethnicity/race of the population targeted by the programs funded by the foundation.

The following are the suggested categories for this data field:

- General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)
- Multi-Ethnic (No Single Ethnicity/Race 50% or more of Target Population)
- Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (50% or more of Target Population)
 - African American/Black
 - Asian
 - Caucasian/White
 - Latino
 - Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native
 - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
 - Other Ethnicity/Racial Minority

5. Income Level

This data field describes the income level of the population targeted by the programs funded by the foundation.

The following are the suggested categories for this data field:

- No Target Income Level/All Income Levels
- Poverty Level (defined by the federal Department of Health and Human Services)
- Low Income (80% or below of Area Median Income as defined by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development-HUD)
- Moderate Income (120% of Area Median Income as defined by HUD)

6. Rural/Urban

This data field categorizes the population targeted by the programs funded by the foundation according to whether they are rural, urban or a combination.

The following are the suggested categories for this data field:

- Rural
- Urban
- Combination of Rural and Urban
- Other (please provide)

7. Geographic Diversity

This data field describes where the target population resides.

The following are suggested categories for this data field for a California-based foundation:

- Statewide
- Northern California
- Southern California
- Bay Area
 - Alameda
 - Contra Costa
 - Marin
 - San Francisco
 - San Mateo
 - Santa Clara
- Central California
 - Tuolumne
 - Mono
 - Mariposa
 - Inyo
- Central Coast
 - San Luis Obispo
 - Santa Barbara
- Central Valley
 - Fresno
 - Kern
 - Kings
- Madera
- Merced
- San Joaquin
- Stanislaus
- Tulare
- Los Angeles County
 - Antelope Valley
 - East
 - Metro
 - San Fernando
 - San Gabriel
 - South
 - South Bay
 - Ventura
 - West
- Monterey Bay
 - Monterey
 - San Benito
 - Santa Cruz
 - North Coast
 - Del Norte
 - Humboldt

- Lake
- Mendocino
- Napa
- Sonoma
- Trinity
- North Counties
 - Butte
 - Colusa
 - Glenn
 - Lassen
 - Modoc
 - Nevada
 - Plumas
 - Shasta
 - Sierra
 - Siskiyou
 - Tehama
- Orange County
- Sacramento Delta
- Alpine
- Amador
- Calaveras
- El Dorado
- Placer
- Sacramento
- Solano
- Sutter
- Yolo
- Yuba
- San Bernardino/Riverside
 - Riverside
 - San Bernardino
- San Diego/Imperial
 - Imperial
 - San Diego