

INDEX

A

Agape Foundation, 35, 189
Agencies: “fitting” grantmakers and, 5–19;
501(c)(3) letter of, 22, 189–190, 193;
including statistics from your, 77; size,
history, and sophistication of, 98. *See also* Applicants
American Dental Association, 140
American Diabetes Association, 70
Anderson Family Foundation: guidelines
of, 7–9; letter of inquiry to, 10–19
Appleton, L., 59, 84
Applicants: fitting mission of grantmaker
and, 6; importance of following the
guidelines, 5–9; letter of inquiry by,
10–19. *See also* Agencies; Proposals
Argus County Community Fund, 64
Argus County homelessness, 54–57,
64–67
Arts organizations: challenges of evaluat-
ing, 98–99; Needs Statement dilemma
of, 62–63
Ashbury, J., 186
Attachments: board of directors list,
190–191; decisions on whether or not
to include, 191–192; 501(c)(3) letter,
22, 189–190, 193

Authoring issues: florid writing, 151–166;
“Frankenstein” proposals by multiple
authors, 127–128; grantwriting tips
on, 137; importance of consistency,
148–149; making sense of nonsense,
167–184; redundancy and inconsis-
tency, 128–137; Senior Dental Access
examples of, 129–135, 139–149;
staying organized in collaboration,
137–149; transforming your proposal,
195–197. *See also* Writing styles
Authors. *See* Multiple authors

B

Baca, M. C., 50
Beckwith, D., 53
Betsy Ross Elementary School, 25, 28
Bird, L. M., 67
Blue Moon County, 129–135, 139–149
Board of directors list, 190
Boston Foundation, 61, 91, 93, 106
Boyd, F., 190
Bridges to Nature proposal, 10–11, 15–17
Buck Foundation, 76
Budget section: decision on whether to
balance or not the, 110–111; final
recommendations on, 111–112;

Budget section, *continued*
grantmaker complaints about, 111;
grantmaker expectations regarding,
101; grantwriting tips on, 103, 104,
106, 107; importance of financial
details in, 105–106; including the
revenue in, 104–105; matching the
words with the dollars in, 103–104;
narratives included in the, 106–107;
Partnership for Progress, 57, 102*t*;
providing revised budgets in, 107–
110; spotting financial flaws in,
102–103

Burkhart, Sister J., 61, 90, 187, 190

Busloads to Bridges program, 16–17,
18

C

Caliendo, G., 53, 184, 186

California HealthCare Foundation, 91,
105

CALM (Community Art and Literacy
Museum) proposal: initial version of,
153–161; revamped, 162–166

Census demographic data, 68

Charles W. La Due Family Fund, 129, 139

Charts, 187–188

Citibank, 187

Citibank Community Relations, 60

Clarke, C. A., 101

Client stories: great debate over using, 59;
pros and cons of using, 59–62

Collaborating authors. *See* Authoring
issues

Communication: importance of crystal
clear, 183–184; lofty vocabulary/noble
phrases impact on, 175–176; writing
as you speak, 176

Community Foundation of Greater
Memphis, 24, 137

Cottingham, A., 58, 61, 85

County Social Services and Crisis Inter-
vention, 54, 64

Craft, L., 81, 152

Crossroads Fund, 50, 60, 84, 186, 188

D

Demographics: using census data on, 68;
Polaris County, 72*t*–73*t*

Deterville, A., 60, 187

Diabetes Education Program proposal:
Evaluation section initially used in,
89–91; Evaluation section makeover
used in, 94–97; Goals and Objectives
section initially used in, 86–88, 89;
Goals and Objectives section make-
over used in, 94–97; statistics initially
used in, 70–77; statistics used in
makeover version, 77–82

Diaz, M. P., 13, 76

Display material, 187–189

Dyson Foundation, 60

E

East Bay Community Foundation, 76

Elbel, C., 50, 188

Eldred, J., 91

Ella Hogans Community Resources, Inc.,
54, 57, 64

Elliott, V., 60, 76, 91–92, 137

Elred, J., 105

Endowment for Health, 91, 106, 188

Evaluation. *See* Program Evaluation
section

F

Fellowship House proposal, 121–125

Fenner, L., 19, 38, 60, 98–99

“The Fit”: definition of, 6; four factors of,
6–7; letter of inquiry makeover for,
14–19; using the guidelines to find,
5–6; wrapping up, 19

501(c)(3) letter, 22, 189–190, 193

- Fleishhacker Foundation, 50, 188
- Florid writing: CALM proposal example of, 153–161; CALM proposal rewritten without, 162–166; grantmakers on annoyance of, 151–152; grantwriting tip on avoiding, 158, 159, 160; recommendations regarding, 166; specific problems caused by, 158–160
- Foellinger Foundation, 97, 152
- Folse, G., 140
- Fonts, 185–186, 187
- Ford, D., 50
- Foundation guidelines: letter of inquiry following, 10–11; mirroring language of the, 7; sample, 7–9; used to make “the fit,” 5–6
- Frank H. and Eva B. Buck Foundation, 76
- “Frankenstein” proposals, 127–128
- Funders. *See* Grantmakers
- Future Funding section: HSoHK proposal, 173, 182; Knitting for Nippers, 34–35; tips on length of, 120
- ## G
- Gassie, D., 128, 189
- Girl’s Best Friend Foundation, 58, 61, 85
- Goals: funder ambivalence over requesting, 84; objectives versus, 84. *See also* Objectives
- Goals and Objectives section: described, 21, 23; Diabetes Education Program proposal, 86–88, 89–91; funder ambivalence over requesting, 84; good planning reflected in, 93; grantwriting tips on, 87, 88; HSoHK proposal, 171, 179; Partnership for Progress Homeless Program proposal, 55; as setting program standards, 85; summing up on the, 99. *See also* Objectives
- Grand Rapids Community Foundation, 81, 152
- Grant size, 98
- Grantmakers: budget section expectations/complaints by, 101, 111; on client stories and testimonials use, 59–62; fitting your agency and, 6–19; on florid writing as annoying, 151–152; importance of Needs Statement to, 52–53; “know your funder” rules on, 196–197; making an impression on the, 5–19; meeting the polled, 2–3; obtaining copy of most current guidelines of, 5–6; process versus outcome evaluation preferences by, 97–98; on statistics as Needs Statement element, 69; unique nature of different, 196
- Grantwriting tips: on accessing demographic census data, 68; on anticipating questions and providing answers, 175; on avoiding florid writing, 158, 159, 160; on budget narratives, 107; checking and proofing your work, 14; on financial details to include, 105; importance of impression made by proposals, 39; on inconsistencies, 137; on matching proposal information and budget, 104; on Objectives and Goals section, 87, 88; on proposal length, 120; show that your agency fits, 13; on showing revenue in the budget, 104; on typefaces and fonts, 187; on using calculators to check the math, 103; on using statistics, 76; what to include in a Needs Statement, 62; on writing as you speak, 176
- Graphs, 187–188
- The Greater Tacoma Community Foundation, 50
- Gregory, M., 12, 53, 91, 93, 105, 187, 192

Gregory Norwood Family Foundation
(Knitting for Nippers): initial proposal
of, 25–40; remixing the proposal,
40–50
Guidelines. *See* Foundation guidelines

H

Haas Fund, 18, 61
The Health Trust, 59, 84
History and Mission section: described,
23; Knitting for Nippers initial, 25–28;
Knitting for Nippers makeover, 41–42;
tips on length of, 120
Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 23,
188
Homeless Resource Center proposal
(Partnership for Progress): Needs
Statement of, 54–58, 64–67; proposed
revised budget in, 108*t*–109*t*
HSoHK (High School of Hard Knocks)
proposal: initial version of, 169–176;
makeover version of, 176–184

I

Impacts, 92
Inconsistency issue, 128–137
Information overload, 75–76
Inputs, 92
IRS 501(c)(3) letter, 22, 189–190, 193

J

Jacobs, A., 12, 52–53, 59, 98, 168, 190
Jacobs, B., 50, 59
The James Irvine Foundation, 60, 105,
185, 188
John Muir/Mt. Diablo Community
Health Fund, 53, 184, 186
J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, 12,
52, 58, 75, 159, 186

K

Kemmis, B., 50, 60, 84, 186, 188
Knitting for Nippers: initial proposal of,
25–40; remixing the proposal, 40–50
“Know your funder” rules, 196–197

L

Langendorf Foundation, 60, 90
Language issues: lofty vocabulary/noble
phrases, 175–176; writing style as,
167–168; writing as you speak, 176
Leeway Foundation, 24, 188
LeRose, P., 24, 99
Letter of inquiry: initial “ugly duckling,”
10–11; lack of “fitness” in initial,
12–13; lack of relevant and substantive
details, 14; lack of “zing,” 14; makeover
of initial, 14–19; poor first and lasting
misimpression of, 13–14
Liberty Hill Foundation, 76
Logic models, 92
Lydia E. Girande Memorial Clinic pro-
posal: Evaluation section of, 89–91,
94–97; Goals and Objections sections
of, 86–88, 94–97; makeover version of,
94–97; use of statistics in, 70–75,
78–82
Lynch, E. M., 38–39, 53, 59, 77, 81, 98,
106, 149, 185

M

McCammon, J., 159
McGlinchey, L., 6, 69, 84, 106, 168
McQueen, A., 61, 91, 93, 106
Maine Health Access Foundation, 24, 60,
62–63, 97
Martia G. Santos Family Foundation, 70
Mary Black Foundation, 106
Massachusetts Bar Foundation, 38, 59, 77,
81, 98, 106, 149, 185

Measurable Outcomes section: described, 50; HSoHK proposal, 173, 181–182; Knitting for Nippers initial, 33–34; Knitting for Nippers makeover, 44–45. *See also* Outcomes

Methods section: HSoHK proposal, 171–172, 179–181; Partnership for Progress, 55–56; tips on length of, 120

Millett, R., 13

Mission statements: fitting grantmaker and your agency’s, 6; nonsense writing style of, 167–168; proposal’s statement on, 21, 23

Multiple authors. *See* Authoring issues

Murphy, J., 38, 104

“Mystery” proposal: crystal clear communication to avoid, 183–184; grantwriting tips on, 175, 176; HSoHK example of nonsense, 169–176; HSoHK example of revamped, 176–183; writing style of, 167–168

N

The Needmor Fund, 53

Needs: establishing the, 57–58, 62–63; opportunity versus, 63

Needs Statement section: using client stories and testimonials in, 59–62; described, 21, 22, 23, 50; dilemma for arts organizations, 62–63; establishing the need using the, 57–58, 62–63; grantwriting tips on the, 62, 68; as “heart of the proposal,” 51, 69; HSoHK proposal, 169–171, 177–179; importance for grantmakers, 52–53; Knitting for Nippers, 21, 22, 23, 29–31, 42–44, 50; “making the case” in the, 51, 68; Partnership for Progress, 54, 57–58, 63, 64–68; statistics as necessary element of, 69, 82; tips on length of, 120. *See also* Proposal sections

New England Foundation for the Arts, 19, 38, 60, 98

New Mexico Association of Grantmakers, 50

Nike, 98, 151

NikeGO grant programs, 98

Noel Norton Foundation, 153

Nonsense. *See* “Mystery” proposal

Northwest Health Foundation, 38, 53, 60, 97, 128

O

Objectives: funder ambivalence regarding, 84; goals versus, 84; process and product, 90, 92; SMART approach to, 87. *See also* Goals; Goals and Objectives section

O’Brien, C. T., 57

Okamura, R., 61, 190

Open Society Institute, 6, 69, 106, 168

Oral Health in America: A Report of the Surgeon General, 140

Outcome evaluation approach, 97–98

Outcomes, 92. *See also* Measurable Outcomes section

Outputs, 92

P

Pacific Foundation Services, 12, 53, 91, 93, 105, 187, 192

Paredes, L., 76

Partnership for Progress proposal: Budget section of, 57, 102*t*, 108*fig*–109*fig*; Needs Statement section of, 54, 57–58, 64–67

Phillips, F., 19, 61

Photographs, 187–189

Pleasantville Interfaith Alliance, 54, 55, 56, 64

Plough Foundation, 50, 59

Polaris County demographics, 72*t*–73*t*

- Posner, J. R., 61, 77, 185
- Posner-Wallace Foundation, 61, 77, 185
- Potruck Family Foundation, 13, 61, 105
- Problem Statement section. *See* Needs Statement section
- Process, 92
- Process evaluation approach, 97–98
- Process objectives, 90, 92
- Product objectives, 90, 92
- Program Description section: Knitting for Nippers initial, 31–32; Knitting for Nippers makeover, 45–47; Partnership for Progress, 56
- Program Evaluation section: Diabetes Education Program proposal, 89–91; good planning reflected in, 93; HSoHK proposal, 173, 181–182; Knitting for Nippers, 32–33, 47; logic models used in, 92; moving beyond bean counting, 91–92; as part of best practices, 85; process versus outcome evaluation approach in, 97–98; summing up for the, 99; tips on length of, 120
- Proposal examples: Bridges to Nature, 10–11, 15–17; CALM (Community Art and Literacy Museum), 153–161, 162–166; Fellowship House, 115–125; HSoHK (High School of Hard Knocks), 169–184; Knitting for Nippers, 25–49; Lydia E. Girarde Memorial Clinic Diabetes Program, 70–75, 78–82, 86–91, 94–97; Partnership for Progress Homelessness Program, 54–57, 64–68, 102*t*; Senior Dental Access, 129–135, 139–149
- Proposal (Knitting for Nippers): fixing disorganized, 40–50; History and Mission section of, 23, 25–28, 41–42; jumbled order of “ugly duckling,” 35–37; last-minute cut-and-paste job of initial, 38–40; Measurable Outcomes section of, 33–34, 44–45; Needs (or Problem) Statement of, 21, 22, 23, 29–31, 42–44, 50; positive comments for the initial, 40; Program Description section of, 31–32, 45–47, 31–32, 45–47; Program Evaluation section of, 32–33, 47; reviewing what went wrong with, 37–38; sample of initial, 25–35; second rewritten, 41–48; solid structure of makeover, 49; writing billboard headings in second, 49–50
- Proposal length: appropriate details to include in, 120–121; Fellowship House example of just right, 121–125; Fellowship House example of too long, 115–121; final recommendations on, 126; florid writing adding to, 159–160; grantwriting tips on, 120; problems with verbose proposals, 113–114; too much detail adding to, 119–120; too spare and short, 121
- Proposal package: attachments to include with, 22, 189–192; charts, graphs, and photographs, 187–189; checklist for, 192–193; final points on preparing, 192; grantwriting tips on preparing the, 187, 189; printing/typeface issues, 185–186; summary of key rules on, 196–197
- Proposal sections: Budget, 57, 101–112; Future Funding, 34–35, 120, 173, 182; Goals and Objectives, 21, 23, 55, 83–99, 171; History and Mission, 23, 25–28; Measurable Outcomes, 33–34, 44–45, 50, 173, 181–182; Methods, 55–56, 120, 171–172, 179–181; Program Description, 31–32, 45–47, 56; Program Evaluation, 32–33, 47, 83–99, 120, 173, 181–182; standard sequence

of, 21–22; Summary, 21, 22, 83, 120.
See also Needs Statement section
Proposals: using client stories and testimonials in, 59–62; components in the form of a question, 23; disorganized disasters, 50; evaluating, 83–99; florid writing of, 151–166; “Frankenstein,” 127–128; length of, 113–126, 159–160; making sense of nonsense, 167–184; the perfect package, 185–197; poor impression of disorganized, 23–24; RFP (Request for Proposals), 12; using statistics in, 69–82; transforming your, 195–197; written by multiple authors, 127–149. *See also* Applicants

R

Rapides Foundation, 24
Rappoport, D. S., 24, 60, 61, 97
Readability, 186
Reality Grantmaking workshops, 1
Reynolds, A. L., 24, 104, 137
RFP (Request for Proposals), 12
Robert Bisinger Charitable Fund, 115, 122
Roberta Gonzalez Foundation, 54
Roybal, D. E., 38
Rumball, L., 50

S

Saint Luke’s Foundation (Cleveland), 24, 61
Sanchez, D., 76
Sanford, L., 106
Santa Fe Community Foundation, 38
SBC Foundation, 106, 190
Senior Dental Access proposal: inconsistencies in, 129–135; organization of rewritten, 139–149
Silzle, B., 24, 188
Sinclair, S., 12, 52, 58, 75
Sisters of the Humility of Mary, 61, 90, 187, 190

Sisters of Mercy of the Americas, St. Louis Regional Community, 186
Smart, A., 24
SMART proposal writing, 87
Sobrato Foundation, 50
Social Venture Partners Seattle, 12, 52, 59, 98, 168, 190
Speight, M., 60
Spell-checking, 13
Statistics: Diabetes Education Program proposal uses of, 70–75, 78–82; grantwriting tip on how to use, 76; including agency, 77; information overload by overusing, 75–76; mastering the use of, 81–82; as necessary Needs Statement element, 69, 82
Stone Foundation, 61, 81, 85, 104
Summary section: described, 21, 22, 83; tips on length of, 120

T

Tactile Textiles: A Sensory Experience exhibit proposal: initial version of, 153–161; revamped version of, 162–166
Talbot-Metz, M., 106
Target population: defining the, 58; demographics of the, 68, 72*t*–73*t*
Taylor, C., 97, 152
Testimonials: great debate over using, 59; pros and cons of using, 59–62
Topakian, K., 35, 189
Treacy, S., 61, 81, 85, 104
Typefaces, 185–186, 187

U

United Methodist Health Ministry Fund, 60, 76, 91, 137
United Way of the Bay Area, 59, 91
Urban Institute, 54

V

Vallier-Kaplan, M., 91, 106, 188
Vally, A., 60, 105, 185, 188
Virginia Tobacco Settlement Foundation,
128, 189
Vocabulary issues, 175–176

W

W. Clement & Jessie V. Stone Foundation,
61, 81, 85, 104
Walker, R., 76
Walter and Elise Haas Fund, 19, 61
Watson, C. M., 59, 91
Website demographic sources, 68
Wells Fargo Foundation, 13, 76
West Polaris County, 70, 72*t*–75, 86
West Virginia Humanities Council, 24, 99
White, M., 98, 151

William J. & Dorothy K. O’Neill Founda-
tion, 57

Wiltsek, N., 13, 61, 105–106
Woodruff, J. L., 38, 53, 60, 97–98, 128
Woods Fund (Chicago), 13
Writing styles: florid, 151–166; making
sense of nonsense, 167–184; problems
with academic, 167; writing as you
speak, 176. *See also* Authoring issues

Y

Y&H Soda Foundation, 38, 104
Young, C., 23, 188
Young, J., 60, 90

Z

Zeman, D.S.A., 24, 61, 98
Zundel, K., 186