

---

## Index

---

### A

Abma, T. A., 114  
 Abolafia, M. Y., 65, 66  
 Academic audiences, 292–293  
 ACCESS (Access to Community Care and Effective Services and Supports), 229  
 Accessibility issues, 250–251  
 Accountability: confusion over evaluation, 28; democratizing evaluation practice, 115; evaluation revelations regarding foundation, 87; as function of evaluation in philanthropy, 53; organizational climate regarding, 175–176  
 Action gap, 192  
 Active for Life Program (RWJF), 121  
 Add Health study, 239–240  
 AEA (American Evaluation Association), 4  
 Agar, M. H., 110  
*Ai Pono* program (Hawaii), 263–264, 265, 266, 268–269, 271, 272

Aiken, L. H., 37, 38, 39  
 AIR (American Institutes of Research), 109  
 Alie, R. E., 43  
 Allegheny Conference on Community Development, 8, 9  
 Allison, G. T., 20  
*The American Journal of Education*, 4  
*American Journal of Sociology*, 250  
 American Psychological Association Task Force on Statistical Inference, 249  
 Andrews, F. E., 32  
 The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 151  
 Annual payout cycle, 121, 122–123  
*Anthology* (SUPPORT), 128  
 Appraising evidence. *See* Methodology  
 Area Agencies on Aging, 227  
 Arendt, H., 113  
 Arlington Group, 205  
 Around the Clock Mobile Crisis Intervention evaluation, 244  
 Atienza, J., 168  
 Authentic knowledge, 101

### B

Babbitt, B., 162  
 Backer, T. E., 54, 68, 83  
 Bagnato, S., 136  
 Bare, J., 76, 83, 92  
 The Barnes Foundation, 48  
 Barth, R. P., 246  
 Bass, M. E., 3  
 Baxter, L. W., 172, 281  
 Bearman, P. S., 240, 241  
 Beery, W. L., 145  
 Beirle, T. C., 84  
 Bergholz, D., 9  
 Berk, R. A., 252  
 Bickel, W. E., 9, 51, 54, 55, 56, 64, 69, 104, 119, 137, 166, 302  
 Biesta, G.J.J., 113  
 Birthing/parenting foundation–grantee relationship, 79–80  
 “Black box” evaluation, 15  
 Blandin Community Leadership Program, 80, 81  
 Blandin Foundation, 80, 81  
 Blendon, R., 37  
 Board of trustees, 179–180, 288–289

## 306 Index

Board voting cycles, 121, 125  
 Bonnet, D. G., 76  
 Boruch, R. F., 120, 125, 139  
 Bothwell, R., 42  
 Bowen, K., 111  
 Boyle, P., 240  
 Bradshaw, J., 84  
 Brandt, L., 32  
 Braverman, M. T., 236, 238, 281  
 Brewster, K., 35  
 Briefings, 296–297, 298–299  
 Brilliant, E. L., 20, 21  
 Brim, O. G., Jr., 32, 33, 34, 35, 47  
 Brindis, C. D., 223  
 Bromelkamp Company, 205  
 Brown, J. H., 262  
 Brown, J. S., 250  
 Bruchner, H., 240, 241  
 Bucuvalas, M. J., 120, 140  
 Bunge, M., 239  
 Business cycles, 123–124  
 Butt, M. G., 42

## C

Cagampang, H. H., 250  
 The California Endowment, 151  
 The California Wellness Foundation, 151  
 Campbell, D. T., 238, 241, 242, 244, 274, 286  
 Capacity-building initiatives, difficulty of, 84–85  
 Carnegie, A., 8  
 Carson, E., 46  
 Case studies. *See* Evaluation case studies  
 Casey Foundation, 151  
 Caulkins, J. P., 136, 137  
 Causation/causality, 239–241  
 CCIs (comprehensive community initiatives). *See* Initiatives  
 CCLI (Packard Foundation), 160–163  
 Ceci, S. J., 251  
 Center for Effective Philanthropy, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 63, 64, 71  
 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 246  
 The Central Evaluation Unit, 15  
 Chait, R. P., 61  
 Chang, C. F., 124  
 The Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, 69

Chelimsky, E., 15, 21, 55, 56  
 Chen, H., 245  
 Cherry picking, 247  
*Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 42  
 Churchill, L., 34  
 Cicchetti, D. V., 251  
 Cities-in-Schools Program, 109  
 Civil leadership power, 9–10  
 The Cleveland Foundation, 12, 41  
 Cluster reviews, 172  
 Coghlan, A., 111  
 Cohen, J., 249  
 Cohen, R., 20, 21  
 Cole, S., 251  
 Collaborative foundation-grantee relationship, 78–79  
 Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy, 31  
 Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, 21, 35  
 Communicating evaluation results: communicating negative findings, 303; contributing to public debate, 301–303; public dissemination of findings, 302; variations in interpretations of findings, 302; varieties of communicator-audience contact when, 300–301. *See also* Evaluation audiences; Information needs  
 Communication: complications from public, 85; establishing evaluation audiences/information needs for, 286–293; implications for evaluation results, 300–303; risk analysis to enhance foundation-grantee, 89–94; tools and approaches used for, 294–300; understanding the environment of, 282–286  
 Communication environment: described, 282–283; establishing audiences for information, 283; establishing how much information is needed, 284; establishing what information is being sought, 283; establishing what they want to know, 283–284; establishing who is communicating, 284–285  
 Communication tools/approaches:

communicating via the Internet, 297, 299–300; final reports, 294–295, 296; periodic informal meetings, 297, 299; presentations and briefings, 296–297, 298–299; summary reports, 295, 296  
 Community Foundation for Monterey County, 217  
 Community Leadership Program (RWJF), 230–231  
 Community Partners for Older Adults (RWJF), 227  
 Conceptual use of evaluation, 5  
 Conner, R. F., 166  
 Connors-Gilmore, M., 54  
 Constantine, N. A., 236, 245, 250, 252  
 Constantine, W. L., 155, 201  
 Contra Costa County Health and Social Services Departments, 271  
 Conventional evaluative knowledge, 101  
 Conway, G., 18, 19  
 Cook, T. D., 237, 241, 242, 244, 286  
 Cooley, W. W., 9, 119  
 Cooper, R. G., 156  
 Cooperative foundation-grantee relationship, 78  
 CORE (Congress of Racial Equality), 105  
 Coulter, D., 113  
 Council on Foundations, 20, 30, 42, 46, 104, 302  
 Creative tension, 260–261  
 Cronbach, L., 67, 109, 237  
 Csuti, N. B., 51  
 Curry, K., 245  
 Cybergrants, 205

## D

Dar, R., 247  
 D.A.R.E. (Drug and Alcohol Resistance Education), 262, 275  
 David and Lucile Packard Foundation, 151–154, 160–163  
 David, T., 148, 174  
 Davidson, E. J., 259, 261, 267  
 de Geus, A. P., 267  
 Dembosky, J. W., 136, 137

- Democratizing evaluation practice:  
 accountability of, 115; use of authentic knowledge in, 101; core principles of, 107–116; democracy, knowledge, and evaluation used in, 106–107; democratic values used in, 100; as education, 99–100; envisioning an educative and, 98–99; foundations as leaders in educative and, 103–106; knowledge and power in, 102–103; toward acceptance of diversity, 112–115. *See also* Foundation snapshots
- Dennis, M. L., 8
- Developmental evaluation, 80
- Developmental evaluation foundation–grantee relationship, 80–81
- Dillman, K. N., 229
- DiMatteo, M. R., 249
- “Do We Know What We Are Doing?” (Brim), 32
- Donaldson, S. I., 262
- Donors legal standing, 29
- Dowie, M., 104
- Downs, A., 11
- Drag-anchor philanthropy, 104
- Drucker, P., 28
- DuBois, W.E.B., 105
- Duguid, P., 250
- E**
- Easterling, D., 51
- ECI (Early Childhood Initiative) [The Heinz Endowment], 135–137
- Economic Opportunity Act (1964), 35
- Edgett, S.J., 156
- Effect size, 249
- eGrant, 205
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), 35
- Eli Lilly Foundation, 45, 46, 103, 120
- Emerson, J., 13
- Emery, M., 113
- Engelhardt, S., 43–44, 45
- Ennett, S. T., 262
- Evaluability assessment, 270
- Evaluation: A Forum for Human Services Decision-Makers*, 35
- Evaluation: academic-based vs. field-based, 65–66; ambiguous results/misleading conclusions from, 237–239; “black box,” 15; communicating results of, 281–303; constraints on, 52; constructive uses for, 23–24; defining, 36, 54, 69, 202, 237; democratizing practice of, 98–116; developing standardized reporting forms for, 214–217; diverse and changing field of, 65–67; external stakeholders and, 17, 23; field-based, 65–66, 185–200; five categories of information gained from, 33; flawed assumptions revealed through, 20; focus of, 171–174; foundation context of, 22–23, 54–55; foundation size and utility/quality of, 5–6, 22–23; grantees’ view/role during, 21–22; impact on subsequent funding, 12; integrated into foundation activity cycles, 119–141; limits of, 39–42; narratives/stories to supplement, 214, 233; observations on current practice of, 53–65; participatory, 81; pioneers (1972–1980) of, 37–39; problematic nature of nonprofit organization, 27–28; responsibility and authority for, 15–16; rules of engagement for, 14–15; skepticism regarding, 46–47; standard of evidence used in, 7–8; three functions in philanthropy of, 53–54; three general kinds of uses for, 5; two basic problems confronting, 4; ubiquity of, 42–46. *See also* Methodology issues
- Evaluation accountability: confusion over, 28; as evaluation function in philanthropy, 53
- Evaluation audiences: establishing communication environment for, 282–284; establishing the, 283; external, 286, 287, 291–293; information needs of, 286–293; internal, 286–287, 288–290. *See also* Communicative evaluation results
- Evaluation case studies: on civic leadership, philanthropic power of foundations, 9–10; on engaging community’s leadership, 20; on evaluation impact on subsequent funding, 12; on evaluation rules of engagement, 14–15; on external stakeholder importance, 17; on Ford Foundation efforts to decentralize NYC schools, 19–20; on use of grant analysis, 207; on Green Revolution and philanthropy power, 18–19; on the rewards of evaluation integrity, 10–11; on social enterprise philanthropy, 13; strategic evaluation in field building, 6–7; on summer camp program/mismatched expectations, 76–77
- Evaluation integrity, 10–11
- Evaluation judgments: consequences of unsystematic vs. systematic, 148; elements of the process of making, 146; example of making, 160–163; issues involved in making, 145–146; issues to focus on in planning for, 149–154; options for defining levels of intensity in, 154–155; planning process criteria for, 156–158; processes involved in making strategic, 159–160; strategic evaluation planning process needed for, 147–149
- Evaluation and Program Planning*, 37
- Evaluation Quarterly*, 37
- Evaluation report forms, 214–217
- Evaluation research: basic concepts and definition of, 33; foundation origins of, 32–35; Great Society, conservative resolution and growth of, 35–37
- Evaluation Review*, 37, 41, 42
- Evaluative attitude, 261
- Evaluative Research* (Suchman), 33
- Evaluative thinking: benefits for grantees, 261–276; defining, 259–260; evaluative know-how element of, 261; about financial issues, 208–209; link between

- creative tension and, 260–261;  
on-line resources on, 279; about  
program implementation/effectiveness, 210–211; during program site visits, 217–219; promoting grantee, 209–217; steps toward phasing in, 276–278
- Evaluative thinking benefits: to build knowledge base about social change, 273–275; creating more compelling project proposals, 261–262; demonstrating value of organization's activities, 275–276; gathers evidence about community needs/strengths, 263–264; helping new program “find its feet,” 267, 270; increasing chances of program success, 267, 270–273; shows plausibly how program will meet needs, 264, 266; shows that homework has been done, 262–263; spells out criteria for program success, 266–267
- Evaluators: challenges when evaluating initiatives, 224; implications of field-based evaluation for, 196–197; internal staff, 290; often seen as representing foundation, 88
- Ewing Marion Kaufmann Foundation, 139
- Executive management, 289
- Experimental/quasi-experimental designs, 241–244
- External evaluation audience, 286, 287, 291–293
- F**
- Farrar, E., 109
- “Fat boy in the canoe,” 193
- Fetro, J. V., 246
- Field building evaluation case study, 6–7
- Field leaders, 196
- Field-based evaluation: academic-based vs., 65–66; effective philanthropies and, 189–190; getting value for money using, 198–199; implications for evaluators, 196–197; implications for field leaders, 196; implications for foundation leadership, 194–196; to inform inquiry and guide action, 193–194; issues of, 186; limitations of exclusive focus on grantee proposals in, 190–192; step-by-step process of change using, 192–193; value of multiple perspectives in, 187–189
- Fighting Back Initiative (RWJF), 224, 226–227
- Filer Commission, 35
- Final reports, 294–295, 296
- Financial issues: grant analysis providing information on, 204–208; impact of evaluation on subsequent funding, 12; thinking evaluatively about, 208–209
- Fine, M., 109
- Fishbein, M., 245
- Fishing expedition, 247
- 501(c)(3) organizations, 56
- Flewelling, R. L., 262
- Focus of evaluation: foundation as a whole, 172–173; geographic regions/targeted populations as, 173–174; initiatives as, 172; issues regarding, 171; projects as, 171; selecting, 174; strategies used by foundation as, 173
- Ford Foundation, 19
- Foundation accountability: evaluation revelations regarding, 87; organizational climate regarding, 175–176
- Foundation activity cycles: examining details of grant cycle, 126–127; grantmaking and seven, 120–122; how grant cycles create challenges/opportunities for evaluation, 137–140; impact on foundation behavior, 122–126
- Foundation authority: budget process dictating, 15–16; as evaluation requirement, 15; recommendations on responsibility and, 16–17
- Foundation Center, 5, 14, 21, 30, 123, 167, 168
- Foundation cultural factors: diversity of stakeholders, 178–182; organizational climate regarding evaluation purpose, 175–178
- Foundation culture: of good intentions, 61–63; impact on evaluation utility to foundation, 10; impact on responsiveness to grantees/grant applicants by, 14; as learning barriers, 61–65; mission and vision of, 11–12; professional autonomy as part of, 63; values and expectations defining, 10
- The Foundation Directory* (Foundation Center), 30
- Foundation funding: grant analysis providing information on spending and, 204–208; impact of evaluation on subsequent, 12; thinking evaluatively about, 208–209. *See also* Grantees
- Foundation goals: impact of foundation size on, 8; which are difficult to quantify/measure, 227–228. *See also* Outcomes
- Foundation leadership: board of trustees, 179–180, 288–289; executive management, 289; program staff, 17, 168, 170, 195–196, 289–290
- Foundation mission: foundation culture and vision of, 11–12; reviewing/updating, 203–204
- Foundation News and Commentary* (Council on Foundations), 30
- Foundation News* (later *Foundation News and Commentary*), 30, 31, 39, 42
- Foundation power: intended/unintended consequences of, 18–19; relationship between staff and grantees, 17
- Foundation size: described, 5; evaluation utility/quality and, 5–6, 22–23; impact on foundation goals by, 8; resource level of large foundations, 167–169; resource level of small and medium-sized foundations, 169–171
- Foundation snapshots: The Historic American Foundation, 97–98, 100, 114; The Large City Found-

- dation, 97, 100, 106, 111–112;  
 The Local Community Founda-  
 tion, 98, 101, 106. *See also* De-  
 mocratizing evaluation practice  
 Foundation Source, 205  
 Foundation staff: implications of  
 field-based evaluation for,  
 195–196; internal evaluation  
 staff, 290; of large foundations,  
 168; relationship between  
 grantees and, 17; of small and  
 medium-sized foundations, 170  
 Foundation structural factors: de-  
 scribed, 167; focus of evalua-  
 tion, 171–174; resource level,  
 167–171  
 Foundation vision, 11–12  
 Foundation-grantee relationships:  
 birthing and parenting, 79–80;  
 challenges in developing useful,  
 81–86; collaborative, 78–79; co-  
 operative and businesslike, 78;  
 developmental evaluation,  
 80–81; operating foundation  
 variation of, 80; partnering, 79;  
 power differences between  
 grantees and staff, 17; risk  
 analysis to enhance communi-  
 cation/effectiveness of, 89–94;  
 summer camp case study on  
 mismatched expectations and,  
 76–77; types listed, 77–81; ways  
 evaluation can harm, 86–89;  
 ways evaluation can promote  
 change/improve, 86. *See also*  
 Foundations; Grantees  
 Foundation-grantee relationships  
 challenges: barriers to open rela-  
 tionships, 81–82; complications  
 from public communications,  
 85; confusion about guidelines,  
 85–86; confusion over founda-  
 tion guidelines by grantees,  
 85–86; difficulty of capacity-  
 building initiatives, 84–85; ef-  
 fects of initial contacts, 82–83;  
 evaluation as tool for compli-  
 ance, 83; frustration over  
 small/matching grants, 83–84;  
 power and consensus issues, 74  
 Foundation-sponsored evaluations:  
 constructive uses for, 23–24; rec-  
 ommendations for better, 24  
 Foundations: activity cycles of,  
 119–141; criticism of/increased  
 regulation (1953–1969) of,  
 30–32; culture/cultural factors  
 of, 10–15, 167, 175–182; evalua-  
 tion research and, 32–37; evalua-  
 tive thinking demonstrating  
 value of activities by, 275–276;  
 problematic nature of evalua-  
 tions for grantmaking, 29; re-  
 sponsibility and authority for  
 evaluation of, 15–16; respon-  
 siveness style of, 14–15; size of,  
 5–10, 167–171; social enterprise  
 model of, 13; structural factors  
 of, 167–174; waxing/waning of  
 interests and initiatives by,  
 125–126. *See also* Foundation-  
 grantee relationships; Initiatives;  
 Nonprofit organizations; Philan-  
 thropy  
 Franklin, W., 34  
 Frederickson, G. M., 32  
 Freeman, H. E., 38  
 Freeman, H. L., 6, 38  
 Freund, G., 53  
 Frick, H. C., 8  
 Frierson, H., 109  
*The Future of Foundations* (American  
 Assembly), 32
- G**
- Galaskiewicz, J., 183  
 Garvey, M., 105  
 General Electric, 273  
 Giese, M. L., 247  
 Gill, B. P., 136, 137  
 Gilmore, T. N., 6, 12, 14  
 Glanz, K., 245  
 Glaser, J. S., 21  
 Glasgow, R. E., 243  
 Glenn, J. M., 32  
 Go/no-go decision, 139–140  
 Goodyear, L., 111  
 Gorman, D. M., 245  
 Government officials/staff,  
 291–292  
 Graham, J. W., 262  
 Grant analysis: benefits of,  
 207–208; case example of, 207;  
 on percentage of funds allo-  
 cated across priority areas, 205,  
 206; relevant types of informa-  
 tion used in, 204; shoestring  
 strategies/practical tips on, 208  
 Grant applicants: administrative ex-  
 pense ratios and selection of,  
 64–65; foundation culture and  
 impact on responsiveness to, 14  
 Grantee Perception Report  
 (Hewlett Foundation), 71, 72  
 Grantees: benefits of evaluative  
 thinking for, 261–276; confusion  
 over foundation guidelines by,  
 85–86; diversity of stakeholders  
 making up, 180–181; evaluation  
 contributing to learning by, 54;  
 evaluation limitations when fo-  
 cused on proposals by, 190–192;  
 evaluation process role by,  
 21–22; as external audience,  
 291; foundation culture and im-  
 pact on responsiveness to, 14;  
 important evaluation role of, 17;  
 promoting evaluative thought  
 by, 209–217. *See also* Foundation  
 funding; Foundation-grantee re-  
 lationships  
 Grantmakers for Effective Organi-  
 zations, 13, 54, 70  
 Grantmaking cycle: creating chal-  
 lenges/opportunities for evalua-  
 tion, 137–140; examining ECI  
 (Heinz Endowment), 135–137;  
 examining SUPPORT program  
 (RWJF), 128–135; overview of,  
 120–122; reviewing/updating  
 strategies used during, 203–204;  
 three broad phases related to,  
 126–128  
 Grantmaking foundations. *See* Foun-  
 dations  
 Grants: conducting analysis of,  
 204–208; geographic regions/  
 targeted populations of, 173–174;  
 place-based, 173  
 Grassroots Leadership Program  
 (Kellogg Foundation), 78–79  
 Great Society legislation, 35  
 Green Revolution case study,  
 18–19  
 Greene, J. C., 67, 72, 96, 107, 110,  
 111, 112, 159  
 Grossman, A., 61, 64, 124  
 Grossman, D. C., 245

Grossman, J. B., 224, 228, 230  
 Group Health Community Foundation, 14  
 Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound, 14  
 Guba, E. G., 110  
 The Guiding Principles for Evaluators, 4  
 Gutman, M. A., 227, 230

**H**

Hacsi, T. A., 114  
 Haimes, Y. Y., 90  
 Halfon, N., 223  
 Hall, P. D., 27  
 Hammack, D. C., 32  
 Hansen, W. B., 262  
 Hanson, G. S., 262  
 The Health Improvement Initiative, 151  
 Heath, R. L., 84  
 Heimann, F. F., 32  
 The Heinz Endowment, 9, 191  
 The Heinz Endowment ECI (Early Childhood Initiative), 135–137  
 Heinz, T., 136, 137  
 Henry, G. T., 111, 298  
 The Hershey Trust, 48  
 Hewlett Foundation, 72, 90  
 Hilliard, A., 103  
 Hirschhorn, L., 6, 12, 14  
 The Historic American Foundation, 97–98, 100, 114  
 Holland, T. P., 61  
 Homes Families Program (RWJF), 230  
 Hood, S., 100, 109  
 Hopson, R. K., 96, 100, 109, 110, 159  
 House, E. R., 99, 100, 109, 110, 154, 244  
 Howe, K. R., 99, 100, 110, 154  
 Howe, M. M., 259  
 Hubbard, B. M., 247  
 Huebner, T. A., 114  
 Hughes, D. C., 223  
 Hughes, E.F.X., 5, 140  
 Hughes, J. N., 244  
 Hunter, D., 55, 104  
 Hutchinson Smoking Prevention Project, 243–244

**I**

The Illinois Facilities Fund, 13  
 Improvement climate, 176–177  
 Independent Sector, 13, 42, 46  
 Infant Health and Development Program, 249  
 Information needs: communication environment in context of, 282–286; evaluative audiences and their, 286–293; operational, 287, 288; strategic, 287; tactical, 287–288. *See also* Communicating evaluation results; Knowledge sharing  
 Initiative challenge solutions: clarify true reason for initiative, 230–231; consider alternatives to formal evaluation, 233; don't evaluate the nonevaluable, 229–230; fund and encourage mixed-method approaches, 232; fund measurement/development efforts, 231–232; incorporate more planned variation in multisite initiatives, 231  
 Initiative challenges: contextual influences/changes over time, 225; demonstrations designed from bottom up, 226–227; effects of timeframe, 229; evolution of community initiatives, 225–226; goals that are difficult to quantify/measure, 227–228; multiplicity in programs, populations, context, 227; phenomena that do not lend to random assignment, 228–229  
 “Initiative Funds” (McKnight Foundation), 80  
 Initiatives: CCIs (comprehensive community initiatives), 224; difficulty of capacity-building, 84–85; as focus of evaluation, 172; foundation features that pose challenges to, 224–229; solutions for addressing challenges to, 229–233; variety of specific reasons for funding, 223–224; waxing/waning of foundation interests and, 125–126. *See also* Foundations  
 Institute for Community Peace,

225–226

Instrumental use of evaluation, 5  
 Internal evaluation audience, 286–287, 288–290  
 Internal evaluation staff, 290  
 Internet: communicating via the, 297, 299–300; evaluative thinking resources on the, 279

**J**

Jackson, J., 109  
 Jacobson, N. S., 249  
 Jellinek, P., 228, 230, 231  
 Jim Crow social structure, 104–105  
 John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, 92, 191–192  
 Johnsen, M., 229  
 Johnson & Johnson, 37, 39  
 Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 67, 72, 109, 281  
*Journal of the American Medical Association*, 245  
 Julnes, G., 111

**K**

Kanter, R. M., 27, 28  
 Kaufmann Foundation, 139  
 Kaye, 55  
 Kellogg Foundation, 45, 46, 70, 78, 114, 151, 172  
 Kelly, M., 6, 12, 14  
 Kettering Foundation, 34  
 King, M., 9, 10  
 King, M. L., Jr., 103, 106  
 Kirby, D., 246  
 Kistler, W., 65  
 Kleinschmidt, E. J., 156  
 Knickman, J. R., 52, 223, 228, 230, 231  
 Knight Foundation, 92, 191–192  
 Knowledge: conventional evaluative, 101; democratizing evaluation practice and authentic, 101; democratizing evaluation and role of democracy and, 106–107; democratizing evaluation and use of power and, 102–103; evaluative thinking to build social change, 273–275  
 Knowledge gap, 192

## Index

311

- Knowledge sharing: as evaluation function in philanthropy, 53; "strategic grants" and potential for, 55. *See also* Information needs
- Kramer, M. R., 21, 51, 54, 57, 58
- Kunreuther, H., 91
- Kuo, V., 166
- L**
- Lagemann, E. C., 32
- The Large City Foundation, 97, 100, 106, 111–112
- Large foundation, 167–169
- Learning: evaluation contributing to grantee, 54; as evaluation function in philanthropy, 53; foundation-side barriers to, 56–65; grantmaking and organizational, 138
- Learning barriers: cultural/organizational, 61–65; evaluation of projects instead of strategies, 69–70; evaluation-side, 65–70; inattention to performance and results, 56–57; positive reinforcement/inflated expectations, 58–59; professional autonomy as, 63; surmounting the, 70–73; tyranny of grant-selection cycle/administrative expense ratios, 64–65; weak governance, 60–61
- Learning climate, 176–177
- Lee, J., 84
- Leland, N., 246
- Letts, C. W., 61, 64, 124
- Leviton, L. C., 3, 5, 20, 119, 120, 125, 139, 140, 237
- Lewis, F. M., 245
- Lichtenstein, E., 243
- Life cycles of nonprofit organizations, 121
- Light, R. J., 238
- Lilly Foundation, 45, 46, 103, 120
- Lincoln, Y. S., 110
- Lindbloom, E. C., 35
- Lipman, H., 54, 168
- Lipsey, M. W., 6, 244, 249, 251
- Literacy Plus (Pittsburgh), 9–10
- The Local Community Foundation, 98, 101, 106
- Logic models, 211–212, 233, 245
- Longstaff, T. A., 90
- Lumina Foundation, 72
- Lynam, D. R., 262
- Lynn, J., 128
- M**
- MacCoun, R. J., 251
- MacDonald, B., 100
- Mackie, J. L., 239
- MacNeil, C., 110
- The Magazine of the Heinz Endowments*, 9–10
- Main, J., 270
- Making Connections (The Annie E. Casey Foundation), 151
- Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 302
- Mantell, P., 231
- Marcus, A. C., 243
- Mark, M. M., 111, 145, 237, 241
- Mathematica Policy Research, 12
- Mathison, S., 110
- Maurice Falk Medical Fund, 34
- McClintock, C., 67, 72
- McCombs, K., 224, 226
- McKim, V. R., 239
- McKnight Foundation, 79–80
- McMullan, B. J., 45, 46, 55, 123, 186, 302
- McNelis, R. H., 6, 54, 302
- Medium-sized foundations. *See* Small/mid-sized foundations
- Melton, M. S., 155, 166, 201
- Mertens, D., 100, 109
- "Meta-evaluation," 70
- Methodology issues: causation, correlation, and alternative explanations, 239–241; dealing with ambiguous results/misleading conclusions, 237–238; experimental/quasi-experimental designs, 241–244; interpreting null or negative results, 251–253; multiple significance testing strategies, 247–249; program theories/social science theories and, 244–245; randomized designs, 242, 243–244; statistical significance testing, 245–247; transparency and accessibility issues, 250–251; understanding results in broad context, 253–254. *See also* Evaluation
- Meyer, J. W., 183
- MicroEdge, 205
- Middlestandt, S. E., 245
- Milich, R., 262
- Mill, J. S., 239
- Millett, R. A., 51, 55, 56, 96, 103, 104, 109, 137, 159, 166
- Minneapolis Medical Research Foundation, 36, 46
- Mission: foundation culture and vision of, 11–12; reviewing/updating, 203–204
- Mitroff, I. I., 20
- Modarresi, S., 65, 66
- Mojica, M., 223, 224, 226
- Mondale, W., 36
- Moskowitz, J. M., 238
- Multiple significance test strategies: conducting fewer and more focused tests, 247–248; employing stringent statistical significance criterion, 248; supplementing with alternative indicators of effects, 249
- Murray, V., 46
- N**
- Narratives, 214, 233
- National Center for Nonprofit Boards, 46
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 21
- National Community AIDS Partnership, 224
- National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention, 224
- National Institute of Mental Health, 36
- National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, 239–240
- National Society of Fund-Raising Executives, 46
- Nee, D., 223, 224, 226
- Negative results interpretation, 251–253
- Nelson, C. A., 51, 55, 56, 104, 137, 166
- New Haven Foundation, 34
- New media audience, 292
- Newacheck, P. W., 223

Newman, D. L., 65, 66, 67  
 Nielsen, W. A., 19, 20, 37  
*Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 42  
 Nonprofit organizations: as external audience of evaluation, 293; life cycles of, 121; problematic nature of evaluations for, 27–28.  
*See also* Foundations  
*Nonprofit Times*, 42  
*Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42  
*Nonprofit World*, 42  
*Nonprofit World's survey* (1997), 44  
 Northwest Area Foundation, 79  
 Northwest Regional Education Laboratory, 41, 42  
 NPO Solutions, 205  
 Null results interpretation, 251–253

## O

Oliphant, G., 9, 10, 135, 136, 137, 139  
 Omer, H., 247  
 Operating foundations, 80  
 Operational information needs, 287, 288  
 Orosz, J. J., 63  
 Ostrander, S., 47  
 Outcomes: establishing criteria for successful, 266–267; measured to determine performance, 213–214. *See also* Foundation goals; Performance

## P

Packard Foundation, 151–154, 160–163  
 Participants: as outside stakeholders, 181–182; of virginity pledge programs, 240–241, 250  
 Participatory evaluation, 81  
 Partnering foundation–grantee relationship, 79  
 The Partnership for the Public's Health, 151  
 Patel, S., 12  
 Patrizi, P., 4, 45, 46, 51, 54, 55, 69, 123, 137, 185, 186, 196, 302  
 Patton, M. Q., 68, 76, 80, 86, 90, 119, 120, 255, 282, 283, 302

Pauly, E., 185  
 Pedhazur, E. J., 240  
 Peikes, D., 12  
 Performance: inattention to results and, 56–57; measuring outcomes to determine, 213–214; necessity of comparative measures of, 57–58; using evaluation report to improve, 219–221; value judgment element of measuring, 28. *See also* Outcomes  
 Performance gap, 260–261  
 Periodic informal meetings, 297, 299  
 Persuasive use of evaluation, 5  
 Peters, D. P., 251  
 Peterson, A. V., 243  
 Peterson Commission, 32  
 Peterson, P., 31  
 Petrosino, A., 114  
 The Pew Charitable Trusts, 69, 72, 126, 172, 299, 300  
 The Pew Memorial Trusts, 13  
 Philanthropic power case study, 9–10  
 Philanthropy: demonstrating worth of, 21; drag-anchor, 104; evaluation exposing vulnerability, 20–21; frustration with evaluation in, 186–187; history of, 27; “scientific,” 48; three functions of evaluation in, 53–54. *See also* Foundations  
 Piontek, M. E., 282, 298  
 Pittsburgh foundation community, 8–10  
 Place-based grants, 173  
 Porter, M. E., 21, 54, 57  
 Power: democratizing evaluation and use of knowledge and, 102–103; as element of relationship between grantees/foundation staff, 17; evaluation case study on civil leadership, 9–10; evaluation case study on Green Revolution and philanthropy, 18–19; foundation–grantee relationship and issues of consensus and, 84; intended/unintended consequences of foundation, 18–19  
 Prager, D., 148  
 Presentations, 296–297, 298–299

Preskill, H., 119, 166, 168, 177, 282, 298  
 Princeton Conference on the History of Philanthropy (1956), 30  
 Professional autonomy, 63  
 Program effectiveness: ambiguous evaluation results/misleading conclusions about, 237–238; causation, correlation, and alternative explanations of, 239–241; examples of randomized/quasi-experimental designs for, 243–244; experimental/quasi-experimental designs for, 241–243; interpreting null or negative results, 251–253; measuring outcomes to determine, 212–214; multiple significance test strategies for, 247–249; program theories/social science theories on, 244–245; statistical significance testing for, 245–247; thinking evaluatively about implementation and, 210–211; transparency and accessibility elements of, 250–251; understanding results in a broad context, 253–254  
 Program officers, 179, 180  
 “Programs That Work” designation (CDC), 246  
 Program theories, 244–245  
 Programs: clarifying true purpose of, 267, 270; evaluation results communicated to staff of, 289–290; keeping up with changing needs of community, 272–273; life cycle of, 121; logic model used during implementation of, 211–212; multiplicity in, 227; supplementing numerical data with power of stories, 214; thinking evaluatively during site visits to, 217–219; using evaluation report to improve, 219–221  
 Public/Private Ventures, 302  
 Purser, R. E., 113  
 Push-Excel program, 109

## Q

Quasi-experimental/experimental designs, 241–244

## Index

313

**R**

- Rallis, S. F., 301  
 Rand Corporation, 302  
 RAND ECI study, 136, 137  
 Randomized experiments, 242, 243–244  
 Raney, J., 247  
 Raphelson, M., 244  
 Reding, G. R., 244  
 Redman, E., 120  
*Reducing the Risk* evaluation, 246, 247  
 Reichardt, C. S., 241  
 Resnick, M., 239  
 Responsiveness style, 14–15  
 Rich, R. F., 120, 128  
 Richards, R., 172  
 Richardson, E., 36  
 Rimel, R. W., 126  
 Rimer, B. K., 245  
 Ringwalt, C. L., 262  
 Risk analysis: benefits of, 89–91; defining, 90; evaluating types of risk, 92–94; scenario planning using, 91–92  
 Rivlin, A., 231  
 Roberts Enterprise Development Fund, 13  
 Rockdale Foundation, 72  
 The Rockefeller Foundation, 15, 16, 18–19  
 Rockefeller, J. D., III, 31, 35  
 Rog, D. J., 223, 224, 226, 227, 230  
 Rogers, D. E., 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 47  
 Rogers, P. J., 114  
 Root, D., 135, 136, 137  
 Rosenbaum, D. P., 262  
 Rosenthal, R., 249  
 Rossi, P. H., 6, 37, 252  
 Rossman, G. B., 301  
 Rowan, B., 183  
 Russell, B., 187  
 The Russell Sage Foundation, 30–32, 41, 44  
 RWJF Community Leadership Program, 230–231  
 RWJF Community Partners for Older Adults, 227  
 RWJF Fighting Back Initiative, 224, 226–227  
 RWJF Homes Families Program, 230  
 RWJF (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation), 6, 7, 12, 14, 16, 38, 41, 44, 48, 69, 121, 151, 190, 191  
 RWJF School-Based Health Centers Demonstration, 228, 230, 231  
 RWJF SUPPORT program, 128–135  
 RWJF Urban Health Initiative (UHI), 228–229  
 Ryan, W. P., 61, 64, 124
- S**
- Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools Expert Panel (Department of Education), 245–246  
 Sage Foundation, 30–32, 41, 44  
 Saidel, J., 43  
 Salasin, S., 36  
 Sanders, J. R., 66, 72, 172  
 Sathe, V., 261  
 Saxe, L., 224, 226, 227  
 Scattershot approach, 247  
 Scheirer, M. A., 67  
 Schmelkin, L. P., 240  
 School-Based Health Centers Demonstration (RWJF), 228, 230, 231  
 Schorr, L., 90  
 Schwab Foundation, 69  
 Schwandt, T. A., 114  
 “Scientific” philanthropy, 48  
 Scott, W. R., 183  
 Scriven, M., 67, 115, 149, 259, 261  
*Second Step* evaluation, 247  
 Seita, J. R., 43  
 Self-evaluation techniques, 233  
 Senge, P., 176–177, 260, 261, 267, 270  
 Serlin, R. C., 247  
 Shadish, W. R., Jr., 67, 237, 241, 242, 243, 244, 286  
 Shaffer, J. P., 248  
 Silver, D., 229  
 Simon, J. G., 35  
 Sinclair, M., 21  
 Singer, J. D., 238  
 Site visits, 217–219  
 Slater, J. K., 155, 201  
 Sledge, G., 90  
 Small/mid-sized foundations: adopting evaluative ways of thinking within, 202–209; helping grantees to think evaluatively, 209–217; resource level of, 169–171; thinking evaluatively during site visits, 217–219; using what you have learned from evaluations, 219–221  
 Smith, M. F., 65, 237, 270  
 Smith, N. L., 41, 42  
 Smith, S., 201, 219  
 SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee), 105  
 Snow, D., 301  
 Snow, P. E., 52, 54, 69, 172  
 “Social Accounting, Evaluation, and the Future of Human Services” (Mondale), 36  
 Social Enterprise Alliance, 13  
 Social enterprise model, 13  
 Social science theories, 244–245  
 Sonnichsen, R. C., 295  
 Stake, R. E., 69, 109, 115  
 Stakeholder diversity: inside the foundation, 179–180; outside the foundation, 180–182; as part of foundation culture, 178–179; prioritizing evaluation questions and, 182  
 Stakeholders: democratic values in evaluation and participation by, 100; diversity of, 178–182; evaluation and external, 17, 23; notion of visiting with one another, 113; relationship between foundation staff and external, 17  
 Standard of evidence, 7–8  
 Standfield, J., 104, 105  
 Stanley, J. C., 242  
 Statistical significance testing, 245–247  
 STEP (Summer Training and Education Program), 230  
 Stern Family Fund, 104  
 Stevens, B., 12  
 Stevens, S. K., 124  
 Storytelling, 214, 233  
 Strategic information needs, 287  
 Struckoff, E., 34  
 Stuffelbeam, D. L., 72, 281  
 Suchman, E. A., 33, 34, 43  
 Summary reports, 295, 296  
 Summers, D. V., 27, 28

SUPPORT (Student to Understand Prognoses and Preferences for Outcomes and Risks of Treatments) [RWJF], 128–135  
Szanton, P., 5

**T**

Tactical information needs, 287–288  
Tax Reform Act (1969), 31, 32  
Taylor, B. E., 61  
Television Audience Assessment, 41  
Theory of change, 245  
The Time-Warner Foundation, 13  
Timpane, M., 231  
Tobler, N. S., 262  
Torres, R., 119, 166, 168, 177, 282, 298  
*Toward Reform of Program Education* (Cronbach and Associates), 99  
Transparency issues, 250–251  
Tuckman, H. P., 124  
Tuft, E. R., 287, 298  
Turner, S. P., 239

**U**

UHI (Urban Health Initiative) [RWJF], 228–229  
United Way, 21, 88, 114  
University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension Service Web site, 212

The UPS Foundation, 13  
U.S. Department of Education, 245–246  
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 240–241  
U.S. General Accounting Office, 15

**V**

Virginity pledge programs, 240–241, 250  
Vision, 11–12  
Visiting activities, 113  
*Voluntas*, 42


**W**

Wadsworth, Y., 270  
Walker, G., 224, 228, 230  
Wallace Foundation, 190  
Walling, W., 54  
Washington, B. T., 105  
Weak governance, 60–61  
Weatherford, J. M., 10  
Weis, L., 109  
Weiss, C. H., 39–40, 43, 45, 70, 114, 120, 138, 140  
Weitzman, B. C., 229  
Wells, I. B., 105  
Wescen, S., 109  
“What Is Evaluation Good For?” (Salasin), 36

Wheeler, S., 32  
“Where Politics and Evaluation Research Meet” (Weiss), 39  
Whitmore, E., 100, 111  
Wholey, J. S., 155, 229, 270  
“Who’s Using Evaluation” survey (*Nonprofit World*, 1997), 44  
Wiens, J. R., 113  
Wilhelm, I., 54, 168  
Wilkinson, L., 249  
Willett, J. B., 238  
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, 72, 90  
Wind, J. Y., 267  
Wisely, D. S., 53, 54, 55, 58, 103, 120, 230  
W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 45, 46, 70, 78, 114, 151, 172  
WKKF (W. K. Kellogg Foundation), 14  
Wong, L., 109  
Woods Fund, 72  
Work-Out model, 273  
Worthen, B. R., 65, 66  
Wright, S. R., 37  
Wye, C., 67

**Z**

Zaltman, G., 120, 128  
Zelikow, P., 20  
Zimmerman, R. S., 262



This page constitutes a continuation of the copyright page

The quotations from King and Oliphant in Chapter One are from King, M., and Oliphant, G. (2000). "Tough Love," in *H, The Magazine of the Heinz Endowments*, 2, 10–25. Accessed July 9, 2003 at <http://www.heinz.org>. Reprinted with permission of the Heinz Endowments.

The selections from Orville G. Brim in Chapter Two are from Brim, O. G., Jr. (1973). "Do we know what we are doing?" In F. F. Helmann (Ed.), *The Future of Foundations*, 216–258. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. Reprinted with the permission of O. G. Brim and the American Assembly.

The Chapter Two quotations are from the Sara L. Engelhardt interview in Saidel, J. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 12, 336–485. Copyright © 2002 by John Wiley & Sons. This material is used by permission of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

