



## Improving Grant Application and Reporting

### PROJECT PROPOSAL AND UPDATE September 2009

---

#### I. Statement of Need

Most grantmakers<sup>1</sup> take their responsibilities to support nonprofit and other public-serving organizations seriously, and spend considerable time thinking about how they can be most effective. Stories of highly productive, warm, and mutually satisfying partnerships between organizations and their funders abound. Yet the grantmaking process is rife with inefficiencies, and these inefficiencies mean that everyone is wasting time and money that could be devoted to accomplishing missions.

Most funders prefer, or even require, that grantees seek funding from multiple sources, and with good reason. Much like an investment portfolio, the fiscal health of nonprofits is increased and the risk reduced with a diversity of funding sources.

Therefore, most grantseekers juggle multiple funders, each of which has a distinct set of questions, a separate grantmaking cycle, a different budget form, individual online or hard-copy systems, and page, word or character specifications, not to mention myriad requirements for how demographic data is to be represented, activities evaluated and results reported. Imagine this scenario replicated in thousands of nonprofits responding to thousands of foundations, and it becomes easy to see how the sector's grantmaker-specific practices might interfere with the efficient flow of funding to address community needs.

Nonprofit leaders are beginning to voice their frustrations. In *Daring to Lead 2006*, from CompassPoint and the Meyer Foundation, researchers found that a substantial proportion of nonprofit executive directors are deeply frustrated and fatigued by institutional fundraising, "both the logistics of the process and the influence that funders exert." This exhaustion contributes to high burnout and turnover in nonprofit executives.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this report, "grantmakers" refers generically to all grantmaking organizations including private and public foundations, corporate giving programs, and grantmaking programs that are part of nonprofit organizations and associations. At times, the words "foundation" and "funder" are also used in a generic sense. For the purposes of this project, grantseeking organizations of all shapes and sizes, from the largest university to the smallest community nonprofit, are referred to as "grantseekers" or "nonprofits."

<sup>2</sup> Bell, Moyers and Wolfred, *Daring to Lead* 2006, 13.

It is no exaggeration to say that the current system of application and reporting has grantseekers and grantmakers alike drowning in paperwork and distracted from purpose. Such practices may be only a small part of the bigger picture of grantmaking effectiveness, but they threaten to undermine other grantmaking effectiveness efforts by creating barriers to nonprofit success.

These barriers confront the combined third sector (philanthropy and nonprofits) with an effectiveness paradox. Foundations strive to increase their own impact, in part through specialized application and reporting practices. Many feel that they cannot be responsible stewards of philanthropy's resources without requiring significant and customized information from nonprofit organizations. But these individualistic practices—multiplied by thousands of grantmakers—place a heavy burden on organizations seeking funding and hamper their ability to be efficient with time and ultimately effective in their missions. Most foundations don't fully appreciate the extent and consequences of these inefficiencies and the rising number of those that grasp the problem struggle with how to solve it.

Compounding the problem is philanthropy's diversity of purpose and operations, which makes standardizing practices across foundations highly difficult. As the saying goes, "If you've seen one foundation, you've seen one foundation." More than 71,000 grantmaking organizations with assets of more than \$550.6 billion operate in the United States.<sup>3</sup> With so many funders operating in so many unique ways, it is no wonder that efforts to improve practice tend to be localized. Yet grantmakers can no longer afford to let fragmentation derail the sector from doing something about these practical obstacles to nonprofit efficiency and effectiveness.

Determined to address the great waste of time and energy caused by inconsistent and inefficient reporting and application procedures, eight organizations representing grantmakers and grantseekers came together to form Project Streamline. The Grants Managers Network (GMN) manages the project. Its advisors on the project include:

- Association of Fundraising Professionals
- Association of Small Foundations
- Council on Foundations
- Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers
- Foundation Center
- Grantmakers for Effective Organizations
- National Council of Nonprofits

---

<sup>3</sup> The Foundation Center, "Highlights of Foundation Yearbook, 2007 Edition"

## II. Goals

By creating a set of principles to guide grantmakers' decisions about their application, monitoring, and reporting practices and developing resources to support change, Project Streamline hopes to achieve the following goals:

### **Goal 1: Increase Awareness Among Grantmakers of the Impact of Their Requirements on Grantseekers**

The philanthropic sector has seen tremendous expansion over the past 15 years. From 1992 to 2004, the number of private foundations almost doubled from approximately 35,000 to over 67,000.<sup>4</sup> With this growth, the field is evolving in a number of critical areas, from strengthening its evaluation practices (benchmarking, measurable outcomes, etc.) to better managing grantmaking and associated portfolio risks.

Today's social and technological changes (which offer new ways for funders to find information helpful in their grantmaking and for applicants to communicate their objectives and results) are dramatic, yet it is unclear what steps modern philanthropy is willing to take to harness new opportunities to empower the nonprofit sector to achieve its own objectives. Project Streamline will create a sense of urgency around the need for sector-wide improvements.

Through national and local meetings, media coverage, blogs, training, tools, and other efforts, Project Streamline will focus the philanthropic field on the flaws in current application, monitoring, and reporting practices and facilitate a collaborative effort to address those flaws. Project Streamline will not result in a "one size fits all solution," but it will be successful if it can make grantmakers aware of the impact of their grantmaking processes on grantseekers and institutionalize a more thoughtful approach to determining individual foundation requirements.

Short-term success in increasing awareness among grantmakers of the problems they are creating will be measured by i) participation in Project Streamline presentations, ii) media and blog coverage, and, eventually, iii) surveys of partner organization constituencies.

Project Streamline's long-term success will be measured by the extent to which the principles are institutionalized and become part of the philanthropic culture. One indicator of this institutionalization is their adoption by individual grantmakers. A second indicator will be their inclusion in basic industry training and tools (e.g., Council on Foundations training, Association of Small Foundations' Foundation in a Box, Grants Managers Network grants management manual, etc.).

---

<sup>4</sup> Foundation Center, 2006 - [http://foundationcenter.org/findfunders/statistics/pdf/02\\_found\\_growth/03\\_03.pdf](http://foundationcenter.org/findfunders/statistics/pdf/02_found_growth/03_03.pdf)

## Goal 2: Reduce Costs for Both Grantseekers and Grantmakers

Project Streamline seeks to reduce the resources used in application and reporting processes, allowing both grantmakers and grantseekers more time to focus on mission-related activities.

Grantmakers struggle with internal inefficiencies, including the amount of time spent tracking down paperwork, fielding calls from confused applicants, and transferring data from proposals and reports to online tracking systems. Some grantmakers also spend enormous amounts of time on processes that are often pro-forma, such as approving budget revisions and extension requests—changes that are almost always approved. A report by the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) concluded that the sum of grantee administrative costs and average foundation administrative costs results in an estimated total administrative cost of 13 percent of every foundation grant dollar.<sup>5</sup>

It is difficult to estimate how much time nonprofits spend developing and writing grant applications and reports. A Rand Corporation Case Study of one nonprofit organization calculated that it spent 11 percent of its budget and 44 percent of its organizational time complying with funder requests.<sup>6</sup> The Center for Effective Philanthropy's (CEP) data shows the average amount of time spent on the grant proposal creation and application/selection process is 27.45 hours per grant, with a median of 20 hours. Reporting and evaluation receive considerably less attention: nonprofits indicate that they spend between an average of 20.48 hours on foundation-required reporting, with a median of 10 hours.

This means that nonprofits don't really receive grants. They receive "net grants"—the total amount of funding minus the true cost of getting and managing the grant.<sup>7</sup> Nonprofits must weigh the possibility of funding against the cost of seeking it. One nonprofit focus group participant explained that she discouraged her staff from pursuing grants of less than \$25,000, because in her experience, they were almost always "ludicrously complicated for nothing much at the end." For many other nonprofits, the cut-off point was \$5,000.

Project Streamline seeks to reduce both grantmaker and grantseeker costs through i) more streamlined requirements (i.e., less paperwork) and the elimination of duplicative requirements. Strategies to achieve these cost reductions include defining the minimum legal and regulatory requirements for grant application, monitoring, and reporting; promoting "right-sized" requirements that reflect the grant size and/or length of relationship; and encouraging grantmakers to limit their requirements to just the items needed for decision making.

---

<sup>5</sup> Buchanan, *Indicators of Effectiveness*, 17.

<sup>6</sup> Lara-Cinisomo and Steinberg, *Meeting Funder Compliance*, 45-47.

<sup>7</sup> Buechel, Keating, and Miller, *Capital Ideas: Moving from Short-Term Engagement to Long-Term Sustainability*, 24.

Project Streamline will monitor success in reducing the costs to both grantmakers and grantseekers by 1) monitoring changes in CEP data and 2) conducting surveys and focus groups with grantmakers and grantseekers.

### **III. Management and Staffing**

**Attachment A** contains the current contact list for each of the roles described below:

- A. Key Partners – The Key Partners contribute resources and expertise to plan the project and engage their constituents and others in adopting the recommended principles through endorsement and dissemination of the final products.
- B. National Advisory Committee - A National Advisory Committee, comprising representatives from all of the Key Partners, sets project goals and guides the project's development and implementation.
- C. Project Chair – The Project Chair oversees the work of the National Advisory Committee and manages the work of the project manager.
- D. Project Manager and Staff – The Project Manager, supported by project staff, implements the project following the work plan approved by the National Advisory Committee and manages any consultants working on the project.
- E. Consultants – The consultants carry out the major research and writing activities for the project and will be engaged, as needed, in the development of principles and tools for the project.

The Grants Managers Network is responsible for the implementation and financial management of Project Streamline.

### **IV. Workplan**

Project Streamline will be completed in three phases occurring between 2007 and 2011:

Phase 1: Defining the Problem (January 2007 – December 2007)

Phase 2: Developing Principles and Resources (January 2008 – December 2008)

Phase 3: Adopting Principles (January 2009 – December 2011)

#### **Phase I – Defining the Problem**

**Status: Completed December 2007**

Phase I consisted of a scan of the field (literature search and conversations with funders, grantees, and others) to identify common grantmaking procedures and practices from application through reporting. It looked for examples of streamlined efforts among multiple funders (e.g., common applications, shared portals) and sought to understand the experiences of nonprofits working with multiple funders.

Intersector Consulting was hired to gather and analyze data that addressed the following objectives:

1. Identify areas of concern to nonprofits regarding grantmaking practices from application through reporting.

2. Identify areas of concern to funders regarding grantmaking practices from application through reporting.
3. Identify common procedures for information collection and processing by funders, and compile examples of procedures, applications, reporting forms, etc., in print and online.
4. Identify procedures/practices in need of streamlining.
5. Identify examples of existing initiatives to streamline procedures/practices among multiple funders.
6. Assess existing efforts to standardize foundations' procedures and practices, including the history of these efforts and the lessons learned.

## **Phase II – Developing Principles and Resources**

**Status: Completed December 2008**

In April 2008, *Drowning in Paperwork, Distracted From Purpose* was released and a supporting website, [www.projectstreamline.org](http://www.projectstreamline.org), was launched. The report identifies ten flaws in the current application and reporting system and recommends that grantmakers adopt four core principles as a first step towards improving the system. The website solicits feedback on the report and captures solutions that address the flaws from grantmakers and grantseekers.

Using the research report and four core principles as a jumping off point, Project Streamline then sought a broad national consensus on the development of application, monitoring, and reporting principles and promising practices.

The major accomplishments of Phase II are:

***Disseminated 14,000 copies of the report and promoted the findings to more than 83,000 grantmakers and grantseekers***

The report generated significant interest in the field. Nearly 14,000 reports have been delivered in paper and electronic form to interested grantmakers and grantseekers and all eight partners have promoted the report to their constituencies, informing more than 10,000 grantmakers, 3,000 fundraising professionals, and 70,000 nonprofit leaders of the report and its findings. This outreach, combined with coverage in the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *Responsive Philanthropy*, and other industry publications and blogs has raised awareness of the project throughout the field. The Project Streamline website ([www.projectstreamline.org](http://www.projectstreamline.org)) contains samples of articles written on Project Streamline.

In addition, nearly 6,000 visitors have accessed the Project Streamline website. The site now appears as the first search result on Google and other search engines, confirming its popularity.

***Held 39 conversations with more than 1,000 grantmakers and grantseekers to gather input on potential principles and needed resources***

Project Streamline presented the research report findings and gathered input on potential principles and resources through:

- a. National conferences, including Council on Foundations, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, and Association of Fundraising Professionals
- b. Local meetings with regional associations of grantmakers and Grants Managers Network regions
- c. A series of on-line chats and teleconferences

A total of 39 sessions reaching more than 1,000 grantmakers and grantseekers have been held across the country. These sessions not only met Project Streamline goals, but provided partners, particularly the Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers and the Grants Managers Network who sponsored the majority of the sessions, with highly relevant content and effective programs for their members, creating a “win-win” situation for everyone.

To ensure consistent communication and input gathering, Project Streamline developed a “Conversation in a Box” for the sessions, including a presentation, talking points, participant worksheets, and other helpful items. The original intent was that any interested group could use the “Conversation in a Box” materials to make a presentation to their constituencies. It quickly became clear, however, that these groups preferred to have a presenter who was more familiar with the material, and Project Streamline met these requests. As we move forward with Phase III, Project Streamline will need to allocate resources for presenters as well as content for any future trainings or sessions.

Based on the number of requests for presentations and the level of participation by those who attended the sessions, it is clear that the Phase II dissemination strategy has been successful and achieved the dual objectives of building awareness of the issues and generating input on the findings and recommendations contained in the report. The feedback we received from these sessions has been overwhelmingly positive and affirming. The sessions enhanced understanding among grantmakers and grantseekers of the need for streamlining. Those who had not considered these issues were intrigued and inspired, and those who already had begun to streamline felt justified and supported in their efforts.

Word of mouth about the sessions has spread and Project Streamline continues to receive requests to provide content and speakers for these introductory sessions. With resources redeployed to Phase III activities, Project Streamline will develop an alternative, web-based method to deliver an “Introduction to Project Streamline” to interested grantmakers and grantseekers.

We have published a Phase II report which shares more details about what we learned from the field. The comments, questions and suggestions captured in these sessions will be used to finalize the principles and drive the Phase III strategy. The fact that the findings and recommendations have been validated by a broad cross section of those who work in the philanthropic and nonprofit sectors provides credibility and promotes confidence in the final product.

Project Streamline launched two additional efforts in 2008 to support the adoption of principles by the field.

### Communications

Project Streamline continued to update the content on its website to promote discussion, share ideas, and deliver tools to help grantmakers streamline and engage grantseekers in the discussion.

To date, two newsletters have been produced and received by more than 45,000 people primarily through existing newsletters and communications tools. Recipients included:

- 1,300 GMN members
- 30,000 AFP December eWire subscribers
- 4,900 people on ASF's mailing list
- 3,200 subscribers to NCN's email newsletter
- 1,200 American Association of Grant Professionals members
- 500 Grantmakers for Children, Youth, & Families members
- 4,000 members of regional associations of grantmakers

The third issue of the newsletter is planned for a September 2009 release. The newsletters focus on stories of how grantmakers have streamlined their practices to demonstrate how streamlining can be accomplishments and encourage replication of specific practices across the field.

### Workgroups

Working groups charged with resolving specific issues and developing tools are a critical component of Project Streamline's Phase III work. The workgroups are composed of field representatives (both grantseekers and grantmakers) and address priorities identified through the Project Streamline research and national and regional conversations. Each group is responsible for making recommendations about a specific issue and coming up with a useful and durable product for dissemination to the field.

Four workgroups have been formed based on recommendations from the *Drowning in Paperwork* report and input from grantmakers across the country. Workgroups are facilitated by Jessica Bearman (Project Streamline consultant) and chaired by members of the project's National Advisory Committee. The four workgroups are:

| <b>Workgroup</b>                                | <b>Task and Product</b>  |
|---|--|
| Online Systems                                  | Determine and describe what works, what doesn't, and recommend best practices for online systems.  |
| Budgets, Financial Reporting, and Grant Periods | Address grantmaker budget and financial reporting templates and grant periods that don't align with fiscal years or project timelines. Recommend approach to budgets and financial reporting that will work for both nonprofits and foundations. |
| Basic Due Diligence Requirements                | Develop a list of minimum requirements and implement a strategy to obtain lawyer and auditor endorsements and adoption of the minimum requirements.  |
| Right-Sized Requirements                        | Determine and promote guidelines for right-sizing requirements.  |

The tools and resources produced by these workgroups will be key components of our Phase III strategy to promote adoption of the principles by the field. All workgroups have completed initial drafts of their work and these are currently being crafted into a "Guide to Streamlining", described in more detail in the next section.

### **Phase III – Adopting the Principles**

**Status: In Process**

Phase III, **Adopting the Principles**, is now underway. The goals of this phase are to encourage adoption of the core principles within the funding community by offering informational resources and tools for those grantmakers seeking to improve their application, monitoring, and reporting processes, and to develop and implement appropriate mechanisms to track Project Streamline's impact on philanthropic practices. Specific activities and products that will support these goals include:

1. Ongoing and multifaceted communication designed to raise awareness of the drain on resources and energy that results from current practices and to share Project Streamline findings and solutions. A variety of mediums will be used, including reports, web discussions, presentations, newsletters, convenings and a frequently updated website. To the extent possible, the number of people touched will be recorded in order to measure the reach of the outreach and communication strategies.
2. *The Guide to Streamlining* will be released beginning in September 2009. This guide will incorporate the final principles, workgroup products, and pilot training content to create a resource that grantmakers can use to direct their streamlining efforts. It will also include advice to grantseekers interested in supporting streamlining.

We will release the Guide as an electronic set of tools (online, but printable). This will allow us to easily update and add to it as our knowledge grows. It is also consistent with the collaborative approach we've taken with the project to date—releasing ideas and information for a field-wide discussion. As an added bonus, this approach means that we can release each principle as it is completed. This allows us to:

1. Get information out there as quickly as possible
2. Release the Guide in more easily “digestible” pieces for users
3. Have multiple “announceables” to maintain Project Streamline’s momentum.

We’re currently finalizing the content (see **Attachment B** for Guide outline) and working out the release schedule, but we should begin releasing products in September with everything released by November.

We are also moving the Project Streamline website to a new platform prior to this release, which will allow much more interactivity by visitors.

3. “How to Streamline” training will be a one-day workshop designed to help foundations and other grantmakers streamline their application and reporting practices. It will be offered through Project Streamline partner organizations such as the regional associations of grantmakers. Learning goals for the workshop include:
  - a) Understand the ways that current systems of application and reporting may be placing unnecessary burden on funders’ nonprofit partners;
  - b) Surface and check assumptions about what kinds of information are necessary for effective and responsible grantmaking;
  - c) Identify the drivers for and cultural barriers to streamlining and consider ways that they might be overcome;
  - d) Share stories and lessons-learned about efforts to streamline grantmaking practices; and
  - e) Create action plans for making concrete changes to application and reporting practices.

We piloted the first workshop with Philanthropy NW in March. The pilot evaluation found:

- 90% (19 of 21) found the workshop met expectations
- 100% agreed that it provided new ideas and resources
- 96% (20 of 21) intended to apply what they learned

Attachment C is the full evaluation of the workshop and the revised plan for delivering the workshops.

We have partnered with four regional associations of grantmakers—Philanthropy NW, Council on Michigan Foundations, Donors Forum of Chicago, and Associated

Grantmakers to conduct the next round of workshops. We secured a grant from the Forum of Regional Association of Grantmakers to support this effort. Two workshops will be held late this fall and two in January. These will help us to finalize the workshop content and refine the business model for the workshops so that we can begin contacting GMN chapters, regional associations and others to gauge their interest in hosting the workshop.

4. A Grantmaker Assessment Tool is being developed in partnership with the Center for Effective Philanthropy and is expected to be released in late 2009/early 2010. This will be a simple, on-line tool that allows grantmakers to assess their current practices against the flaws identified in the *Drowning in Paperwork* report. It will provide users with data and a report that can be used to advocate internally for change. This tool and the related report will facilitate the tracking of progress over time. Summaries of specific data, such as the estimated cost of administrative requirements, will be generated by aggregating user results, and this information can be used by Project Streamline to track changes in grantmaker practices.
5. Tracking the impact of Project Streamline will be an ongoing process. Some of the tracking mechanisms have been identified above: tracking interest in the project by the numbers of individuals reached through communication strategies and those accessing tools provided in the *Guide to Streamlining*, tracking the progress of funders who participate in "How to Streamline Training," and the aggregation of data from funders who use the Grantmaker Assessment Tool. Longer term, change that has occurred in the field since the launching of Project Streamline will be evaluated by returning to the sources of the research that was conducted for the *Drowning in Paperwork* report and incorporating findings from the training program and assessment tool.

## **Project Conclusion**

Beginning in 2011, GMN will fold the Project Streamline principles, tools, and resources into its ongoing work and continue to work towards institutionalizing industry change and ensuring that the impact of Project Streamline continues long after the formal project is completed.

## **V. Budget and Fundraising Plan**

The total projected cost of Project Streamline is \$566,066. Through June 30, 2009, \$394,000 has been raised from 21 grantmakers to support the project. Attachment D contains a complete budget and funder list for Project Streamline.

Given the caliber of project partners, importance to the industry, and interest expressed to date, GMN is confident that the entire budget for Project Streamline can be secured through grants from private, community, and corporate foundations.

# ATTACHMENT A

## Project Streamline Management and Staffing

### A & B. Key Partners and National Advisory Committee Members

| Organization                                  | National Advisory Committee Member   | Constituents          |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Association of Small Foundations              | Andy Carroll, Senior Program Manager   | Small-Size Funders    |
| Association of Fundraising Professionals      | Cathlene Williams, Consultant  | Grantee Organizations |
| Council on Foundations                        | Tonia Bain, Director of Special Projects   | Funders               |
| Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers | Nancy Roberts, President, Connecticut Council for Philanthropy   | Funders               |
| Foundation Center                             | Patricia Pasqual, Director, Washington, D.C. Office<br>Sara Englehardt, Past President   | Funders and Grantees  |
| Grantmakers for Effective Organizations       | Lori Bartczak, Manager of Content Development  | Funders               |
| Grants Managers Network                       | Kyle Reis, Ford Foundation<br>Stephanie Duffy, The McKnight Foundation<br>Teresa Crawford, Frey Foundation<br>Jonathan Goldberg, Surdna Foundation<br>Byron Stuck, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation | Funders               |
| National Council of Nonprofits                | Amy Coates Madsen, Director, Standards of Excellence Institute   | Grantee Organizations |

### C. Project Chair

| Organization            | Name  |
|-------------------------|---|
| Grants Managers Network | Richard Toth, Director, Office of Proposal Management, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation |

### D. Project Management

| Organization            | Name                                  | Role            |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Grants Managers Network | Michelle Greanias, Executive Director | Project Manager |
| Grants Managers Network | Catherine Downs, Administrator        | Project Support |

### E. Consultants

| Organization           | Name                                    |
|------------------------|---|
| Intersector Consulting | Jessica Bearman and Kristen Lindsay     |
| Bearman Consulting     | Jessica Bearman                         |
| Sedway Associates      | Mark Sedway and Courtney Spalding-Mayer |
| Alice Cottingham       | Alice Cottingham and Associates         |
| Romero Hayden          | Center for Effective Philanthropy       |

# ATTACHMENT B

## Guide to Streamlining Preliminary Outline



### Guide to Streamlining Components

- Organized around four principles with supplemental section on process and building support for change.
- Released as online product (but printable).
- Each principle released as completed.
- Try to have each principle section be consistent and include
  - Principle description
  - Workgroup products
  - Electronic tool
  - Stories of grantmakers who have streamlined
  - Advice for grantseekers

Guide Outline (in Tentative Release Order)

#### A. Streamlining Framework (September)

- How to build the case for change
- Identify opportunities for change
- Implement change

#### B. Relieve the Burden (October)

1. Principle description
2. Budgets and Financial Reporting workgroup work
3. Online Systems workgroup work
4. Online Vendor Systems Analysis (March 2010)
5. Ratio tool to help grantmakers use financial information
6. Review of key online systems to see which meet workgroup standards
7. Stories of grantmakers who have successfully streamlined in these area
8. Grantseeker advice

### **C. Rightsizing (November)**

1. Principle description
2. Rightsizing workgroup work
3. Examples of right-sized applications and reporting forms
4. Stories of grantmakers who have successfully streamlined in these areas
5. Grantseeker advice

### **D. Begin From Zero (November)**

1. Principle description
2. Due diligence workgroup work
3. Risk assessment tool from workgroup
4. Stories of grantmakers who have successfully streamlined in these areas
5. Grantseeker advice pulled from Conversations results

### **E. Communications**

1. Principle description
2. Resources/Tools
  - Summary of Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) report
  - Examples of questions/surveys/methods of obtaining grantee feedback
  - Examples/how to develop clear grant guideline
3. Stories of grantmakers who have successfully streamlined in these area
4. Grantseeker advice

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**Project Streamline Workshops**



**PROJECT STREAMLINE ACTION WORKSHOP**  
**FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Jessica Bearman, Bearman Consulting  
Alice Cottingham, Cottingham & Associates  
June 15, 2009

## Workshop Evaluation and Further Follow-up Recommendations

---

### **Pilot workshop assessment and implications**

We sought to measure the effectiveness of the “How to Streamline” workshop pilot through an online evaluation immediately following the workshop and via a round of follow up calls one month after the workshop. We were primarily interested in learning three things:

1. Feedback about the workshop itself and how it could be improved in future iterations
2. Information about what participants would find useful as follow-up from Philanthropy Northwest
3. Assessment of the impact of the workshop and materials on foundations’ motivation and ability to streamline their processes – and information about the extent to which participants implemented the changes they had intended to make.

Initial evaluation of the April 2009 pilot workshop was conducted by Philanthropy Northwest immediately following the training, via an online survey of forced-choice and open-ended questions. Results show that:

- 90% (19 of 21) found the workshop met expectations
- 100% agreed that it provided new ideas and resources
- 96% (20 of 21) intended to apply what they learned
- 86% (18) found it useful or very useful and 14% (3) found it somewhat useful
- 80% said it was effective or very effective in helping them understand the impact of current systems of application and reporting
- 90% reported it was effective or very effective in helping them surface assumptions about what kinds of information are necessary for effective and responsible grantmaking
- 95% found it effective or very effective in helping them identify drivers for and barriers to streamlining and considering ways to overcome barriers
- 60% (12 of 20) reported that it was effective or very effective in helping them share stories and lessons learned from their own and others experiences, and to review their foundation practices and identify opportunities for change
- 80% found it effective or very effective in helping them create action plans

We conducted follow up calls to 11 of the funding institutions one month after the workshop. We asked:

- Since the workshop, how have you moved forward with streamlining?
- What aspects of the workshop have you drawn from to make progress?
- What else do you need to continue making progress?

Our conversations found a universally high commitment to streamlining. A majority of participants told us that the pre-session homework yielded surprising and illuminating information about their processes that further inspired them. Progress since the workshop was proceeding at variable speeds, related to other foundation processes taking precedence, additional buy-in or team-building being done, or strategic thinking about how to proceed.

Almost all the participating foundations had taken at least some steps to begin streamlining before the workshop. For those foundations that were further into the streamlining process, the workshop served to reinforce commitment, deliver enthusiastically received first tools from the PS work groups, and make time specifically devoted to working with another team member to plan and talk about next steps.

For the foundations less far along in streamlining, the workshop served to deepen the understanding of team members who had thought less about its implications and inherent opportunities for change – an outcome that was highly valued by the staff people who previously had learned and thought a great deal about streamlining. In another instance, a staff person found the workshop to be the catalyst for serious contemplation about what would be required to change foundation culture to support what she perceives as urgently needed streamlining, and how strategically to foster that change. While she has not yet come to conclusions, she is actively mulling over the questions and possible approaches.

Many participants came to the workshop hoping for specific information about what works, what's necessary and not for due diligence, and what others are doing. Many had hoped for a chance to talk about their own processes and questions, and to get others' feedback and suggestions. This is consistent with the lowest ranking in the data collected immediately after the workshop. Some found others at the workshop to talk with who had useful suggestions and reflections, and experience with tools such as online application software. Some found the case studies useful amalgams of experience, providing an opportunity to talk through decisions using a hypothetical scenario. But overall a great deal of appetite remained for very concrete and focused information and for peer consultation and feedback. While no one put it quite this way, foundations are in effect asking to streamline their learning.

In summary, the workshop served to help participants

- deepen commitment to streamline application and reporting
- build organizational will
- create and flesh out action plans
- anticipate challenges
- get a first look at valuable new tools
- with cross-functional teams a chance to come to greater shared understanding
- meet and connect to others with similar aims

In addition, participants' satisfaction with the workshop burnished PNW's reputation as a philanthropic resource. A number of participants said they would welcome opportunities to learn about specific topics and to talk with colleagues at brief sessions hosted by PNW.

We believe it would be useful for Project Streamline or Philanthropy Northwest to conduct one more round of follow up calls to the pilot workshop's participants six months after the workshop – in October 2009. We asked participants if they would be willing to receive a second follow-up call and all said they would. This call could test whether participants continue to move forward with streamlining, as they plan, ask for examples of their successes and glitches, and determine whether the content, planning time, and tools from the workshop have had lasting value. The calls would also further reinforce the importance of streamlining. In addition, the calls would

allow Project Streamline and or Philanthropy Northwest to continue to collect valuable and instructive stories about streamlining in the real world.

For future workshops, we recommend that PS and the organizations that host trainings continue to evaluate as follows:

- Host organizations should be asked to send a simple standardized online survey to participants in advance of the training, to establish a baseline and to inform the trainer.
- Hosts should also be asked to follow up with participants shortly after the training to assess satisfaction and effectiveness, using a standardized set of five or six questions provided by PS. This would provide feedback to the trainer and host, while reinforcing the importance of streamlining.
- PS should extend evaluation by sending another brief online survey, with a handful of standardized questions about the use of content and tools from the training, four to six months after each training. This survey would further reinforce commitment and request implementation examples.

The pre-workshop survey used by Philanthropy Northwest is found at <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/survey-intro.zgi?p=WEB228XTDK69KC&store=1>

The post-workshop survey is found at <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB2293HB2E9HP>

Questions used in the follow up calls one month after follow.

Evaluation questions:

- 1) Since the workshop, how have you moved forward with streamlining?
  - a. What has moved smoothly?
  - b. Where have you encountered rough patches?
  - c. If not – what have been the barriers?
- 2) What aspects of the workshop have you drawn from to make progress?
  - a. Are there other things you wish we had done, upon reflection?
  - b. Was the content useful, or was it mainly just committing to doing something that helped you make progress?
  - c. To what extent was being with your team (or not) a factor helping/hindering progress? (How big could your team have been?)
- 3) What else do you need to continue making progress?
  - a. Where will you turn for those resources?
  - b. What would you like PNW to offer to support you?

## Project Streamline Action Workshop - Revised Agenda

The following reflects debriefing and follow up call comments about what would strengthen the agenda.

| Time                  | Element/Description   | Notes  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| <b>PRE</b>            | <p>Pre-assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the PS report and Snapshot (executive summary)</li> <li>Review the “Guide to Streamlining”</li> <li>Take the self-assessment (once available)</li> </ul> <p>Conduct a brief investigation. This baseline data will help to make our workshop richer and most productive for your foundation. <u>It will also help you to measure your streamlining progress after the workshop.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a diagram of each step in your foundation's application process. Include steps for foundation staff as well as steps for grantees.</li> <li>Complete the <i>Identifying Your Baseline</i> worksheet</li> <li>Optional: some foundations have also found the following to be extremely useful:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>count the number of sheets of paper that a new applicant must submit when requesting funding from your foundation, and measure the weight of a full application;</li> <li>call 1-2 trusted grantees and ask them to:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>estimate the amount of time that they spent applying for and reporting on funding from your foundation</li> <li>tell you about an application process that they find most straightforward and helpful. What is it, and why do they prefer it?</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Bring your results to the workshop.</p> |  |
| <b>AM</b>             | <p>As participants arrive and are greeted, they are invited to post examples of their own or others’ dubious practices on the TRUE CONFESSIONS poster.</p> <p>Complete the <i>Drowning in Paperwork</i> pop quiz – already on each table.</p>   | <p>Lichtenstein-style drawing of a crying woman saying: “Oh Heavens! I forgot to streamline!”</p>  |
| <b>9:00</b><br>30 min | <p>Welcome<br/>Introductions<br/>Agenda review, Goals</p>   | <p><b>Introductions:</b> name, role, foundation affiliation, and what brought you to the workshop (motivations for streamlining)</p>                   |
| <b>9:30</b><br>45 min | <p><b>Defining the need:</b> Quick review of Project Streamline findings and core recommendations</p> <p>Ask foundations to think about what they have tried/learned.</p>   | <p>PPT review of flaws in the system and core recommendations</p> <p>Report out – each foundation calls out what they would like to share and what</p> |

|                 |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
|                 | <p>4. What has your foundation done that you are most delighted about and that you'd be willing to share with others? Write it on a card – put on a stanchion.</p> <p>5. What would you really like to hear more about from someone in the room? Write on the other side of the card.</p>   | they want to learn.  |
| <b>Time</b>     | <b>Element/Description</b>  | <b>Notes</b>   |
| 10:15<br>60 min | <p><b>Streamlining Phases:</b> Introduce the idea of streamlining phases and Adaptive vs. Technical challenges. Ask foundations to identify the phase they are currently working on.</p> <p>For each phase, participants identify (small or full group):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What needs to happen during this phase?</li> <li>• What works well? What barriers need to be overcome?</li> </ul> | <p>Discuss and then post foundation on streamlining phases chart that includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friction/Vision</li> <li>• Exploring need</li> <li>• Building case</li> <li>• Identifying opportunities</li> <li>• Planning change</li> <li>• Implementation</li> <li>• Assess and Refine</li> </ul> |
| 11:15           | <b>BREAK</b>  |  |
| 11:25<br>30 min | <p><b>Force Field Analysis:</b> Identify the drivers and barriers to streamlining. Discuss underlying assumptions that support the status quo.</p>  |  |
| 11:55           | <b>Working Lunch – networking and peer consultations</b>  | Working lunch – participants invited to discuss challenges and successes with peers.   |
| 12:30           | <b>PPT: Streamlining Principles in Action</b>   | PPT – introduce guidelines   |
| 12:45           | <p><b>Principles in Practice</b></p> <p>Participants divide into groups by interest to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due-diligence</li> <li>• Budgets/financial information</li> <li>• Right-sizing</li> <li>• Online systems</li> <li>• Communications</li> </ul> <p>40 minute breakouts (x2) and 30 minute reporting</p>  | <p>Facilitated groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share current practice</li> <li>• Examine own practices in light of the guidelines</li> <li>• Discuss opportunities for change</li> </ul> <p>1. Make note of other ideas and questions</p>   |
| 2:35            | <b>Break</b>  |  |

| Time | Element/Description   | Notes                                   |
|------|---|---|
| 2:50 | <p><b>Foundation process review</b></p> <p>Foundation-specific teams review their own process (using worksheet as a guide) and look for opportunities to make changes.</p> <p>Teams also make a plan-of-action, which will vary depending on where foundations are in the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How can we move to the next phase?</li> <li>- Who needs to be involved?</li> <li>- What do they need to know/do?</li> <li>- What are the next steps?</li> <li>- What are some pitfalls to avoid?</li> </ul> |   |
| 3:30 | <p><b>Closing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual reflection (use <b>circle/sq/triangle worksheet</b>)</li> <li>• Commitments: individual, foundation, and collective (with PNW)</li> <li>• Capture burning questions, expectations</li> </ul>  | Capture burning questions for follow-up |

**MATERIALS:**

- Identifying your Baseline Prework
- Hard copies of “Drowning” and snapshots for everyone
- Streamlining Phases
- Guide to Streamlining
- Worksheets for FOUNDATION PROCESS REVIEW
- Goals: worksheet for foundation teams
- Closing reflections organizer
- Reflection sheet

## Recommendations for Additional Models

---

There is considerable room for hosts to be creative in configuring this workshop, but we recommend that it be offered with a face-to-face component of at least 3-4 hours in length. Without the in-person opportunity, the peer networking, interaction, and reflection time that make the workshop valuable would be unlikely to occur. Exceptions to this might be warranted if the content is offered to an existing community of practice. However, the workshop can be modified to include webinars or teleconferences.

1. Half-day workshop +pre and follow-up webinars: Webinars or teleconferences could be used to prepare for or as a follow-up to a face-to-face workshop. In this scenario, the initial webinar would essentially be an introduction to Project Streamline’s basic principles and recommendations, and could be open to a larger group of foundations than would elect to participate in the face-to-face training.

| ACTIVITY  | PROPOSED CONTENT  |
|---|---|
| Pre workshop webinar – 90 minutes                 | PPT to introduce Project Streamline’s key findings and core principles. Homework given – define baseline (same as homework for full-day workshop)   |
| ½ Day Face-to-face workshop – 3-4 hours           | Streamlining phases<br>Force field analysis<br>Principles in Practice – intro to the “guide”<br>Right-sizing in real life – applying the guidelines to foundation practice<br>Goal setting and next-step planning   |
| Follow-up conversation (via webinar or brown-bag) | Participants return for a follow-up 3-6 weeks after the workshop to discuss: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What did your foundation do after the workshop?</li> <li>2. What worked well? What has been challenging?</li> <li>3. What else do you need to know to move forward, and where can you get that information?</li> </ol> |

2. Streamlining Specifics Webinar Series: We propose that workshops be supplemented by follow-up opportunities for narrowly focused conversations about specific aspects of streamlining, such as Basic Due-Diligence, Online Systems, Right-Sizing, and Budgets & Financial Information. Sessions could be offered by regional associations as specific programs for their members, or could be offered by PS in the form of webinars open to foundations from around the country. Each could contain some combination of the following:

- Introduction – review of PS principle and specific guidelines
- One to three foundation representatives with tested streamlining expertise in the subject asked to provide concise and concrete examples of their practices, and then respond to questions and thoughts from those participating.
- External experts (as appropriate) to discuss specific content (such as legal requirements, online systems specs, etc.)

- Discussion by participants – what have they tried, successes, challenges.

## **Business Model - Project Streamlining Training**

---

Project Streamline (PS) has successfully made the case for streamlining application and reporting practices in foundations, a number of which have already applied or begun to apply its principles. In response to foundations' desire for additional "how to" support, PS piloted a full-day workshop, hosted by Philanthropy Northwest, which found sufficient interest to fill the April 2009 session and turn away two interested foundations. PS wants to establish a business model for training so that it can be offered widely by regional associations and others.

### **Market**

In the near future, PS will make a "Guide to Streamlining" available to all online, supplemented by an online foundation assessment tool. Some foundations will find these resources sufficient to their needs and will implement streamlining on their own, or will hire an outside consultant to facilitate and guide the planning, implementation, communications, and or evaluation phases. Others are likely to want some degree of support and guidance to get started, deepen internal commitment, or resolve challenges that have arisen in the process.

In the current economic climate, foundations are more eager than ever to ensure that their processes are efficient internally and that their grantmaking process supports, rather than stresses, their nonprofit partners. As a result, the regional associations consulted believe that there will be substantial interest in Project Streamline's Action Workshop among their constituents. GEO has also expressed interest in featuring the workshop at its 2010 conference. PS has no direct competitor at the moment for its trainings. GEO intends to offer an Action Learning group, a two-day intensive, facilitated peer consultation model for foundations in the midst of streamlining that wish to work with colleagues to develop solutions to problems encountered. It costs \$5,000 per foundation team (exclusive of travel and lodging costs). The planned 2009 pilot session has been postponed until the necessary six to nine foundation teams have been recruited. Should an Action Learning group be formed, we think it would be an excellent addition to Project Streamline's constellation of offerings, and would not be likely to draw participants from the Action Workshop.

### **Marketing**

Foundation staff and trustees/board members who attended the pilot session told us that the workshop was useful in several ways that might be explicitly marketed:

- Informative content. Participants reported that they learned more about reasons to streamline, grant decision-making assumptions that may be unreliable, aspects of grantmaking that may be streamlined, barriers and accelerators for foundation change, and some proven practices of streamlining and change management.
- Carved out time. Participants found that the workshop provided valuable time for a team of staff and or trustees to discuss its foundation's streamlining. Participants told us this allowed them to inform and elicit deeper buy-in from other team members, and to begin or advance planning together. We believe that a team approach significantly increases the

likelihood that streamlining will take hold and become embedded in a foundation's culture, so we don't want to encourage leaders to attend alone. Instead, the best model would involve a decision-maker, an implementer (e.g., the grants manager) and, if possible, others who will be affected by or will influence the process.

- Deepened thinking. The workshop allowed streamlining leaders within a foundation to deepen their thinking and refine plans.
- An opportunity to map grantmaking process. The pre-session homework was highly valued by some participants as a surprising and sobering reality check. Many had never undertaken a mapping of their process before.
- Peer learning. Participants learned from and with colleagues, in part to enhance knowledge and networks, but also to get a bead on local philanthropic practices and to identify useful resources that have worked well for others (e.g., online application software).
- Action planning. Leaving with a plan for next steps was useful to foundation participants, several of whom commented that they were able to return to their organizations and implement some changes immediately.

Marketing will be primarily the responsibility of workshop hosts, but Project Streamline could provide brief promotional materials, including stock language describing the workshop and its goals, and quotes from past participants.

### **Hosts**

Future workshops may be hosted by a number of kinds of organizations, including:

- Regional associations of grantmakers
- Other philanthropic membership groups, such as COF, GEO, GMN, and ASF (GEO has indicated interest in using this as a pre-conference session for their national conference in April 2010.)
- Foundations, for the foundation itself or for a group of foundations

Hosts would be responsible for marketing workshops and webinars, setting and covering costs, trainer engagement, registration, fee collection or fundraising, delivering the online pre-training survey and post-training evaluation to participants and providing results to the trainer. For workshops, hosts would also be responsible for providing and setting up suitable training space and refreshments, and copying materials for participants. Hosts would make staff available for two conversations with the trainer to inform the training and provide feedback following it.

GMN would refer prospective hosts to former hosts for references and additional information, connect hosts with trainers, provide hosts with content for two standardized online surveys (pre-training to learn about participants, and an evaluation immediately post-training) and develop and administer a six-month post-workshop evaluation). GMN may wish also to provide copies of *Drowning/Distracted* and the *Snapshot* to host organizations for distribution to training participants.

| Host responsibilities  | GMN/Project Streamline Responsibilities  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market workshops and webinars</li> <li>• Setting and covering costs</li> <li>• Trainer engagement</li> <li>• Participant registration</li> <li>• Fee collection or fundraising</li> <li>• delivering the online pre-training survey and post-training evaluation to participants and providing results to the trainer</li> <li>• Secure suitable training space and refreshments, copying materials for participants.</li> <li>• Two conversations with the trainer(s)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer prospective hosts to former hosts for references and additional information</li> <li>• Connect hosts with trainers</li> <li>• Provide hosts with content for two standardized online surveys (pre-training to learn about participants, and an evaluation immediately post-training) and develop and administer a six-month post-workshop evaluation).</li> <li>• Provide copies of <i>Drowning/Distracted</i> and the <i>Snapshot</i> to host organizations</li> </ul> |

**Covering Expenses**

Full day workshop

We calculate that a typical full-day workshop for up to 27 grantmakers with one facilitator will cost \$4,390, inclusive of costs of consultation (with travel), materials, refreshments, and miscellaneous.

We assume that hosts will want to cover costs, so each must recruit a minimum number of participants. If 20 people participate, hosts will need to charge \$220 per person. With 27 participants, a fee of \$165 per person would cover costs.

If, as has been contemplated, PS trains additional facilitators, travel costs could be virtually eliminated in more areas, bringing down the typical cost to \$2,940 (tab one). Fees of \$150 per person for 20 people or \$115 for 27 would cover expenses. At little additional cost – \$3,125 – PS could incorporate a train the trainer feature into its next workshops, as originally envisioned in the Forum request (tab 3). This approach would increase PS’ control of the manner and content of its training.

Because teams are strongly preferred over single representatives from foundations, we recommend that hosts charge the fees above for those who attend in teams, while charging singletons more.

If hosts want to make money on the workshop, their primary options are to increase the fee per participant, use in-house staff to train, and or seek partial or full grant underwriting. Some hosts will seek underwriting simply to cover costs, because they are not accustomed to charging members for educational opportunities.

90 Minute Webinar

We believe that there will be a one-time start-up cost to develop curricula and several sets of slides that can be used with webinars with various foci (for example, introducing Project Streamline principles, research findings, and guidelines, or delving more deeply into an area of

particular interest, such as budget streamlining). We project this cost at \$2,000. GMN would be responsible for engaging consultants for webinar development and confirming interest of prospective expert participants (from PS work groups and other funders identified by PS). We imagine that the start-up cost would be covered by GMN with grant funding or by allocating the cost across the first few host organizations.

We calculate that each webinar, potentially for an unlimited number of grantmakers, with one facilitator, and two content experts would cost \$2,465 per session (see detail). For webinars not including content experts, the cost drops to \$1,465. To cover the costs of each webinar, we suggest hosts charge a fee per foundation. However, the total cost per webinar is modest, and it may be possible for hosts to offer it as a member benefit for which a fee is not assessed.

Alternately, GMN might seek funding (or partner to seek funding) from national and or regional funders to underwrite the cost in whole or in part of workshops and webinar development and execution. (The request to the Forum by GMN and regional associations is an example of this approach. If funded, the grantees might consider underwriting a portion of costs and covering the balance with fees, so as to able to offer the workshop more than once locally.) Given the degree of interest in PS shown by the Ford and Gates Foundations, they would seem natural prospects for other possible grant support.

# Project Streamline Budget

Revised 6/30/2009

|   | 2007<br>Actual  | 2008<br>Actual   | 2009<br>Budget   | 2010<br>Budget  | 2011<br>Budget  | Total            |
|---|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <b>Phase I: Defining the Problem</b>      |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| <b>TOTAL PHASE I</b>                      | <b>\$90,863</b> | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$75,723</b>  |
| <b>Phase II: Drafting the Principles</b>  |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| <b>TOTAL PHASE II</b>                     | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$123,295</b> | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$123,295</b> |
| <b>Phase III: Adopting the Principles</b> |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| <b>Staffing</b>                           |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| GMN Executive Director                    | \$0             | \$0              | \$20,800         | \$20,800        | \$20,800        | \$62,400         |
| Benefits                                  | 0               | 0                | 1,510            | 1,510           | \$1,510         | \$4,530          |
| Employer Taxes                            | 0               | 0                | 1,634            | 1,634           | \$1,634         | \$4,902          |
| <b>Total Staffing</b>                     | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>         | <b>23,944</b>    | <b>23,944</b>   | <b>23,944</b>   | <b>71,832</b>    |
| <b>Professional Services</b>              |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| Action Workshops                          | 0               | 0                | 32,000           | 25,000          | 0               | \$57,000         |
| Assessment Tool                           | 0               | 0                | 65,000           | 0               | 0               | \$65,000         |
| Communications Strategy and Tools         | 0               | 0                | 35,000           | 10,000          | 5,000           | \$50,000         |
| Evaluation                                | 0               | 0                | 0                | 0               | 15,000          | \$15,000         |
| Project Management                        | 0               | 0                | 10,075           | 10,000          | 0               | \$20,075         |
| Website Hosting and Maintenance           | 0               | 0                | 10,000           | 5,000           | 5,000           | \$20,000         |
| Workgroup Facilitation                    | 0               | 9,045            | 15,000           | 0               | 0               | \$24,045         |
| <b>Total Professional Services</b>        | <b>0</b>        | <b>9,045</b>     | <b>167,075</b>   | <b>50,000</b>   | <b>25,000</b>   | <b>251,120</b>   |
| <b>Meetings and Travel</b>                |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| Action Workshops                          |                 |                  | 7,000            | 5,000           | 0               | \$12,000         |
| Workgroups                                |                 |                  | 500              | 0               | 0               | \$500            |
| Other                                     |                 |                  | 0                | 2,500           | 0               | \$2,500          |
| <b>Total Meetings and Travel</b>          | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>         | <b>7,500</b>     | <b>7,500</b>    | <b>0</b>        | <b>15,000</b>    |
| <b>Guide to Streamlining</b>              |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| Design                                    | 0               | 0                | 0                | 0               | 0               | \$0              |
| Printing                                  | 0               | 0                | 0                | 0               | 0               | \$0              |
| Mailing                                   | 0               | 0                | 1,000            | 500             | 0               | \$1,500          |
| <b>Total Publication</b>                  | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>         | <b>1,000</b>     | <b>500</b>      | <b>0</b>        | <b>1,500</b>     |
| <b>Administration</b>                     |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |
| Office Supplies                           | 0               | 0                | 250              | 250             | 250             | \$750            |
| Rent                                      | 0               | 0                | 3,402            | 3,402           | 3,402           | \$10,206         |
| Telecommunications                        | 0               | 0                | 500              | 500             | 500             | \$1,500          |
| <b>Total Administration</b>               | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>         | <b>4,152</b>     | <b>4,152</b>    | <b>4,152</b>    | <b>12,456</b>    |
| <b>TOTAL PHASE III</b>                    | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$9,045</b>   | <b>\$203,671</b> | <b>\$86,096</b> | <b>\$53,096</b> | <b>\$351,908</b> |
| <b>TOTAL PROJECT STREAMLINE</b>           | <b>\$90,863</b> | <b>\$132,340</b> | <b>\$203,671</b> | <b>\$86,096</b> | <b>\$53,096</b> | <b>\$566,066</b> |

**Project Streamline**  
**2009 Financial Report**  
as of September 30, 2009

|  | <u>Actual</u>    | <u>Budget</u>     | <u>Variance</u>    |
|--|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Staffing</b>                          |                  |                   |                    |
| GMN Exec Director (20% of time)          | 15,649.00        | 20,800.00         | -5,151.00          |
| Benefits                                 | 610.00           | 1,510.00          | -900.00            |
| Employer Taxes                           | 1,193.00         | 1,634.00          | -441.00            |
| <b>Total Staffing</b>                    | <u>17,452.00</u> | <u>23,944.00</u>  | <u>-6,492.00</u>   |
| <b>Professional Services</b>             |                  |                   |                    |
| Action Workshop                          | 14,555.00        | 32,000.00         | -17,445.00         |
| Assessment Tool                          | 696.00           | 65,000.00         | -64,304.00         |
| Communications Strategy & Tools          | 3,495.00         | 35,000.00         | -31,505.00         |
| Project Management                       | 8,103.00         | 10,075.00         | -1,972.00          |
| Website Hosting & Maintenance            | 2,138.00         | 10,000.00         | 5,238.00           |
| Workgroup Facilitation                   | 15,238.00        | 15,000.00         | 29,225.00          |
| <b>Total Professional Services</b>       | <u>44,225.00</u> | <u>167,075.00</u> | <u>-122,850.00</u> |
| <b>Meetings &amp; Travel</b>             | 2,840.00         | 7,500.00          | -4,660.00          |
| <b>Research Report Publication</b>       |                  |                   |                    |
| Design                                   | 0.00             | 0.00              | 0.00               |
| Mailing                                  | 61.40            | 0.00              | 61.40              |
| Printing                                 | 0.00             | 1,000.00          | -1,000.00          |
| <b>Total Research Report Publication</b> | <u>61.40</u>     | <u>1,000.00</u>   | <u>-938.60</u>     |
| <b>Administration</b>                    |                  |                   |                    |
| Phone                                    | 0.00             | 500.00            | -500.00            |
| Rent                                     | 2,539.00         | 3,402.00          | -863.00            |
| Supplies                                 | 0.00             | 250.00            | -250.00            |
| <b>Total Administration</b>              | <u>2,539.00</u>  | <u>4,152.00</u>   | <u>-1,613.00</u>   |
| <b>Total Project Streamline</b>          | <u>67,117.40</u> | <u>203,671.00</u> | <u>-136,553.60</u> |

**Project Streamline**  
**Fundraising Status Report**  
**September 30, 2009**

|   | <u>Amount</u>           |
|---|-------------------------|
| <b><u>Committed</u></b>                       |                         |
| Carnegie Corporation of New York              | \$25,000                |
| Christensen Fund                              | \$10,000                |
| Community Foundation for Palm Beach           | \$2,500                 |
| David and Lucile Packard Foundation           | \$90,000                |
| Dekko Foundation                              | \$5,000                 |
| Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation            | \$5,000                 |
| Ford Foundation                               | \$50,000                |
| Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers | \$10,500                |
| Francis Families Foundation                   | \$2,500                 |
| Frey Foundation                               | \$5,000                 |
| Harold K. L. Castle Foundation                | \$10,000                |
| Kansas Health Foundation                      | \$5,000                 |
| Kresge Foundation                             | \$50,000                |
| McKnight Foundation                           | \$25,000                |
| Robert Wood Johnson Fnd.                      | \$50,000                |
| Russell Family Foundation                     | \$1,000                 |
| Ruth Mott Foundation                          | \$500                   |
| Saint Luke's Foundation                       | \$5,000                 |
| Surdna Foundation                             | \$15,000                |
| William and Flora Hewlett Foundation          | \$25,000                |
| William Penn Foundation                       | \$2,000                 |
| <b>Total Committed</b>                        | <b><u>\$394,000</u></b> |
| Total Budget                                  | \$566,066               |
| <b>Unfunded Balance</b>                       | <b>\$172,066</b>        |
| <br><b><u>Pending</u></b>                     |                         |
| Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation             | TBD                     |
| <b>Total Pending</b>                          | <b><u>TBD</u></b>       |
| <b>Total Awarded and Pending</b>              | <b><u>\$394,000</u></b> |