

**Future Impact:
Considering foundation philanthropy in California**

Conference Report

**The Getty Center
Los Angeles, California
August 3, 1999**

**© Lucy Bernholz 1999. All Rights Reserved.
Blueprint R & D
San Francisco, California**

**Future Impact:
Considering foundation philanthropy in California**

Executive Summary

The Conference

On August 3, 1999, thirty foundation executives and scholars from California gathered at The Getty Center in Los Angeles to discuss how to assess the impact of foundation philanthropy in the state. The rapid growth of foundation philanthropy in California and the state's role as a harbinger of future demographic, social and economic trends for the nation as a whole contributed to the timely nature of the conversation.

The conference was organized by the San Francisco consulting firm Blueprint R &D and the New York University Center for the Study of American Culture and Education, and hosted by The Getty Grant Program. The topic and agenda brought foundation executives and scholars together to consider the nature of philanthropic impact, the purposes of research on the issues, and several potential strategies for moving forward.

The Challenge

The challenge is to build a body of independent research that can capture the essence of CA philanthropy as it now is, communicate that in ways that are meaningful to philanthropic decision makers and scholars, and be positioned also to identify and explain the changes in the field. Constructing such an approach was described as a process of "writing history as it happens" and positioning the field to be able to answer questions regarding the future impact of philanthropy.

Foundations in California are growing, in both numbers and asset size, faster than anywhere else in the nation. In addition, new strategies of institutional philanthropy are being created and philanthropists are searching for ways to understand the impact of their giving. Scholarship on philanthropy is an emerging field, and the literature and research resources available for considering the role of foundations in the American West are few. The opportunity to consider how to spur high quality scholarship on foundation philanthropy, how to use research to inform foundation practice, and how to begin answering questions regarding the current and future impact of foundation philanthropy in California, the West and beyond was the impetus for the conference.

With the rapidly growing foundation assets in the State, and the resultant overlap in program areas, the need to know "what happens independent of foundation investment" and "what happens from the aggregate foundation investment" in healthcare, test scores, or audience development becomes ever more pressing.

These questions were deliberately framed by region. The regional nature of foundation philanthropy is a largely unexplored field of study. Within the frame of region,

conference participants also considered research on community-specific philanthropy, trend analysis of foundation giving in a single program area, and the interactions between public and private funders. All of these perspectives shape the final recommendations for considering foundation impact.

The Opportunity

Bringing together scholars and foundation executives to develop research strategies on philanthropy has the potential to:

- Advance the field of philanthropy by fostering rigorous methodologies for assessing impact;
- Enrich and disseminate scholarship on philanthropy by providing forums for active discussion with practitioners; and
- Inform scholarship on public policy and social issues in which foundations work by bringing to light the role of philanthropy in public/private intersections.

Understanding the rapid changes in philanthropy, locally and globally, is of paramount concern and timeliness.

Key Questions

Four guiding questions framed the day: How can we assess foundation impact over time? How do region, community, and program focus matter in the assessment of foundation impact? What research topics are of use to both scholars and the field of philanthropy? What are viable strategies for answering the questions of foundation impact?

The conference focused on California, and the characteristics of the State added to the list of key questions. Currently home to the fastest growing foundation sector in the country, a seat of remarkable population and economic growth, and one the nation's most diverse demographic bases, "California is," as Wallace Stegner once said, "America, only more so." In considering this rapidly changing place, a model for analyzing foundation impact needs to be able to answer the following questions as well:

- What happens when a foundation sector grows this fast and this large?
- What kinds of organizations are being created that constitute this growth?
- Are they different, or just more and bigger?
- How do these foundations work with each other? How do they work against each other?
- How do they interact with the nonprofit and policy sectors?
- What impact will the foundation sector have on the future of California?

Recommended Strategies

The conference participants discussed the following strategies for assessing foundation impact and for deepening scholarship on philanthropy.

1. **Foster scholarship on foundation philanthropy in the American West and share that research with the field through roundtables of scholars and foundation executives.** Sponsor opportunities for scholars in fields of interest to present their work to foundations and to consider the role of foundation philanthropy in their larger studies of social issues and/or public policy.
2. **Develop regional “mapping” projects.** Create local maps of foundation funding on specific issues in defined regions to inform the field on the aggregated trends, directions and impact of foundation funds over time. These maps would be visual, narrative, and quantitative.
3. **Integrate scholarship on foundation philanthropy into professional development opportunities for foundation professionals, board members, and individual philanthropists.** Use histories, case studies, and research on foundation trends and characteristics to provide ongoing learning opportunities about philanthropy. Partners could include scholarly associations, research institutes, and California or Western regional associations.
4. **Create a “Cybrary” to link existing foundation studies on issues in California for use across foundations and by scholars.** Leverage existing research on funding trends and community opportunities currently commissioned by individual foundations to inform the field more broadly.

For more information on the Future Impact Conference or the strategies presented in this paper contact: Lucy Bernholz, Blueprint R & D, 45 Franklin Street, Suite 220, San Francisco, California, 94102. 415-255-9700, lucyb@blueprintrd.com, www.blueprintrd.com

Future Impact Considering foundation philanthropy in California

Conference purpose and participants

On August 3, 1999, thirty foundation executives and scholars gathered at the Getty Center to consider potential ways of understanding the impact of foundation philanthropy in California. The day was organized by the San Francisco consulting firm Blueprint R & D and the New York University Center for the Study of American Culture and Education, and hosted by The Getty Grant Program.

The meeting was designed to present several frameworks for considering the impact of foundation philanthropy, now and in the future. All participants agreed that California provides an exciting and illustrative place to focus such inquiries, given that the state now contains the nation's fastest rate of growth in foundation assets, is home to one of the world's largest economies, is the most populous state in the nation, and is a harbinger of demographic change.

The meeting structure deliberately brought together foundation executives with university scholars. Understanding the impact of philanthropy will require the involvement of the best researchers and has the potential to inform existing scholarship on social issues. Developing mutual research interests and fostering an exchange of ideas between scholars and philanthropic practitioners was one of the key goals for the meeting.

Framing the questions

Foundations have struggled for years to assess their impact. There are many constituencies interested in such work. Foundation board members and executives want to know the impact of their funding. Policy makers, the media and donors want to know which philanthropic strategies are effective and which are not.

The intersections between public policy and private philanthropy seem only to grow more prevalent as philanthropic assets grow and the public sector programs reform and devolve to state and local levels. In light of these changes, nonprofit leaders need to know how to maximize their relationships with both public and private funders. At the same time, scholars in the humanities, social sciences, business, and the law are increasingly recognizing the need to understand the role and impact of private funders in social issues and matters of public policy as the traditional lines between the sectors shift.

Meeting participants were introduced to various perspectives for considering foundation philanthropy, including the regional lens and a community analysis. In

addition, two case studies were presented: an issue-specific study and an example of a regionally-specific, issue-driven, public-private partnership. The two frameworks were deliberately presented as complementary strategies, and the case studies provided the depth and insight of living examples.

Four guiding questions framed the day: How can we assess foundation impact over time? How do region, community, and program focus matter in the assessment of foundation impact? What research topics are of use to both scholars and the field of philanthropy? What are viable strategies for answering the questions of foundation impact?

This list of key questions was augmented by certain specific characteristics of California. Currently home to the fastest growing foundation sector in the country, a seat of remarkable population and economic growth, and one the nation's most diverse demographic bases, "California is," as Wallace Stegner once said, "America, only more so." In considering this rapidly changing place, a model for analyzing foundation impact needs to be able to answer the following questions as well:

- What happens when a foundation sector grows this fast and this large?
- What kinds of organizations are being created that constitute this growth?
- Are they different, or just more and bigger?
- How do these foundations work with each other? How do they work against each other?
- How do they interact with the nonprofit and policy sectors?
- What impact will the foundation sector have on the future of California?

The regional lens

Regional studies of foundation impact are compelling and were used as an overall framework for the meeting. Regional analysis allows for the close examination of other key variables, including the sizes of the philanthropic and nonprofit communities, the interactions between public and private sector decision makers, the influence of urban, suburban or rural characteristics, the age of key institutions, and local and state political, economic or social values. The need to develop understanding and analysis of regions in the American West is particularly acute with regard to the historic literature on philanthropy, a body of work based almost entirely on organizations in the East. As philanthropic assets in the western states explode in size, the need to understand growth and impact, as well as the nature of the western story, becomes ever more pressing.

While it is tempting to equate region with existing political boundaries, more than one meeting participant pointed out that this easy designation may not be the most useful. As one person noted, "On certain issues, Southern California may

have more in common with San Antonio, Texas than with San Francisco.” Others pointed out that there are regional distinctions not captured by political lines and that marketing executives, for example, draw a unique regional map of the United States based on consumer characteristics. One of the compelling qualities of region as a lens is its relevance to foundations, most of which are clear about their geographic focus and concerned about the relationship between global trends and their local region.

Discussants also considered the comparative and aggregate values of regional analyses. As the geographic center of American foundation philanthropy shifts from East to West, there is a growing awareness that studies of foundation philanthropy across the country can be compared to one another to distill distinctive regional qualities and aggregated to draw a truly representative American picture. Just as the regional lens allows for close analysis, the comparative and aggregate views inform a more national understanding of philanthropic growth and change.

Relating the regional analysis to the global context was a new and compelling component of the frameworks presented. The current era of rapid global communication, interconnected economies, and highly mobile individuals and corporations has presented numerous new challenges to organized philanthropy. These rapidly changing times coincide with, and to some extent drive, an unprecedented rate of wealth creation and wealth differential. Understanding the global picture in ways that allow philanthropists to create locally significant strategies for social change calls for new ways of thinking about foundation work and impact.

Lucy Bernholz, President of Blueprint R & D and author of one of the few historical analyses of foundation giving in Northern California, presented a framework that links regional studies and global thinking. By thinking regionally in a global age Bernholz posited the idea of developing studies of the role of mobility, interconnectedness, and globalization in specific regions. Aligning regional analyses with global trends may be done by asking specific research questions about how foundations in different regions in California are changing their practices, working together, or shifting their boundaries and then comparing this picture to other places. Grounding these studies in the actual work and funding initiatives of foundations will add to their utility. In addition, the opportunity to learn from historical examples and past case studies is present and of interest.

Another strategy is to apply the very tools that are driving this age of globalization – rapid advances in information and communication technologies – to the tasks of studying and practicing foundation philanthropy. Regional research projects that put databases online, use data and global mapping software to draw maps of philanthropic giving in different parts of the state, and build shared libraries of information on philanthropy in certain regions are three possible approaches.

The regional framework presented was the basis for Bernholz's own work on philanthropic giving in public schools. Private Foundations and Public Schools: San Francisco in the 1960s and 1970s, a historical study of two foundations and one school district in San Francisco over a twenty year time period provides a model for thinking about future studies. First, it is important that the regions selected for analysis be of the right size and nature. This is to say that the region might not be a politically bounded county but must be a region (the San Francisco Bay Area or Silicon Valley, for example) that identifies itself and that matters to the foundations involved in the work.

Second, in framing a region, the density of the foundation community will matter; places with many foundations will differ from places with few, even if the total value of philanthropic assets are the same. Third, the great opportunity of regional analysis is to be able to aggregate foundation dollars at a regional level to see funding of significant size relative to public funds on a certain issue. Such studies can yield insight into direct collaborations between the public and private sector, as in the San Francisco Beacons Initiative case study presented at the conference.

Finally, regional studies can be used to shed light on issues that transcend public boundaries but that might align with the geographic focus of the local foundations. Transportation issues that cross county lines, pollution abatement on shared waterways, local mobility patterns of day laborers or homeless individuals, and suburban audience use of urban cultural resources are just a few examples of such issues. For foundations making decisions or scholars seeking better to understand these topics, regional analyses of public and private involvement will prove useful.

Community lens

In assessing the impact of foundation philanthropy it is important to recognize that there are both common attributes across organizations and communities, and qualities of philanthropy specific to certain communities. The role of community in structuring and influencing philanthropic tradition and impact was discussed by the conference participants in response to research conducted in the Jewish community. The working hypothesis is that communities, be they ethnic, religious, racial, or geographic communities, both shape and are shaped by the philanthropic institutions they support.

Gary Tobin of the Institute for Jewish and Community Research presented findings from his extensive research on Jewish foundations and individual Jewish philanthropists. Through surveys and interviews, the Institute has developed a framework for considering the interactions between individuals, institutions and communities. This framework has been used to assess the current state of

philanthropic giving in the Jewish community and to propose strategies for improving practice in the field.

The framework focuses on two key relationships: those between individuals and institutions, and the relationships amongst institutions. Tobin stresses the need to consider the role of individual people in assessing the impact of the foundations they create. In the Jewish community with which he works, Tobin has found the questions, attitudes, motivations and fears of individuals to be major forces in shaping the work of the philanthropic institutions. Trying to shape a philanthropic agenda for Jewish foundations as a group then, is a challenge of shaping consensus among the individual community leaders and encouraging communication between community and philanthropic leadership.

The research on the Jewish community has important ramifications for considering foundation impact in that community and beyond. Tobin's understanding of factors that affect individual philanthropic action include personal uncertainty, the fear of making mistakes, roles of professional advisors, risk-aversion/comfort, impatience and peer consciousness. These individual characteristics play themselves out in how institutions act, or more accurately, how individuals act when organized institutionally. When considering institutional impact, the challenge becomes factoring in these individual characteristics.

The overlap between the community lens and the regional lens is easy to see. The need to understand the individuals, organizations, and community of institutions within a place is paramount if a meaningful map of local philanthropic activity is to be developed. Some of the attributes that Tobin identifies in the Jewish community, moreover, may be found in other communities, just as some may be unique. The blend and balance of racial, religious and ethnic communities in any given region may influence the overall picture of philanthropic activity.

Arts funding over time: A program area case study

A brief discussion of the ways that foundation philanthropy have changed within a single issue area, the arts, serves as an example of industry-specific commissioned research. Over the course of twelve years Grantmakers in the Arts (GIA) has commissioned three studies of trends in arts philanthropy. Using the Foundation Center's national database, these studies have identified trends in arts grant making over time. The most recent study, completed in 1998 looked at the role of philanthropic funding in arts and culture from 1992-1996.

The studies draw on the Center's database of large grants (over \$10,000) and show retrospective, aggregate program priorities; growth or decline in the overall amount of private arts grants; variations in priority based on foundation structure;

and the prevalence of the arts as an area of focus for foundations. The 1998 report also identified regional variation in arts funding.

Following the 1998 study, Grantmakers in the Arts and the Foundation Center surveyed member foundations about their use of the research. A qualitative report on these findings is due toward the end of 1999. Several arts funders responded in a summer edition of the GIA newsletter regarding the utility of the report as a baseline study. What is significant about this case study is the interaction between the funders and the researchers. A common research agenda was established and an analysis carried out. Funders across the country considered the report in light of their own prevailing interest, be it regional differences between “haves and have nots” or the relative position of museums as grant recipients when compared to other cultural institutions. Others noted the “temptations” raised by this work, generating many more questions than it could possibly answer.

In presenting the case study, Loren Renz, Vice President for Research at the Foundation Center, was careful to explain the limitations of the study. As an example of applied research, the trend reports are quite helpful, for they show the dynamic use of industry-wide data, the natural interest in one’s own region or area of specialty, and the rich opportunity to expand on quantitative glimpses of national trends with qualitative considerations of regional or community variation.

While not intended as an impact assessment, the arts trend studies show how this type of research can be used to guide decision-making and collaboration. The case study whet the appetites of conference participants for both “decision-based” research and “conclusion-based” research.

Schools and Community: A public/private case study

The afternoon’s other case study presented a complementary approach to national trend analysis. Deborah Alvarez Rodriguez, Director of the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and their Families, sketched the history and short-term impact of a public-private collaboration called the Beacons Initiative.

Drawn from community school partnership models in New York City, the San Francisco Beacons Initiative focuses on positioning urban schools as neighborhood centers. The City’s five Beacons schools stay open late, provide classes for youth and adults, and represent shared decision-making, program provision, and resource allocation between the school district, community service providers, and numerous City departments. A governing body of public department and foundation leaders has overseen the initiative from its inception, and has made notable inroads in developing joint (or aligned) application, reporting and evaluation tools and measures.

As a case study for this presentation, the Beacon Initiative showed the complexity that can be brought to light when foundation philanthropy is considered on a close level. Even a quick review of the Initiative brought out the working dynamics between the individuals involved, the history of past joint projects, the politics that shape an autonomous school district's interactions with city government, the divergent strategies of the city's many philanthropic foundations, and the deliberate and fortuitous course of events that brought these pieces together to change the options for the city's children.

Taken together, the two case studies showed the value of both national, quantitative analysis and local, qualitative detail. Both approaches are useful to framing questions about foundation work, and ultimately the two together provide richer understanding of regional characteristics and global change.

Impact and evaluation

Throughout the day the conference participants responded to the frameworks for assessing foundation impact across the sector. The conference provided a natural opportunity for the foundation representatives to discuss their particular needs for research. Much of the work being done to consider foundation impact is clustered under the heading of evaluation, and it was on this topic that the greatest list of needs was generated.

Speaking from the perspectives of individual organizations, four participants presented their thoughts on impact and evaluation. Martha Campbell, Program Director for the James Irvine Foundation; Bruce Sievers, Executive Director of the Walter and Elise Haas Fund, and Peter Hero, President of Community Foundation Silicon Valley presented organization-specific thoughts. Caroline Tower, Executive Director of Northern California Grantmakers, commented on the research opportunities she saw from working with hundreds of funders as well as other regional associations.

All of the speakers emphasized a growing recognition of the need to consider impact. Whether the push comes from board members who are considering setting new organization priorities or from staff who want to know how effective one strategy is compared to another there is a drive to understand the results of foundation grants. There is also a growing consideration of external forces and the demands they make for a record of foundation impact. These sources include those completely outside of philanthropy, such as the media and the legislature, both of which seem to demand a reconciling of foundation impact with some cyclical frequency. Dynamics within the field of philanthropy but external to individual organizations are also a factor, including the sense that new donors want to see results in new ways and that the collaborative work done by so many foundations (especially in Northern California) call for some shared measures or benchmarks. The opportunities for new models of philanthropy and the

challenges they often assert with regard to the “old” ways of doing foundation business, also contribute to the growing interest in foundation impact.

While the need for research and a framework for considering impact was clearly widespread, the basic tools still seem to be at large. Conference participants identified a need for common metrics – ones that were both meaningful and accessible. This is a longstanding challenge to foundations, given the opportunity costs for these investments and the long-term nature of change in the fields in which foundations invest. Agreement was easily reached that any such metrics needed to be developed with foundation input.

Related to the question of metrics was the need for credible, independent data against which foundation investments and program outcomes could be assessed. Those foundations that were making considerable investments in program evaluation were well aware that there were few benchmarks against which individual program accomplishments are assessed. With the rapidly growing foundation assets in the State, and the resultant overlap in program areas, the need to know “what happens independent of foundation investment” and “what happens from the aggregate foundation investment” in health care, student test scores, or audience development becomes ever more pressing.

The long-term nature of social change has proven to be a large obstacle for foundations. Their significant investments in evaluation and assessment frequently lead to unsatisfying overall results, as the timeframes for measuring and the timeframes for meaningful change are very different.

In addition to the challenges of evaluation, the conference identified important industry-wide challenges to developing satisfactory impact assessments. The different organizational structures of community, private and corporate foundations require different professional skill sets and expertise, and place different priorities on assessment. These different types of foundations develop portfolios that can reflect widely disparate core values, from corporate visibility to commemorating a bygone ancestor. Developing common metrics and employing them across the industry will need to be done in such a way that these disparate attributes can still be considered. Just as challenging, in the short term, was hiring staff with the skills to do the existing work and also contribute to developing such meaningful measures.

Finally, the conference participants commented on the need not only to develop ways to consider the impact of the field, but ways to apply whatever is learned about that impact. Several participants pointed to the challenges of managing information, developing the professional expertise of foundation staff and boards, and being able to turn the vast quantities of information already available into useful knowledge.

Strategy recommendations

The conference captured the current opportunity to develop a research framework and agenda that can meet the needs of scholars and foundations alike. Several specific strategies were outlined. Some overarching principles for such work were also identified. These include the need to develop research that can guide ongoing decision-making processes, and research that is conclusion-based. Some independent research can serve as reference points for foundation program decisions and evaluations, while also adding to the scholarly understanding of regions and social issues. Projects or strategies to begin nurturing this research should be useful to the many constituencies interested in philanthropic impact, including nonprofit organizations, foundations, the public, and the media. The resources that already exist in the State, particularly research institutions, scholarly organizations, and foundation-commissioned research should be used as starting points for developing new studies and efforts.

The challenge is to build a body of independent research that can capture the essence of California philanthropy as it now is, disseminate that in ways that are meaningful to philanthropic decision-makers and scholars, and be positioned to also identify and explain the changes in the field. Constructing such an approach was described as a process of “writing history as it happens” and doing so would position the field to answer questions regarding the future impact of philanthropy.

From these broad principles, several specific strategies emerged for future consideration. Each of these is described below.

Foster scholarship on foundation philanthropy in the American West and share that research with the field through roundtables of scholars and foundation executives. Sponsor opportunities for scholars in fields of interest to present their work to foundations and to consider the role of foundation philanthropy in their larger studies of social issues and/or public policy. Scholarship that can contribute to the long-term analysis of foundation impact is of particular interest. Those who try to explain the impact of philanthropy often point to the long-term nature of outcomes in this type of work. Thus history is an important tool for understanding philanthropic impact -- it can take a long time to see change, and foundations and scholars should be prepared to look backward.

In order to be prepared to look backward, foundations can position themselves now by doing a better job of documenting the work, inviting observation and discussion and thinking about “writing the history as it happens.” Historians of the State or major regions, those who study social or sector issues of interest to foundations, as well as the history of key policy areas would be useful resources. This type of analysis includes existing or commissioned conclusion-based historical research.

Develop regional “mapping” projects. Local maps of foundation funding on specific issues in defined regions would inform the field on the aggregated trends, directions and impact of foundation funds over time. Such maps would be particularly useful for place-based analysis. Foundations are increasing their focus on place-based grantmaking, and regional analyses that would support the evaluations of these initiatives would have great utility. Comprehensive community initiatives, neighborhood efforts, and municipal grant initiatives would be supported by studies of broad foundation grantmaking trends in the same region. Historical narratives of the foundation communities and activities in those places and deeper understanding of the local foundation community involvement in specific issue areas would provide important reference points for these place-based efforts.

These maps would display aggregated foundation activity in a certain place, on certain issues, over time. Collaborative projects lead by small groups of funders could produce visual, narrative and quantitative “maps” of philanthropic investments in their regions. These maps, which would have several layers, could be considered in light of public funding or policy trends, demographic shifts, economic cycles, and provide a framework for considering foundation impact over time and in light of many variables. In addition, the resources that went into developing such maps would prove useful to scholars and would deepen their work.

Integrate scholarship on foundation philanthropy into professional development opportunities for foundation professionals, board members, and individual philanthropists. Use histories, case studies, and research on foundation trends and characteristics to provide ongoing learning opportunities about philanthropy. Partners could include scholarly associations, research institutes, and California or Western regional associations.

In addition to discussing the types of research that would help answer questions of impact, the conference participants were interested in ways to distribute the learning and enrich the understanding of professionals in the field. One proposed strategy was to develop roundtables of scholars and foundation executives that would convene for research presentations, consider the relationship of that research to their own scholarship or foundation focus, and generate additional ideas for future research. These roundtables also would strengthen the ties between the scholarly community and the foundations, setting the stage for greater use of scholarship by foundations and greater understanding of the philanthropic sector by scholars.

A roundtable structure provides a natural setting for California researchers to interact with burgeoning regional research efforts elsewhere in the country.

Create a “Cybrary” to link existing foundation studies on issues in California for use across foundations and by scholars. By building a cyber library (“cybrary”) and archives of their research, foundations would leverage information on funding trends and community opportunities -- that they currently commission individually -- into a knowledge resource for the field.

At the same time, foundations are increasingly coming to recognize the enormous information assets they do have and are willing to share. These include the research that they commission on their fields of interests, the outcomes of the evaluation studies they fund, and many general interest “findings” and white papers that the foundations develop. A cybrary provides a way to share this information and make it accessible across foundations and to scholars. As more and more of these resources become available online, the centralization and cataloguing of foundation reports, evaluations, issue assessments, and “best practice” papers would facilitate scholarship in related areas, the sharing of ideas across foundations, and, indirectly, an understanding of the field of philanthropy as it is changing.

One of the challenges to all of these ideas was gaining access to foundation information. Few foundations on the west coast allow scholars access to their archives, making historical analysis nearly impossible. Until such access is more widely available, the history of California philanthropy will remain largely untold.

Conclusion

Regional analysis, particularly in times of rapid global change, provides a powerful framework for considering the impact of foundations and philanthropy. It brings together many elements and variables that influence foundation work. Foundation decision makers employ this kind of thinking all the time, as much of their work involves asking “what is going on in the big picture and where should we put these funds to make meaningful (often local) changes?” Employing a research and conceptual framework that makes explicit the implicit challenges and activities in philanthropy is a positive step toward bridging the gaps between scholarship and practice, and developing ways to understand the overall impact of the ever-growing foundation sector.

The strategies presented at the Future Impact conference provide feasible options for answering key questions facing philanthropy today. The next step is to put these ideas into action.

For more information on the Future Impact Conference or the strategies presented in this paper contact: Lucy Bernholz, Blueprint R & D, 45 Franklin Street, Suite 220, San Francisco, California, 94102. 415-255-9700, lucyb@blueprintrd.com, www.blueprintrd.com.

Conference Participants

Ms. Deborah Alvarez Rodriguez
Director
Department of Children, Youth and Families
1390 Market Street, Suite 918
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dr. Lucy Bernholz
President
Blueprint R & D
45 Franklin Street, Suite 220
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: 415-255-9700
Fax: 415-255-9003

Ms. Donna Bojarsky
Dreyfus/James Productions
1041 North Formosa Ave
Santa Monica Building #104
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Ms. Michelle Boule
Center for the Study of American Culture
New York University, School of Education
Pless Hall Annex, Room 221
New York, NY 10003-6680

Mr. Paul Brest
Professor
Stanford Law School
Stanford, CA 94305
Incoming President
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
January 2000

Mr. Lon Burns
1625 19th Street
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Ms. Martha Campbell
Director of Evaluation
James Irvine Foundation
One Market Street, Steuart Tower, Suite
2500
San Francisco, CA 94105

Dr. Ellen Condliffe Lagemann
Professor
Center for the Study of American Culture
and Education
New York University, School of Education
Pless Hall Annex, Room 221
New York, NY 10003-6680

Dr. James Ferris
Professor, Program in Public Policy
School of Policy, Planning, and
Development
University of Southern California,
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0626

Mr. Rick Green
Program Specialist
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
300 Second Street, Suite 200
Los Altos, CA 94022

Mr. Peter Hero
Executive Director
Community Foundation Silicon Valley
111 West St. John Street, Suite 220
San Jose, CA 95113

Mr. Michael Klausner
Professor
Stanford Law School
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Ms. Jean Hofacket
Foundation Center Library
312 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA

Ms. Christina Legg
Program Officer
The Streisand Foundation
1460 4th Street, Suite 212
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Dr. Glenna Mathews
University of California Berkeley
Institute for Urban and Regional
Development
316 Wurster Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720

Mr. C. Jack Meyers
Deputy Director, Grants Program
The Getty Institute
1200 Getty Center Drive, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90049-1683

Dr. Theodore Mitchell
President
Occidental College
Office of the President
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Mr. David Mortimer
The American Assembly
475 Riverside Drive, Room 456
New York, NY 10115

Ms. Torie Osborne
Executive Director
Liberty Hill Foundation
2121 Cloverfield Blvd., Suite 113
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Dr. Amy Rabbino
Program Analyst
David L. Klein Jr. Foundation
45 Franklin Street, Suite 220
San Francisco, CA 94102

Ms. Loren Renz
Vice President of Research
The Foundation Center
79 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003-3076

Mr. Jack Shakely
President
California Community Foundation
606 S. Olive St., Suite 2400
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Mr. Bruce Sievers
President
Walter and Elise Haas Fund
One Lombard Street, Suite 305
San Francisco, CA 94111

Ms. Theresa Sivers
Director
Skylark Foundation
9220 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 218
Los Angeles, CA 90069

Ms. Kimberly Smith
Executive Director
New Schools Fund
2750 Sand Hill Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dr. Gary Tobin
President
Institute for Jewish and Community
Research
140 Balboa Street
San Francisco, CA 94118

Ms. Caroline Tower
Executive Director
Northern California Grantmakers
116 New Montgomery St, Suite 742
San Francisco, CA 94105

Ms. Ann Van Dormolen
Vice President & Treasurer
Weingart Foundation
1055 W. 7th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Ms. Louise Velezquaz
Interval Research Corporation
1801 Page Mill Road, Building C
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Ms. Susan Wisely
Program Director
The Lilly Endowment
2801 North Meridian Street
Indianapolis, IN 46208