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AAGP Mission:

The American Association of Grant Professionals (AAGP), a nonprofit membership association, builds and supports an international community of grant professionals committed to serving the greater public good by practicing the highest ethical and professional standards. To achieve this mission, AAGP:

- Serves as a leading authority and resource for the practice of grantsmanship in all sectors of the field.
- Advances the field by promoting professional growth and development.
- Enhances the public image and recognition of the profession within the greater philanthropic, public, and private funding communities.
- Promotes positive relationships between grant professionals and their stakeholders.

AAGP values, embraces, and supports the rich diversity within the grant profession.

About This Publication:

The Journal of the AAGP is a professional journal devoted to the improvement of the grants professional and the profession. It is a resource for teaching and learning within the profession and provides an outlet for sharing information about the profession. It also provides a forum for the discussion of issues within the grants profession and the expression of philosophical ideas.
Dear Readers,

Welcome to the third issue of the *Journal of the American Association of Grant Professionals*. We wish you well this Holiday season and hope you can enjoy time with family and friends.

This issue contains a wide variety of information for today’s grant professional. It is also our largest volume to date. You have available:

- An opinion piece from Michael Wells on today’s grants picture;
- A piece by Maryn Boess using a game theme to detail how to manage your organization’s grantseeking effort;
- A discussion by Gary Frye of the effects of the *No child Left Behind Act* on public schools;
- Phyllis Renninger’s second interview with funders;
- A recorded history of Mary Hale Meyer’s adventure starting a new job and setting up a grants office;
- Michael Wells presenting information on how to use logic models to improve your applications and your programs;
- A piece by VC League teaching the importance of, and how to develop a grant team;
- A discussion by Linda Fairchild of how civil society and our interconnectedness affects the collaborative effort; and
- An update from Randal Givens on the practical side of certification.

We have also included some book reviews and Web reviews to add to your libraries and bookmarks. We hope those of you reading this issue will join these authors and contribute your knowledge and skills to future issues. AAGP is a member-driven organization. Your participation makes it grow and become stronger. That strength supports the entire profession.

On behalf of the Editorial Board, I would like to thank the authors included in this issue. It is through your efforts and work that we have succeeded in publishing this issue of the *JAAGP*. My thanks also go out to the Editorial Board for their hard work, ideas, time and energy. It is only with their support and yours that we can continue to bring you such outstanding works. I hope you enjoy your reading experience.

Sincerely,

Iris A. Coffin, Chair
*JAAGP* Editorial Board
Founding Member, AAGP
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Doom and Gloom

By Michael Wells

Michael Wells has been consulting to nonprofits since 1987, focusing exclusively on grants since 1995. Michael has worked with over a hundred nonprofit agencies, as well as school districts, Indian tribes, local governments and businesses. He is a Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) and has a masters degree in humanities. He currently teaches grant writing at Portland State University. Michael is a board member of the American Association of Grant Professionals.

I hear a lot of people these days worrying about the sagging economy and the drop in the stock market and the supposedly tight grants environment. It seems like the foundations have lost a bundle in the market and grants are harder to get than ever. Woe is us. And while of course there’s some truth to that, it’s not the whole picture. If we step back a bit and take a longer view, it’s not all doom and gloom.

Most large foundations have their assets in the markets. The stock market was berserk in the 1990s. The Dow Jones Industrial Average was about 3300 when Clinton took office and about 11000 when he left. Last year it into dropped to the 7000s and is now back up in the mid 9000s. So, the last decade was a rocket ride and the last two years a roller coaster. If we look at today compared to the market’s high, the Dow is down about 12%. But if we look at today compared to 10 years ago, it’s up 243%, resulting in a net gain of 143%. (For the record, Dow Jones tracks established industrial America. NASDAQ tracks the technology sector or dot coms.)

What does this mean for foundations? Mostly, they’ve been along for the ride. They’ve been up a lot and are down a bit. As an example, let’s look at the Meyer Trust, Oregon’s largest foundation, because I’m familiar with it and I think it's fairly typical of large, general-purpose foundations with diversified portfolios. They had $500 million in 2001; this March they had about $400 million. But 10 years ago they had $300 million, so even after last year’s loss they grew 33% in a decade, while granting $200 million at the same time! And since my conservative retirement accounts have almost fully recovered, I’d guess several foundations’ portfolios have too.

But, in Oregon at least, there’s also a bigger picture. There has been a huge infusion of money into foundations in the last five years or so. Of the 15 largest Oregon foundations, five are new and four others received large contributions. They added over $1 billion in new assets between 1998 and 2001, a 50% increase! That's just Oregon, a small, not-so-rich state, and only the biggest foundations, not to mention smaller ones or community foundation donations.
According to the Foundation Center, this is a national trend. Total foundation giving grew from $9.2 billion in 1991 to over $29 billion in 2001. Since almost all follow the 5% rule, we can assume that assets also tripled in that time. The Foundation Center also says that 40% of America’s large foundations have been established since 1990. There’s every indication that that growth in the number of foundations is going to continue.

So maybe things aren’t so bad.

What lessons can we take from this? Let’s go back to the Meyer Trust. Their Executive Director spoke at the local Association of Fundraising Professionals a few months ago and he said their total requests were down from last year, despite the increasing demand for social services. Apparently many nonprofits decided that giving was going to be tight and didn’t ask.

I guess the first lesson is to ask -- don’t make assumptions about funders’ giving capacity, at least for your routine grants. We usually don’t know how an individual foundation’s portfolio is doing, what other proposals they’re looking at, or where their priorities are.

I think the second lesson is to take the longer view for major proposals. What happened to a lot of foundations is they made big multi-year grants during the boom and they now have to pay them off from smaller asset bases. So last year and this year their current grant amounts may be down, but next year when they’ve paid off their commitments they’ll go up again. If you’re thinking of a big project that can wait, look in your prospect’s annual reports and see how many multi-year commitments they have outstanding. Maybe delaying your major proposal until their next fiscal year makes sense.

The third lesson is, keep your research current. Even if you think you know the top 10 foundations in your state, check and see if there are new ones. I had known about each of the big new Oregon foundations individually, but I didn’t put together what an impact they had collectively until I was asked to speak about the grants environment to United Way agencies and made a chart.

The last thing is, cheer up. Either things will get better or they’ll get worse, and your worrying about the economy isn’t going to change them. It’s unlikely we’re going to sink back to the levels of 10 or even five years ago. Spend your time developing good projects and planning how to get them funded.
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The Grantsmanship Game: Playing to Win

By Maryn M. Boess

Maryn M. Boess is the founding director of GrantsUSA, LLC (www.GrantsUSA.net), grants training and resource service. A highly-regarded national workshop and seminar leader, Maryn’s skill-building sessions on grantsmanship, collaboration, organizational effectiveness, and other topics attract many hundreds of participants every year. Maryn currently serves as AAGP vice president and chairs the Membership Services committee.

One of the most popular workshops we offer through GrantsUSA is a two-day intensive program we call “The Grantsmanship Game: Playing to Win.” The title always catches some people off-guard: Some folks are a bit troubled by the notion of comparing the hard work of managing a grants process with playing a game. Shouldn’t we take grantseeking more seriously than that? Isn’t grantseeking just the simple activity of filling in blanks on a funding application? Does thinking of grantseeking as a “game” mean we’re in competition with each other? Are we saying that we should be having more fun?

In my 18 years of working as an active grant professional – first as a program planner and proposal writer, more recently in my work as a trainer and coach – I have come to see clearly that grantsmanship is not an activity; it’s a strategic, systematic process. At GrantsUSA, we like to call the process “The Grantsmanship Game.” It’s all about managing the details of your organization’s grantseeking effort in a way that gives your proposals the winning edge – and helps them rise to the top when funders make their grant awards. It’s a serious game, to be sure: The well-being of thousands of people can depend on the outcome. But just like any game, it has several basic elements that you need to consider, and learn to work with, in order to win the game consistently.

In this article, we’ll offer a preview of what the Grantsmanship Game is all about, and in future issues of the Journal, we’ll take a closer look at what it takes to become a more consistently successful player.

“Unpacking” the Game

Basketball, checkers, Monopoly, hockey: Different games, yes – but they do share some important elements in common. The Grantsmanship Game shares these elements as well. Here’s what you’ll find when you pull the cover off your Grantsmanship Game box:

_A gameboard._ The gameboard is the playing field, or operating environment, in which the game is conducted. The operating environment is always unique to the game.
being played: It’s pretty tough to play basketball on a checkerboard, or Monopoly in a hockey rink. In the Grantsmanship Game, the operating environment includes your community, your constituents, the regulatory and legislative environment, the socioeconomic and political climate of your community, even the culture and values of your own organization. All of these factors will significantly and dramatically influence the shape of your grantseeking process – and the strategies that will help you be most successful.

**Rules.** All games have rules. These are the non-negotiable fundamental must-do’s and must-have’s of a particular game. If you want to play the game, you must agree to follow the rules. If you don’t follow the rules, either you never get into the game in the first place, or you find yourself “kicked off” the gameboard and out of the game completely. More about the five essential rules of the Grantsmanship Game later.

**Moves, or squares.** In many games, the players must make their way around the gameboard by moving through a sequence of squares, in some specified order. The same is true in the Grantsmanship Game. The moves or squares are the steps that players must take to make progress toward the end goal. In the Grantsmanship Game, the squares represent the tasks or activities that are important to a complete, rock-solid grants process. The moves don’t necessarily have to be made in one-after-another sequence – but no skipping allowed! If a “chance” card (see below) jumps you backward or forward, you must go back and make sure you take care of all the steps you might have missed.

**“Chance” cards.** Guess what – we don’t control everything! Monopoly has its “chance” cards – at any given moment in a game, you can draw a card that either propels you forward or sets you back unexpectedly. Grantseekers know this is true in our game, as well. No matter how carefully we plan and how conscientiously we follow the moves, the unexpected can happen: A key staff person gets sick just before deadline; a major partner pulls out; another major source of funding comes through for you, completely out of the blue. When the Grantsmanship Game hands you a “chance” card like one of these, the layout of the gameboard makes it easier to figure out what you need to do to get back on track and back in the game.

**A “winner’s” goal.** Most games have a clear-cut starting point; not all have a clear-cut end. Monopoly is one example: The game can go on and on until there’s only one player left standing. The Grantsmanship Game is another example. It’s actually a cyclical game: Once you’re on the gameboard, you keep playing as long as you like, cycling through the same rules and the same steps over and over again, only with different corporate, foundation and government funders each time. The game is “won” each time the process succeeds in producing a solid grant proposal that reflects your organization’s very best efforts – one that represents your mission as a service organization, and at the same time connects with the philanthropic mission of the grantmaker.

**Strategies.** Finally, it isn’t enough to simply be familiar with the gameboard and have memorized the official, non-negotiable rules. To be truly, consistently, predictably successful in any game over time, we must also have practical knowledge about how to apply effective strategies. These are the skills and understandings we bring to the game that dramatically affect how efficiently and successfully we address the challenges and decisions that arise as we navigate the gameboard. Many of the top strategies for the Grantsmanship Game are ones we learn over time, through experience. But I maintain that we all start out with three of the most important strategies in our skill bank. These
are: Common sense (surprising how quickly our ability to apply common sense becomes threatened when money is at stake!); good people skills (another surprise: contrary to many opinions, grantsmanship is a people-driven process, not a paper-driven one); and a team- or partnership-oriented mindset (about which more later).

Rules of the Game

The Grantsmanship Game is different every time it’s played, because the specifics of each funder’s priorities, needs and interests are different. But there are five basic rules that drive the game and keep you in control of the process. These are:

Rule 1: Know Yourself.

This rule speaks to the heart of the matter, which I call mission-driven grantsmanship. Success in grantseeking begins at the beginning: With a deeply held, common understanding of who you are as an organization, what you’re here to do in the world, and why it’s important. “Deeply held” means this understanding is the foundation of everything you do as an organization. “Common” means all the stakeholders are marching under the same banner – program staff, administrative staff, board members, volunteers. Focus first on clearly, concisely and compellingly telling your organization’s story and articulating your mission, vision and values. Then and only then will you be prepared to share that story with potential funders.

Rule 2: Build True Partnerships.

A Federal program officer said it loud and clear a few years back: “Whether the funder requires it or not, if it ain’t a collaborative proposal, it ain’t gonna be competitive.” It’s all about leveraging. How can you work with other members of your community to share resources, responsibilities, risks and rewards? The emphasis here is on the word “true.” Funders aren’t fooled by a “partnership” that consists of a slapped-together list of names with no sense of commitment or shared vision behind it. The best partnerships begin before there’s money on the table, because two or three or four people from different organizations recognize an opportunity to work together for the greater good of each other – and the community at large.

Rule 3: Plan, Plan, Plan – Plan!

Did you know that only 20% of a successful grantseeking effort involves actually writing the proposal? The other 80% consists of – you guessed it – planning. A solid grant proposal is nothing more than a business plan, plain and simple. You wouldn’t go to a bank for a loan without a business plan in place; nor should you approach a prospective funder with anything less than a complete, detailed blueprint for how you see your program or project working. The planning should take place before you begin assembling a request for a particular funder. In other words, develop your own business plan first – then you can draw from it and tailor it to fit any grantmaker’s required form and format.

Rule 4: Know Your Funder.

Ah, at last – we’re getting down to the nitty-gritty. “Know Your Funder” speaks to the issue of doing your homework – of using the appropriate resources to identify your
**Rule 1: KNOW YOUR SELF**

1. Develop or review mission
2. Develop or review case statement
3. Wish list/priorities
4. Project profile worksheets
5. Look for partnership potential
6. Host community planning meeting
7. Establish partnership roles/responsibilities
8. Develop project issue statement
9. Develop targets and evaluation
10. Develop program methodology
11. Outline master blueprint
12. Develop budget
13. Finalize master blueprint
14. Research publications for funders
15. Contact funders for additional details
16. Develop "A-list" of funders
17. "WHO DO YOU KNOW WHO KNOWS SOMEBODY?"
18. Begin building long-term relationship
19. Target request to "A-list" funders
20. Submit qualified request by deadline
21. Get funded -- thank the funder(s)!
22. Implement project
23. Evaluate process and program

**Rule 2: BUILD TRUE PARTNERSHIPS**

**Rule 3: PLAN, PLAN, PLAN -- PLAN!**

**Rule 4: KNOW YOUR FUNDING SOURCE**

**Rule 5: CREATE A PERFECT PROPOSAL**

THE WINNING EDGE:

$UCCE$$ IN THE GRANT$MAN$HIP GAME!
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A-list of grantmakers most likely to be interested in what you have to offer, and then of finding out everything you can about who they are, what they’re looking for, and what they hope to achieve with their grantmaking – before you decide whether to submit a proposal. All other factors aside, the single most important reason funders choose to support a given request for funding is that what the applicant has to offer helps the funders achieve their own mission and purpose in the world. An additional word of wisdom: The best time to begin a relationship with a prospective funder is not two days before the proposal is due.

**Rule 5: Create a winning proposal.**

This is where it all comes together, at last. What is a “winning” proposal? Well, getting funded is a good indicator here – but there’s more to it than that. Whether or not a given proposal is chosen for funding depends on a lot of considerations that are outside the grantseeker’s direct control. For me, the definition of a “winning” proposal focuses on four qualities that we can control. These are:

1. **It’s in on time.** No ifs, ands, or buts. If there’s a deadline, and you don’t meet it, nothing else matters. End of subject.
2. **It crosses all the t’s and dots all the i’s.** Whatever instructions or qualifications the funder holds for the proposal, you’ve paid attention to each and every one of them. Otherwise you run the risk of becoming an “easy out” -- as in: “Oops, look, we asked that proposals be submitted unbound, and this one’s stapled. Well, that’s one more proposal we won’t have to bother reading.”
3. **The proposal clearly represents the front end of a well-thought-out business plan.** This relates directly back to Rule #3 and calls on us to make sure all the questions have been answered, all the pieces are in place, and everything holds together and makes sense.
4. **Your proposal makes it very clear how supporting your proposal will help the funder further its own philanthropic mission.** Guess what: Grantmakers need us – they can’t fulfill their philanthropic missions for creating change in the world without the programs and services that we offer. Our proposals succeed to the extent that we can demonstrate this all-important match with the funder’s own mission.

**The Rule of Common Sense**

There’s one other non-negotiable rule to success in the grantsmanship game – and that’s what I call the Rule of Common Sense. We mentioned this earlier, as part of our discovery of the Grantsmanship Game process, but it bears looking at again. All other things being equal, we can rely on our own innate common sense – the same good thinking skills that have helped us be successful in other areas of our life – to guide us through much of the Grantsmanship Game’s murkier territories.

As you’re moving around the gameboard, ask yourself almost any question – for instance: (1) The page limits are so strict; should I eliminate headings and bulleted lists to save space? (2) I wonder if the funder would like to see a description of our partnership efforts, even if it isn’t required? (3) I don’t understand this instruction; what do they really want here? (4) We don’t fit their guidelines but they’re new in our community and doing a lot of local funding. Shouldn’t we send a proposal too?
Then ask yourself: What would common sense dictate? The answers will be, in this order: (1) How would you like it if you were the reviewer struggling through 300 proposals that were nothing but paragraph after paragraph of solid black unbroken text?; (2) Sure, wouldn’t you?; (3) Don’t guess or second-guess – call the funder and ask; and (4) Nope! -- though you may want to begin a “feeling-them-out” relationship in case they open up their funding priorities.

See? That wasn’t so tough. Common sense wins, virtually every time. Hang on to yours, as tightly as you can. You’ll encounter plenty of fellow players along the way who will try to wrest your common sense from you, in the name of chasing the money. Don’t let them. Trust the good judgment that has brought you this far. It can take you all the way.

**A Final Word About “Fun”**

At the beginning of our “Grantsmanship Game” workshop, as a warm-up I often ask people what associations they can make between the words “grantsmanship” and “game.” Most of the answers are pretty predictable: They’ll come up with rules, and players; money (if they’re thinking about Monopoly); competition; and winning. Rarely, a lone voice will raise tremulously in the back of the room, as if almost embarrassed to speak out: “What about fun? I think working on grant proposals is fun. Am I crazy?”

Yes, you are – crazy like a fox. After all, enjoying what we do is what puts the zip in our work, keeps us coming back, keeps us wanting to do more, do better, stretch and grow. The great thing is, it works the other way around, too: The better we are at doing something, the more we’re likely to enjoy doing it.

And – guess what! The more we win, too.
Changes in Grant Proposals Brought about by No Child Left Behind and the New Focus of the White House on Faith-Based and Community-Based Initiatives

By Gary Lee Frye, Ed.D.

Dr. Frye is currently the Lubbock-Cooper Independent School District Grant Writer/Dyslexia Coordinator. He holds a Master’s in Special Education along with 13 provisional and five professional certifications from Texas Education Agency and has an Educational Doctorate in Educational Leadership from Texas Tech University. He has presented at several state and national conferences on the subject of grant proposal writing and served as a grant reviewer for the Texas Education Agency and the Department of Education on numerous grants.

Introduction

The 2002 “No Child Left Behind” legislation has posed unique and fundamental changes in the level and type of collaborations demanded for Requests for Proposals (RFPs). These changes differ from proposal development and proposal review process experienced previously. In the new scenario, RFPs demand that Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), Faith-Based Organizations (FBOs), Local Education Agencies (LEAs), and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) work together on projects that before 2002 would have been done by LEAs or IHEs alone. This case study traces the changes that have occurred at the Federal and state levels in the RFP process through the types of collaborations delineated as required for funding and/or to receive bonus points in the scoring of the proposal. The implications for the development of grant proposal sthat would be competitive in light of this fundamental change are also discussed along with how Lubbock-Cooper Independent School District (LCISD) is working with an IHE (Texas Tech University) to develop a forum where CBOs, FBOs, LEAs, and IHEs come together to form collaboratives for RFPs.

Public School Districts’ Need for Additional Funding

Because of the “No Child Left Behind” legislation (NCLB) focus on measurable student progress, public school districts are under growing pressure to have ever increasing student achievement performance scores. This translates into the desire of school districts to have additional curriculum programs to improve all students’ scores --
along with specialized programs to target improving at-risk students’ scores, since their scores tend to be the lowest in most school districts. Within this dynamic there is the pressure of a lack of additional fiscal resources that limits the new programs a school district can initiate.

Since the 1980s, people have been discussing that “tightening of the financial belt” (Seldin & Maloy, 1981, 330) and “declining enrollments and dwindling budgets” (Maloy & Seldin, 1982, 65) have led public school systems to increasingly look to Federal and state grants to support new and innovative educational programs. These authors made the point that for many school systems the decision will be “what educational programs must go, rather than what new program to support” (Seldin & Maloy, 1981, 330). White and Morgan (1992) discussed the financial straitjacket that most school systems find themselves in because of a “triad of budget woes of shrinking tax dollars at the local, state, and Federal levels; ever-rising fixed expenses; and skyrocketing personnel costs” (p. 260). Schnitzer and Nichols (1998) stated that, “Finding novel ways to fund projects that do not fall under the regular operating budget is important to school leaders in today’s budget-tightening world” (p.1). The reason for this is that it is no longer enough to have a teacher standing in front of a class imparting his/her wisdom and then asking students to recite that wisdom on a conventional assessment measure. Instead, “reformers call for teachers to be facilitators of instruction, students to be involved in relevant, real-life experiences, and the curriculum to provide the skills, processes, and knowledge for productive citizenship in the third millennium….None of these changes comes without a price tag – yet the needed funding is often outside the reach of the school district’s regular operating budget…” (Schnitzer & Nichols, 1998, p. 1). The consensus from the 20-plus years of discussion about alternative methods for funding public education is that a coordinated effort to develop additional funds would yield real benefits to public pre-K-12 education, allowing it to achieve the new vision of what an effective public education system means.

Changes in Governmental Focus: Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives

NCLB along with other Executive Orders and additional legislation have ushered in major changes in the nature and type of partners now required to develop competitive grant proposals. The Charitable Choice Act of 2001, which was contained in H.R. 7/H.R. 1284 (the Community Solutions Act of 2001), ended discrimination against religious organizations participating in certain Federal financial assistance programs, as long as the program is implemented with consideration for the religion clauses contained in the U.S. Constitution. Executive Order 13198, “Agency Responsibilities with Respect to Faith-Based and Community Initiatives,” and Executive Order 13199, “Establishment of White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives,” directed five agencies (Justice, Education, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Housing and Urban Development) to each establish a Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

All executive departments and agencies were directed to designate an agency employee to serve as the liaison and point of contact for the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. (To date there have been seven Cabinet-level Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives established: Agency of International Development and the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Health and Human
Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Labor.) The additional two agencies were added by Executive Order 13280: Responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development with Respect to Faith-based and Community Initiatives. The Orders directed each agency to cooperate with the office and, to the extent permitted by law, provide such support, information, and assistance as may be requested.

The primary purpose of these efforts was to eliminate regulatory, contracting, and other programmatic obstacles to the participation of faith-based and other community organizations in the delivery of Federally funded social services. Executive Order 13279: “Equal Protection of the Laws for Faith-Based and Community Organizations,” provided a statement of six fundamental principles designed to allow these groups to receive Federal funding. Given the value-laden wording, a case could be made that this Order in fact promoted the awarding of funds to these groups. An example of this value-laden wording is as follows: “…in order to further the strong Federal interest in ensuring that the cost and progress of Federal procurement contracts are not adversely affected by an artificial restrictions of the labor pool caused by the unwarranted exclusion of faith-based organizations from such contracts…” Further support for this assertion can be found in the prepared remarks of Attorney General John Ashcroft given on January 13, 2003, to the White House Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Conferences, which are as follows:

…the government has discriminated against people of faith who are striving to do good for others. Out of fear, ignorance and occasional bigotry, faith-based groups have been prohibited from competing for Federal funding on a level playing field with secular groups…. Under Charitable Choice, organizations cannot be excluded merely because they have a cross on their wall or a rabbi on the board of directors. Faith-based organizations cannot be denied the opportunity to meet needs simply because they hire workers who share their religious beliefs. And they cannot be forced to change or compromise their beliefs or their mission in order to qualify for participation in Federal program…. For the first time in a long time, our leaders in Washington understand what Americans of all religious backgrounds have long held to be true: Through faith, all things are possible. (p. 2)

Changes in Grant Partners for Creation of Viable Proposals

One current grant request from the Department of Education embodies the new focus on collaboration and the level of linkage among various groups that is now needed to create a viable grant proposal. The Office of Innovation and Improvement – Teaching American History Grant Program, which will fund almost $100 million dollars worth of programs, begins by stating that the purpose of the program was to “…raise student achievement by improving teachers' knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of traditional American history. Grant awards assist local educational agencies (LEAs), in partnership with entities that have extensive content expertise…. “ The only eligible applicants for the grant were LEAs (including charter schools); but the RFP stated that
the LEA had to work in partnership “...with one or more of the following entities: Institutions of higher education (IHEs); non-profit history or humanities organizations; and libraries and museums.” The RFP also provide up to 20 bonus points, on a 100-point grant, for a proposal that can demonstrate:

…through a rigorous evaluation, whether the implemented program produces meaningful effects on student achievement or teacher performance. Evaluations using an experimental design are best for determining program effectiveness... Evaluations using an experimental design will receive up to 20 points... If random assignment is not feasible, the project may use a quasi-experimental design...Evaluations of this type will receive up to 15 points... Proposed evaluations that use neither experimental designs with random assignment nor quasi-experimental designs using a matched comparison group will receive 0 points under this competitive preference priority.

This intensity of evaluation would normally be beyond the level that LEAs would ever do and would almost necessitate the involvement of an IHE, because IHE professors are accustomed to developing sound research designs and have access to the support staff to engage in such an evaluation. Without this evaluation piece, a proposal would have little chance in receiving funding; thus the IHE link is made necessary as a by-product of the scoring process.

When the White House directives concerning faith-based and community-based organizations are taken into consideration, a viable proposal must have a consortium design that includes all three of these groups of LEA, IHE, and FBO/CBO. Before No Child Left Behind, this type of grant would have just had the LEA developing curriculum to be used at that school district without consideration for other factors. After No Child Left Behind, the Department of Education wants partnerships and scientific evaluation of the effects of the program on teaching. This echoes what Schnitzer and Nichols (1998) stated about “teachers [being] facilitators of instruction, students to be involved in relevant, real-life experiences, and the curriculum to provide the skills, processes, and knowledge for productive citizenship in the third millennium,” because the Department of Education now wants to be assured that the funds are having a measurable effect on instruction.

Implications for Proposal Development at Lubbock-Cooper Independent School District

Lubbock-Cooper Independent School District is unique for a small public school system because it has a development office similar to what is seen at major colleges and universities. The office was created in 1996. Lubbock-Cooper has had only one Director of Development and in 2002 he received a doctorate from Texas Tech University, with a dissertation that studied the creation of development offices in Texas public school systems. Because of this working relationship between Lubbock-Cooper and Texas Tech, along with the changes that were occurring at the Federal level, Texas Tech and Lubbock-Cooper began a forum at the College of Education that brought other LEAs, government agencies, CBOs, and FBOs together to discuss funding opportunities and
allow for networking among the groups. During this period many of the budgets of the organizations were reduced due to state budget short-falls; as a result, many organizations began looking to grants to fund programs that were being cut. The type of organizations that came to the forum and/or requested to be added to the informational listserv grew. The members of the forum began to develop joint proposals. One example was a 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant proposal, in which three school districts, Texas Tech, and four community-based organizations joined. These partners would not have formed the consortium if it had not been for the forum, which helped them become unaware of the services that the others could provide. The resulting proposal was much stronger than individual proposals would have been because of the additional services provided to the students and communities.

Lubbock-Cooper Independent School District and Texas Tech University are planning in fall 2003 to expand the forum to all area school districts. Professors at the College of Education are taking a much more active role in the forum because several have been able to use the forum members as research sites. The members of the forum were willing to function in this role because the forum offers them a better understanding of the Federal and state requirements of scientific research-based programs and the needs of professors to have access to public education students to engage in the research. Similarly, several LEA grant proposals included Graduate Research Assistance positions so that studies could be done of the effects of the instruction. This collaboration is causing the LEAs and IHE to look at one another in a different light. They are seeing that the cooperation and interaction required by grant proposal development can be extended to activities that can be undertaken without funding and will benefit the educational activities of both organizations.

What this Means to AAGP Members

With the passage of the "No Child Left Behind" legislation, the Federal government's focus for funding underwent a basic change in many programs. A focus on higher education issues and students changed to one of looking at K-16 issues and students at all these educational levels. In other words, many higher education proposals now must include collaborative partnerships with public school systems to be viable. The system that Texas Tech and Lubbock-Cooper Independent School District developed through the forum answers the question of how these collaboratives will be formed.

The forum overcame one problem in developing these collaboratives: a basic mistrust between public school and higher education staff. Comments like "living in ivory towers," "not understanding the need for scientific rigor," and so on do not flow between the forum members because they have developed personal relationships. NCLB legislation provided a reason for these two camps to come together and achieve this ultimate goal because the higher education principal investigator now needs to collaborate with K-12 schools and the K-12 schools need to advance the academic performance of all of their students with scientific base programs.

The forum that Texas Tech and Lubbock-Cooper developed also provides a way to bring other CBO’s and FBO’s into the mix in a non-threatening manner, because the discussion of grant funding sources centers on multiple funding sources, not just education-related grants. This is due to the need to develop community capacity that NCLB began and the White House Office for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives is
expanding. Part of each forum focuses on developing community capacity, reflecting the increasing interest among funders in community capacity and collaboration as a means to achieve sustainable programs. The research administration office at the IHE can support these efforts by working with public school districts, community-based organizations, and faith-based organizations who have no development offices to help them understand the grant proposal process. The results from having this forum strongly suggest that this type of system may be the ultimate win-win situation in the area of grant proposal development because even if a proposal is not funded, the act of working together is leading to interaction that benefit all parties.
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Interview with a Program Officer II

By Phyl Renninger

Phyllis Renninger is the Supervisor for Planning & Development at the Duval County Public Schools and resides in Orange Park, Florida. She is a founding member and currently President of AAGP.

In our continued quest to enhance our profession, we think it is important to get perspective from all angles of the grant process. AAGP decided that an interview of those who run grant offices might offer that perspective. I conducted these interviews by phone and email.

I asked all program officers the same questions. The answers varied, but often confirmed or validated what we know as professionals. This article is the second in a series of interviews with the program officers. The following two interviews were conducted with state program officers.

Amieko Watson, Director of National Service Program, Volunteer Florida
Program: AmeriCorps
Location: Statewide, Tallahassee, Florida

Traci Cotton, Education Consultant
Program: Governor's Mentoring Initiative Grant Opportunities,
Location: The Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida

How important is personal contact in the award process?

Watson: Personal contact is not very important in our process because it is a open competitive process. All applicants must have the same information. The more personal or one-on-one contact, the less likely the consistency. Our organization does regional workshops and attendance by grantees at those meetings is important.

Cotton: Personal contact is key with reference to technical assistance. This contact usually provides a greater insight and provides a stimulus in the grant writer's development of the RFP. Parameters are usually more well-defined through this contact which produces a more quality-oriented, succinct, and descriptive grant.
What is your selection process?

*Watson:* External and internal reviewers score proposals according to review score criteria. Staff rank and make funding recommendations to our Board of Commissioners. Commissioners make final funding recommendations.

*Cotton:* Competitive -- grants not receiving a minimum score of 70% will not be considered for funding.

What is your reporting process (if you have one)?

*Watson:* New programs report monthly and on quarterly progress report through AmeriCorps’ national web-based reporting system. Continuing programs report quarterly progress reports through AmeriCorps’ national web-based reporting system.

*Cotton:* Usually a format is created against the objectives of the grant to develop a mechanism/instrument used to indicate progress or the lack thereof.

What kind of projects do you favor or require?

*Watson:* We have five priority areas: Education, public safety, environment, human needs, and homeland security. We also provide additional points to areas supporting governor’s initiative, faith-based, and rural organizations.

*Cotton:* Competitive for school districts.

What changes have you witnessed in philanthropy over the last 5 years or so from the program officer's point of view?

*Watson:* There seems to be more competition for fewer dollars.

*Cotton:* Thankfully, a higher level or accountability.

What advice could you give someone submitting a proposal?

*Watson:* Follow directions, be concise, and volunteer to be [on] a review committee so that you can have some reference point of how proposals are funded.

*Cotton:* Adhere to the program’s request and format. Be clear yet brief.

Could you include a summary of your guidelines (or a web site or mailing address where applicants can get the guidelines)?

*Watson:* [www.volunteerflorida.org](http://www.volunteerflorida.org)

*Cotton:* [www.flamentoring.org](http://www.flamentoring.org)

Could you provide a brief program history?

*Watson:* AmeriCorps is a network of national service programs that engage more than 50,000 Americans each year in intensive service to meet critical needs in education, public safety, health, and the environment. AmeriCorps members serve through more than 2,100 nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations. They tutor and mentor youth, build affordable housing, teach computer skills, clean parks and streams, run after-school programs, and help communities respond to disasters. Created in 1993, AmeriCorps is part of the Corporation for National and Community Service, which also oversees Senior Corps and Learn and Serve America. Together these programs engage more than 2 million Americans of all ages and backgrounds in service each year.
Cotton: The Governor's Mentoring Initiative was designed by the current governor to include and recognize mentoring as an integral component to improving and maintaining satisfactory student achievement. The interaction between mentor and mentee has been found to be a positive in the well-roundedness of an individual. It has further efforts to improve character education, morale building, and therefore a more positive approach in the classroom.
Diary of a Grants Professional

By Mary Hale Meyer

Mary Hale Meyer has been a proposal writer since the 70s and a grants professional since the 80s. She has worked at small and large nonprofits in Philadelphia and at the State University of New York in Buffalo. Currently she is developing and managing grants at Jewish Employment and Vocational Service (JEVS) in Philadelphia. A charter member of the AAGP, she administers the AAGP Forum, is a member of the Journal editorial committee, and was recently elected to the AAGP Board of Directors.

NOTE: It is in the nature of the trade that we change jobs – some of us more frequently than others. I’ve not “job hopped,” but I have moved around some – from position to position and city to city. What follows is a light-hearted diary of my first year at my newest job.

Now I had been a “grants professional” for about 22 years when last December 1st I began a new job at a large, multi-faceted social service agency in Philadelphia.

My previous proposal writing experience had included: Eleven years of “filling holes” in the budget of a pretty small women-serving agency with a series of pretty small local foundation grants; three years of funding a big agency with big Federal and foundation grants; and a somewhat miscellaneous three years at a New York State school of medicine where I facilitated groups of faculty seeking funding for medical student education and student groups seeking funding for socially relevant community programs. In each job, I had pretty much been “it” – the proverbial one-person shop (though at the School of Medicine, there was a large development machine that I could occasionally tap into – usually to discover which local foundation I was not going to be allowed to approach because of larger university priorities).

My new job looked to be serendipitous. I was going to be part of a development team, expand the foundation base, occasionally write government grants. Then I started work.

Day One: Read my job description.

In accordance with the agency strategic plan and core principles, the Grant Development and Management Specialist (GDMS) (me) has responsibility for identifying and facilitating various program development teams for the creation of new program models in strategic areas for [the agency]; actively participate in the
design of models; research government as well as large national and local foundation grant opportunities; conduct required research in the fields of focus and the attendant demographics and trend information required; submit and track the grant applications; if funded, coach and work with program directors in the proper monitoring of goals, outcomes, performance points and budgetary targets; work with program staff to complete and meet deadlines for all grant reports; and be responsible for the submission of these grant reports. The GDMS will work collaboratively with [agency] staff to identify strategic priority projects/programs for program/service enhancements and/or expansion of present program/service offerings, new programs/services, innovations, and contract renewals.

Wow.

Day One, Again – Met the acronyms.

This is a big multi-services agency that, like many agencies founded 50 or 60 years ago, saw a service need, found funding (usually government), met the need. And thus it grew. By the time I joined the staff, the agency had two major divisions, one focused on employment and training, the other on “home, health and work” for persons with mental health problems and/or developmental disabilities, and behavioral health. With growth and divisions came acronyms. Upwards of 70+ of them. Some dealing with agency programs (CJS – Community Job Service; MPP – Maximizing Participation Program); some dealing with agency funders (DOL and DOE, Departments of Labor and Education respectively); some other agencies in the city (PEC for People’s Emergency Center). New acronyms come with new funders (I was to bring in two myself).

I posted the acronym list on my file cabinet next to the phone list, but even with that prompter, I found myself looking blank when colleagues tossed off initials.

Weeks One and Onward – Met the staff.

My boss – the Chief Development Officer – gave me a long list of people to meet and programs to visit. I started with the Chief Operating Officer of each division, then the CEO. I had folders (since unread) bravely labeled “Meeting with HH&W,” “Meeting with E&T,” etc. From these meetings, I went on to programs. I’ve been to two sheltered workshops (both in transition to integrated programming for persons with disabilities), a residence for elderly persons with mental health issues, a methadone maintenance clinic, a building trades school, a refugee service program, and two customer service training programs. And my office is adjacent to a court reporting training program and a fee-for-service career consulting program and down the hall from a college consulting program designed to help disadvantaged youth do better on college admissions examinations. Faces swim. They mingle with the acronyms. Wow, again.

Met the Teams: This agency is big on Teams. I learned about one, the Youth Team, even before I moved back to Philadelphia. I was to be part of it, whatever “it” was. When I arrived, I learned that the agency was positioning itself to be a player in the youth services world. As a team, we inventoried the agency’s programs to see just what we did with young people (quite a lot, it turns out, but in little bits and pieces – not grouped together as “Youth Programs.”) We scanned the horizon for funding opportunities. We interviewed other players in the “youth world” (some of whom I knew from my previous
life in Philadelphia); sat in on meetings of a foundation-funded “Blueprint for Out of School Youth” task force; wrote and rewrote a concept paper on services we might sell to Philadelphia’s Youth Network or other large funding agencies. We laid out action steps and a timeline. At this writing, the Team’s work is coming into fruition as we prepare to collaborate with several big youth players on an application to the Youth Network for a youth training program.

Youth is not the only team, of course. There is a Development Team with its own funding plan and action steps, a Business Development Team that has morphed into a Planning for a Senior Day Program – and these are just the teams I’m involved with. There is quite a trick to balancing the demands of each team – seniors vs. youth, for instance – with the small number of available funding streams.

*Pennsylvania Foundations:* Speaking of funding streams -- As I met with staff and learned about agency programs, I tried to fit each into fundable categories, based on likely funders. Long ago I’d learned that the way to fund programs for a local agency was usually to approach local foundations. My first job as a proposal writer involved filling holes in that agency’s budget with dozens of little grants from dozens of little funders – all from Philadelphia foundations. So early on I busied myself with the directory of Pennsylvania Foundations, classifying potential sources with my newly acquired knowledge of the agency’s programs. Alas, in scouring guidelines, I frequently encountered “we seldom fund agencies with budgets over $1,000,000.” We were too large for many local foundations and, despite the job description’s reference to “national and major local,” too local for many national foundations.

Nevertheless, I did make a foundation plan – a tidy chart with programs and foundations, deadlines and amounts. And I’ve submitted a few applications – one even has a pretty good chance of being funded.

*Other priorities:* These kept cropping up. I’d make a funding plan, take it to the Development Team, get started on a concept and Whammo! An RFP comes up that’s just too good to pass up – with a deadline just around the corner. Which is not to say we chase grants to chase grants. I – along with other members of the Development Team – put together guidelines for a process of deciding what to apply for – a process that takes into consideration agency mission, strategic plan, preparation time, available staff for writing – and we stick to it. It’s just that the deadlines often stand in the way of longer-range projects and have kept me from implementing fully my grand development plan.

*Government:* Even though a goodly part of my job as I understood it was to expand the foundation funding base, many important RFPs come from government agencies – so exploring government funding certainly had to be a priority. I went to a few faith-based funding conferences sponsored by the Federal Government, and learned that here again we were too large for many of the newly announced faith-based initiatives. (And figured, cynically, that with all the budget cuts looming, there wouldn’t be any money anyway!) However, the City of Philadelphia’s AIDS Activities Coordinating Office (AACO) issued a Request for Proposals for HIV prevention, I leapt to. In a former Philadelphia life, I’d written any number of proposals focused on HIV issues; I knew many of the players and something about “evidence-based” prevention strategies; and it seemed as if the agency’s methadone maintenance clinic (acronym = MMC) would be a perfect place to site one of the city’s programs.
I was mistaken. The HIV world had changed since I’d been away – moving from plain old service to an intense focus on planning and outcomes. Although I knew something about outcomes (I was pretty conversant in a process called “stages of change,” for instance), getting through to the clinic staff was not easy. Consequently, planning was difficult. The clinic’s staff was in flux. Members came late to meetings or not at all. The funders’ “evidence-based” buzz word was not a word that most of the staff seemed to understand.

“Proven efficacy,” I kept saying. “Measurable results.”

A few valiant staff members stuck it out, completing the endless tables that accompanied the RFP, all Logic Model and outcomes. I delivered the requisite copies, floppy disk, audit, etc. on time to the AACO office on Valentine’s Day. Then – and only then – did we learn that the funds had been cut, that all the “regular” AIDS agencies needed to be funded, and there was no way we’d be funded. And sure enough, we weren’t.

**Youth:** Did I mention the youth team? Well, we knew that a funding agency – the Philadelphia Youth Network – would be issuing an RFP for a program – and we wanted to compete. We knew we couldn’t do all the pieces ourselves, so we met with potential collaborator after potential collaborator.

The RFP was to come out in August with a September due date. I postponed a vacation. It didn’t come out. Then it looked as if Federal budget machinations were going to keep the RFP from being issued at all this year. Just as I scheduled a vacation with non-refundable airfare and pre-paid hotel reservations, the RFP came out. I’m writing this diary in bits and pieces as I scramble to develop a full-blown collaborative project for youth due 5 days after I set off!

And that, dear colleague, is a story that I’m sure you can relate to – whether you’re new to the profession or, like me, a wrinkled and gray old timer. Why do we stick to it? For many reasons, I suspect: We like the challenge of an impending deadline. We enjoy being part of a program planning team. And perhaps most of all, We love the agency’s mission. On my one year anniversary at this new job, I can only say, “Amen to all that.”
Using Logic Models in Grant Development

by Michael Wells

Thirty or forty years ago, grants were written to serve numbers of people. If you were providing counseling to 100 people a month, that activity was considered an end in itself. Your program was described as bringing them in your door, and your evaluation was counting them. Much successful grantwriting was built around describing your clients’ problems and saying that your program would serve them.

Things have changed in the intervening years. Funders and social service organizations realized that conducting an activity was not the same as achieving results. For example, soup kitchens and homeless shelters provided food and beds to homeless people -- which was good and necessary. But it didn’t end their homelessness. Foundations found that they were funding several shelters, all of whom were housing the same people on different nights, so the same individuals were being counted several times. No one knew how many people were actually homeless, and the programs weren’t necessarily getting them permanent housing.

So there is an increasing trend toward specificity and results. We see foundation guidelines and government RFPs asking for things like “best practices” programs, “outcome-based evaluation” and “sustainable” organizations. Evaluation has become a much larger part of program development and grantwriting.

To the extent that these trends improve services and make changes in people lives and in society, they are good. However, they make the grantwriter’s job more complex. Describing these parts in a narrative can get pretty complex and boring for the reader, the death of fundable proposals. We’ve all had examples of RFPs that required so much detail that the heart of our program got lost in verbiage. Wouldn’t it be easier if you could just draw a picture?

You can!

Over the past decades, evaluators have been developing tools that can be very useful to us in doing grant project planning and presenting goals and objectives. One major evaluation tool which is gaining wider usage is the Logic Model. Used correctly, a Logic
Model can help in writing the body of the proposal, improve services and provide all of the ingredients for making the evaluation section of your proposal a snap.

A logic model is a visual presentation of how your organization does its work -- the theory and assumptions underlying the program you’re seeking to fund. It shows the relationships among the resources you have/need to operate your program, the activities you plan to do, and the results you hope to achieve.

For an evaluator, creating a logic model is a helpful tool for linking theory with practice and deciding what to measure. For the grantwriter, it is a strong graphic presentation which can pull a whole proposal together, and become a resource to draw on for writing narrative. In addition, the process of developing such a model provides a framework for bringing together the grantwriter, agency management, direct service program people and evaluators to develop a project that will meet all of their needs, serve clients better, be more fundable and have measurable outcomes. What’s not to like?

Some of your program people may object to developing a logic model. They protest that their work is practical, not based on academic theories. Not so! A logic model can provide a way for teasing out the program assumptions which are in fact its theory. For example, let’s look at a loosely structured after-school and evening recreation program designed to provide choices to youth and build leadership skills. The theory behind this simple program is that youth get involved in illegal activities and substance abuse partly because of too much idle time and a lack of desire for very structured activities. Its hypothesis is that this program’s implementation will reduce youth tobacco and alcohol use and illegal activity. The proof will be whether your participants show reductions in these problem behaviors.

**Drawing #1**

**Components of a Program Logic Model**

```
Resources Input ➔ Activities ➔ Output ➔ Outcome ➔ Impact
```

**Planned Work**

**Intended Results**

Each component is linked to the next in a conditional logic *If-Then* relationship, like computer programming in Basic. *If* you have access to resources, *Then* you can carry out program activities. *If* you carry out program activities, *Then* you can deliver program services (outputs). *If* you provide program services, *Then* clients will benefit (outcomes). *If* your clients benefit, *Then* hoped-for changes will happen in your community (impact).

In the familiar grantwriting format of developing goals and objectives, goals may become outcomes or impact, and objectives can roughly translate into outputs. Drawings #2 and #3 show the theory and practice of developing a program logic model. They also include a feedback loop (the arrows at the bottom) for Continuous Quality Improvement programs.
**Drawing # 2**

**Components and Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program ingredients, e.g. funds, staff, community support, participants.</td>
<td>The method used to accomplish program goals, e.g., classes, counseling, training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units produced by a program, e.g. number and type of clients served, number of policies developed, number of events planned.</td>
<td>Short term and immediate indicators of progress toward a goal, e.g., collaborative partnerships, improved family functioning or school performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term desired program effects, e.g. resilient community, economic self-sufficiency, violence prevention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Drawing # 3
Sample Program Logic Model for a School and Community Violence Prevention Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Resources**
- Staff
- Violence prevention curriculum
- Case management services
- Partnerships: University, Counseling Centers, Sheriff’s Department, School District
- Participants

**Activities**
- Delivery of violence prevention curriculum in the schools (pre-K to 4th grade)
- Intensive violence prevention groups to high risk youth
- Intensive outreach services to families with high-risk youth
- DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education)
- Family Empowerment Project services to families

**Outputs**
- 4-6 hours of violence prevention education for 1,890 students (pre-K to 4th grade)
- 480 students receive intensive prevention training in 10 groups of 6-10 students each.
- 185 at risk families receive intensive outreach services
- 60 at risk families receive Family Empowerment Project services

**Outcomes**
- Improvement in healthy peer social communication
- Reduction in violent behaviors in school climate
- Increase in healthy behavioral patterns in handling stress
- Improved school-related behaviors
- Increase in family support
- Customer satisfaction

**Goals**

- Violence Prevention
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The obvious advantage of a logic model for the grantwriter is that one simple graphic shows the funder how their grant works with other community resources to carry out your program, and provides the basis for evaluation. Talk about a picture being worth a thousand words!
There Is No One Right Logic Model Format

While the visual formats in Pictures 1, 2 & 3 are commonly used for Program Logic Models because they are familiar to many evaluators and simple to draw, there are many variations. Following are two logic models developed by clients in successful grant proposals. This format allows a multi-service organization, Self Enhancement, Inc. (SEI), to link its different programs to particular outcomes. While it looks a little busy and doesn’t include measurable numbers (which were addressed separately), it clearly shows relationships among different program areas and the ultimate goal of reducing drug involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEI Relationship Model</td>
<td>Consistent Progress on Students' Individual Success Plans</td>
<td>Prevent, Reduce and Delay the Onset of Substance Abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adult Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual Success Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 on 1 Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender Specific Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI Curriculums</td>
<td>Increased Sense of Caring and Support From SEI Staff and Volunteers</td>
<td>Improve Life Management Skills</td>
<td>Reduce Drug Involvement and Promote Positive Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SEI Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Substance Abuse Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Life Management Skills Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI Service Continuum</td>
<td>Increased Knowledge of Risks and Refusal Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dance, Drama, Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trips &amp; Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentives Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI Academic Support</td>
<td>Increased Sense of Self Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Homework Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring School Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentives Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend Parent/Teacher Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI Family Support</td>
<td>Positive Peer Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quarterly Parent Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parenting Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parent Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Case Managers Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Participation in Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on Learning and Good Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Commitment to School and Participation in School Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Family Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved School Bonding and Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Family Functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Family Obstacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Logic Models in Grant Development

**NICWA TECHNOLOGY EMPOWERMENT PROJECT LOGIC MODEL**

**Problems**
- Isolated Communities and Workers
- Untrained CW Staff
- Severe Social Problems, i.e. Abuse and Neglect
- Children in Need of Families
- Lack of Information Systems and Reliable Data

**Needs**
- Information
- Networking
- Training
- “How to” TA
- Data Systems
- Reliable Data

**Access to Technology**
- Matching Indian Families
- Training/TA
- Library/Info
- Peer to Peer Help
- CIS
- “How to Help”

**Barriers**
- Limited Delivery Capacity
- Dispersed Populations
- Cost of Data Systems
- Cost of Conventional Dissemination

**Resources**
- NICWA Resources
  - Library
  - Training
  - Technical Assistance (TA)
  - Curricula
  - Standards
- Tribal Resources
  - Families
  - Practice Innovations
  - Programs
- Information Management Resources
  - Databases
  - Application Servers
  - Federal Data Systems

**Outcomes**
- Improved Outcomes
- Improved Services
- Improved Practice
- Improved Management
This logic model for the National Indian Child Welfare Association (NICWA) was for a project to provide NICWA training, technical assistance, information and networking services to Tribes across the United States over the Internet. It shows the many problems facing Indian Child Welfare Workers and how access to Internet based services could help solve them.

**Developing a Program Logic Model**

When developing a Program Logic Model, evaluation professionals recommend starting with Impacts/Goals and working backwards through outcomes, outputs, activities and resources. If you’re working with an organization’s program staff, this helps them focus on what the funder wants (results) rather than what the program staff wants (funding). This can result in thinking of new ways of doing things and leaving behind practices that may only loosely be linked to the programs intended outcomes.

In designing outcomes for your logic model it is important to be realistic and work from your experience. If this is a new program and you have no baseline data, you cannot “reduce problem behavior by 15%” (from what?). In the real world, your program will only be one of many factors affecting your client’s outcomes. Your evaluation and Logic Model may be more about documenting your program’s contribution than achieving broad social change. Focus on things you have control over. For example, a grassroots community organization focusing on reducing illegal gang activities cannot actually control the number of arrests for gang activities. It can, however, improve community involvement in reporting criminal activity and measure the behavior of the youth actually participating in its programs.

In this brief article I’ve covered the basics of a Program Logic Model, which is perhaps most useful to a grantwriter. There are other types of logic models with other uses, for example, a Theory Approach Model that is useful for internal planning and “making the case” for a program, and an Activities Approach Model that’s most useful for implementation. There is, of course, much more to the subject. Fortunately, there is a wonderful and easily accessible resource on logic models that goes into more detail, including forms and step-by-step instructions. On the Kellogg Foundation website [www.wkkf.org](http://www.wkkf.org), on the left hand side of the home page, is their free 62-page *Logic Model Development Guide*, downloadable as an Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) file.

If you get further involved and want to start using logic models for evaluation, check out The Evaluation Forum, a program of Organizational Research Services in Seattle, [www.organizationalresearch.com](http://www.organizationalresearch.com). They have several affordable publications on outcome-based evaluation.
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Proposal Development:  
A Team Approach

By VC League
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The use of a proposal development team will enhance an organization’s grant solicitation efforts. How you organize the team will depend on several factors. The main ones are: the amount of the request, the potential funding source(s), and the submission date. Ideally, the team should include individuals who assisted in the planning of the program or the request.

Using a team prevents one person from having to do all the proposal development work. My experience is that often an individual with the title of “grant writer” or “grants coordinator,” or something similar, gets saddled with doing most of the work with only minimal assistance from others.

Grant development often involves pulling together information from many sources. The collection of this information along with the other essential activities should be broken down into tasks. If the grant developer cannot find someone to do a task, by default, s/he must do it. This often leads to key tasks not getting the full attention they deserve. For an organization to be consistently successful at securing grants and sustaining its programs, it takes the efforts of more than a one person. Some factors you have to consider when forming your team are listed later in this article.

Grant development requires that you break down the process into the three tasks or skills that most grant solicitation requires. The first is program planning. Before you can prepare a proposal, you must have a program that addresses a need or problem and outcomes that are measurable, time-limited, realistic, and relevant to the problem or need. Program planning should focus on what the organization will do, why they are doing it, how they will do it, and how they know they have done it. This also includes the timeframe for completing it and the cost to do it.

The second step is researching and identifying potential funding sources. This ideally includes matching your organization’s mission and purpose, proposed program, and proposed clients or consumer group with the focus of any potential funding sources. This also includes taking into account the proposed program cost and amount of your request. Also include in this step developing a strategy for approaching the funding source.
The third step involves writing the proposal. People often concentrate too quickly on this task. They regularly contact me with the notion that they need a grant writer, but after a short conversation, it is apparent that more immediately they need a program developer or someone to facilitate the program development process. In most instances, I will also use a team for program development; and, naturally, this team will evolve into my proposal development team.

### Proposal Development Plan

Before developing a proposal, it is important to have a plan that has a timeline. Target the submission date and work backward in creating a timeline. For example, if the due date is July 15, determine what date you want to have the document ready to submit to the funding source. Set the date for completing the proposal a few days prior to that date, say July 12. This means all tasks needed to complete the proposal, including the physical production of it, will have to be completed by that date. On large requests, selecting a completion date may be the team’s first decision after reviewing the guidelines. With smaller requests, or when using an informal team, you as the team leader should decide the completion date.

Include in the plan dates for each draft of the document. Again using “July 12,” you may determine that you need the first draft by June 25 and the second draft by June 30. Try to identify, in the plan, who will read drafts of the proposal, and the editor of the final draft. Always plan on doing at least four drafts. The first two will concentrate on content and the last two on grammar and style. The plan will include due dates for collaborators and other entities, memorandums of understanding, letters supporting the effort, and endorsement letters. Also include dates for when you will need to have various forms signed by certain people, e.g. the CEO or board chair. This is particularly important during vacation and holiday season. Of course, the amount of time you have will affect your plan, but always create a proposal development plan. The plan guides the team’s and your actions.

### Team Size

Team size will vary depending on the amount of the request. On smaller efforts, a team may include only two or three members. However, regardless of the size of the effort, you probably want to limit your core team to eight. This does not prevent you from using others, as you need them. In addition, a team member often will have more than one role. If a request requires collaboration with another organization, try to include a representative from that organization.

### Formal or Informal Teams

Your proposal development team may be informal or formal depending on the size of the request. My experience is that the larger the request, the more likely you will need to have a formal team meeting regularly and interacting with each other. On a smaller request, you may have a team that operates informally, primarily communicates with you by telephone or e-mail, and never meets. Team members may not even know they are part of your team, but they will know they’re to provide you with requested or needed assistance.
Internal or External Teams

You will want to keep new ideas coming to your effort, and one of the best ways to do this is to use people external to the organization. I suggest that with formal teams you include people outside the organization. This will help prevent the effort from becoming too insular. Informal teams may also include those outside your organization with the same effect.

The Team

Team leader or coordinator: This role is responsible for managing the team and overseeing implementation of the tasks in the proposal development plan. If an organization has a grant developer, it could be this person. But regardless of what position they hold, their role will be to oversee the proposal development process. If you are working with an agency as an independent contractor, depending on your agreement with the client, you might serve in this role.

Writer: Of course someone has to write the document. In cases where you may use more than one writer, you will have to designate one of them as the primary or lead writer. Try to limit the writer’s role to writing. However, if they’re needed for other duties, this is not possible.

Content Specialists: Begin working with these people in the program development stage. They are essential for program development and can also be valuable when developing the proposal, because they are able to supply required program-specific information and reference information such as quotes and citations. One reason I enjoy grant development is because it helps me broaden my knowledge beyond the fields that I initially worked in: substance abuse prevention and community development. Various grants I’ve worked on have required me to be familiar with topics ranging from the world’s rain forests to cowboy museums to controversial poets, etc. And even though to complete the tasks I acquired some basic knowledge in the required areas, I still often had to bring in a content specialist (and in some instances more than one). Even though you may be a specialist in any given field, for the purpose of program development and grant development you still may need to work with a content specialist.

Liaisons: A proposal development team requires two types of liaisons: internal and external. When it comes to maintaining positive communications with the applicant organization’s personnel and also with external entities, both have a critical function – that is, keeping rumors at a minimum. Rumors can be a big bump on the road in the proposal development process, particularly those concerning positions, responsibilities, and the budget. In addition, if you are discussing roles with a collaborator or negotiating sub-grantee agreements, controlling rumors is crucial. Keep your liaisons informed and up-to-date on the process. And if used effectively, they can be the eyes and ears for the proposal development team. The following helps differentiate the roles of the two types of liaisons.

• Internal liaison(s): This person is responsible for sharing information with individuals within the organization. This responsibility is particularly important
with larger organizations, and it is designed to eliminate, or at least minimize, rumors. Too often, in many organizations, the proposal development process appears to be secretive and exclusive. As a result, rumors emerge, sometimes initiating unnecessary obstacles. At the very least, this creates a situation where some individuals may feel excluded, or (even worse) threatened regarding their job and career. In addition, the effort may lose potential opportunities because people in the organization know very little about the proposed program or the status of the proposal.

A team leader should keep internal liaisons up-to-date on the status of the proposal development plan and should also advise them about any resources that may be needed to complete the effort. Internal liaisons can share information with people in their work units or departments. This keeps others in the organization from viewing the proposal as the property of the grant developer. The proposal belongs to the organization, not the grant developer. Office politics always have to be considered, and the larger the organization, the more heavily they have to be weighed. Having an internal liaison on your proposal development team and having an effective communication system helps prevent personal issues from unduly interfering with the proposal development process.

- **External liaison(s):** This role is particularly important from the standpoint of developing collaborative relationships. Anyone filling this role should have good interpersonal skills and an excellent rapport with individuals in other organizations. Sometimes one person alone cannot communicate and develop functional partnerships with all the agencies that a program may need to complete a competitive proposal and, subsequently, an effective program. If nothing else, one grant developer doesn’t have the time to maintain contact with several organizations while developing a proposal. So this bolsters the need for using an external liaison. Politics and personality conflicts are by no means restricted to internal settings, so having an external liaison on your team to handle them in a diplomatic way is highly recommended.

**Editor:** No matter how proficient a writer a person may be, they will need to have someone edit their proposal. I like to identify this person before beginning so that I can eliminate them from the writing phase. The editor should not be a person who did any writing of the proposal. For editing purposes, this individual should bring fresh eyes to the proposal.

**Evaluator:** Always include an evaluator on the team when soliciting Federal grants or larger requests. Ideally, this person will have assisted with the program development and now their role is to help with writing the proposal’s evaluation section. They are to ensure that what we say in the grant will meet the litmus test of the potential funding source’s evaluation guidelines.

**Champion:** The proposed project must have someone to champion it. This individual cannot be just someone who believes in the proposed project or sees the needs for the program. Nor can s/he just be an advocate. S/he needs to have influence within the
applicant organization. For example, if a school district is the applicant agency, the most likely advocate would be the superintendent. If this isn’t possible, attempt to recruit the deputy, regional superintendent, or associate superintendent for the unit that will administer the program. In a tax-exempt community-based organization, the champion may be the CEO, an influential board member, or a highly visible volunteer. The champion must be someone who has formal or informal authority to get things accomplished.

If you have a formal team, this individual may never attend a meeting, but the team leader or internal liaison keeps them informed of the progress of the project, and everyone in the organization knows that this person is championing the effort. Thereby all staff in an organization will know the grant developer has the full support of the CEO and that they should cooperate when asked for assistance. I cannot overstate the importance of having a champion for your effort. In some instances the grant developer may not be in a position to have day-to-day contact with high-level management or executive personnel; therefore, selection of an internal liaison that does is critical. This aspect of proposal development is often the missing link for success. Grant developers often address this issue regarding external resources or the potential funding source but pay little attention to it internally, only to find out that they were unable to get maximum use of their organizational resources because they had no one with influence advocating for them.

It is essential to have a thorough development plan backed by a carefully picked grants team. These resources will help ensure a successful application as well as a successfully implemented program.
The Common Good: 
A Mission If We Choose to Accept It

By Linda J. Fairchild

Linda Fairchild is the Program and Fund Development Administrator for the Community Corrections Improvement Association in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Historical Review

The concept of a civil society and our interconnectedness to one another has been studied by historians, sociologists, and anthropologists for many years. The original concept of a civil society can be traced through the works of the Romans and ancient Greek philosophers; however, the modern concept materialized during the 18th century.

The Modernization of These Concepts: 
Civil Society and Common Good

Today it is one of the favorite catchphrases among not-for-profits, and other nongovernmental organizations. This recent eagerness to create a civil society is a attraction to social, nongovernmental organizations; specifically groups that are focused on “specific public interests” such as the environment, the welfare of children, the aging, crime and incarceration, or most feel good initiatives and programs.

For the participants of modern civil society there exists a rule of law that governs these civil society organizations, specifically the freedoms of expression, association, and peaceful assembly. This law is fundamental and essential to building a civil society. Each of these groups believes they are working towards the Common Good. But, if one is to study the concepts, philosophy, and principles of a civil society and the Common Good, one will learn the Common Good is a debatable topic. John Rawls, a contemporary ethicist, defines the Common Good as “certain general conditions that are…equally to everyone’s advantage.”

As we previously established, the original understanding of a civil society embraces a much broader concept, and usually includes all organizations that exist outside of government and the financial market. With this definition of a civil society we need to include the good, the bad, and the ugly: groups that are not necessarily advancing a specific social concern. This information is important for several reasons. It demands our attention to the three important tenets of the not-for profit world: Collaboration, Community, and Consensus, as they can be the most difficult tasks for nonprofit leadership, especially during the bleak and dismissal years of the “dollar squeeze.”
A Challenge for the Not-for-Profit

The past several years have presented a defining challenge. The threat and reality of shrinking dollars creates an environment that tests the humanitarian nature in all of those who face staff reductions, program reductions, and potential loss of a good cause. However austere our worlds become this can be and is the time when we learn best how to work together for The Common Good in a civil society. This is fluently stated by one of the principal theorists of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, who once wrote: “In democratic countries, the science of association is the mother science; the progress of all the others depends on the progress of that one. Among the laws that rule human societies, there is one that seems more precise and clearer than all the others. In order that men remain civilized or become so, the art of association must be developed and perfected among them in the same ratios as equality of conditions increases.”

This is an excellent starting point to an understanding of how the not-for-profit world does operate, or needs to operate. Revisiting the concept of Common Good in a civil society we can appropriately narrow the definition to the cause of each not-for-profit organization, which includes the philosophy and the ethical structure of nonprofit enterprise. As we are painfully aware, the Common Good is not something that happens on its own accord. Not-for-profit managers, coordinators, line staff, and grant writers must show that they have the ability to establish and maintain cooperative efforts with many agencies and the citizens where the agency operates.

Federal Incentives to Stimulate the Growth and Development of Civil Societies

In the past several years, the Federal government has worked to introduce a global perspective to the not-for-profit organizations who apply for Federal dollars. Program development and grant preparation according to Federal RFPs requires capacity building and “community collaboration.” Basically, we will continue to find requirements to incorporate the knowledge and resources of our global community, it is becoming more difficult to retain total control over grant dollars as a single agency. This is good.

An Example of a Civil Society Working Toward the Common Good

This has been a steep learning curve for our agency, but successful. The first point to understand is that we are a government entity, the Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services (community-based corrections, which covers probation and parole). The director of this governmental agency realized the state budget would not provide the revenue we required to provide the services we needed and wanted. Therefore he created a 501(c)(3). The establishment of this foundation created a new avenue for additional revenue to support the additional wants and needs of the governmental agency. This organization is called the Community Corrections Improvement Association (CCIA). Its purpose is to support community corrections with community involvement, acceptance, and financial resources; to establish and embrace pro-active programs that break the cycle of dysfunction for the correctional client and their family. This honorable task serves not only the offenders and their families but also all of society, which includes the victims and the community as a whole.
The creation of a foundation within corrections is unique, and this foundation was the first of its kind in the country. It has been an interesting journey, typically, and more often than not, other agencies and organizations did not want to sit at the same table as corrections. In the same vein, many professionals in corrections believed that those others did not understand the work or needs of corrections and did not want to join a collaborative effort either. The growing crime and incarceration rates became a common ground for everyone to join together to find a solution to the problem.

The most recent example of this mission is exercised in the planning and collaboration of our foundation, CCIA; the U.S. Attorney’s Office; the City of Cedar Rapids; Linn County; and the Taylor, Mound View, Wellington Heights, Northwest Area, and Oakhill/Jackson Neighborhood partners, including community members, youth and social services agencies. Together we are preparing a Weed and Seed Strategy. The Weed and Seed Strategy is a bilateral approach to crime control and prevention. This is how it ensues:

- Law enforcement agencies and prosecutors will cooperate in “weeding out” criminals from the target area.
- “Seeding” will bring prevention, intervention, treatment, and neighborhood revitalization services to the target area.

This method is unique when compared to traditional crime prevention approaches of the past. The strategy is based on collaboration, coordination, community participation, and leveraging of resources. This strategy will not introduce new programs, but maximize the many superb programs that currently exist in the Cedar Rapids area. This effort will solidify permanent channels of communication among the stakeholders, reinforce existing partnerships, and identify and eliminate overlap and duplication, which will provide a maximum benefit to existing services and programs.

What we have learned is there is always room to grow and expand your network of associates. Even as a successful agency we do not have all of the answers. Broadening our horizons to demonstrate an inclusive atmosphere is good business and will more likely create a working civil society that serves the Common Good. It is more profitable for an agency or agencies to work in a collaborative effort for several reasons:

1. The greatest accomplishments occur in an environment where we value our partners in an inclusive environment, and can recognize and accept the differences, work through our conflicts, and stand on common ground to formulate a solution. This propagates mutual respect and dignity, as well as provides fertile ground to fulfill the remaining common sense points.
2. The possibility of securing greater sums of grant funding, both local, state, and Federal is increased and enhances our community efforts.
3. This technique provides a seamless approach to serve consumers that will ensure they do not fall through the invisible trapdoors.
4. Successful consumers create a stronger community.
5. It is the right thing to do!
Professional Certification: The Practical Side--To Be or Not To Be

by Randal J. Givens

Randal J. Givens is a founding member of AAGP and served as our first President. He currently serves as a board member and the Chair of the Long-Term Planning and Bylaws Committee and is the Director of Grants and Program Development at York College in York Nebraska.

The level of civility of a society is largely dependent upon the extent to which the society manifests philanthropic tendencies. The measure by which we tend to identify a culture as more or less philanthropic is the relative degree of the society’s trust, reciprocity, concern and care for the society as a whole, as well as for the individual members of its communities, in particular those who are in some manner less able or unable to care for themselves. In America, this societal caring is manifested through a three-sector structure: the governmental, the for-profit, and the non-profit sectors. The non-profit or philanthropic sector’s activities have been facilitated by the tax reform act of 1969 and its subsequent amendments, including the new legislation of 2003. It is historically unique and exciting to see the level of legislation for, employment in, and financial support of the broad philanthropic sector.

As discussed in previous articles by this author, the nature and identity of the modern American grants professional is contextualized by three key factors. These include the historical development of institutionalized philanthropy, the legal and sociocultural environment, and the “professionalization” of the job/activities. These factors have engendered a nationally unifying movement toward greater effectiveness and service to society (Givens, 2002. pps. 1-4) and (Givens, 2002, pps. 28-37).

This article will examine the grants professionals’ ultimate value to society, evaluating it on the basis of our utility to the facilitation of the philanthropic process. Our “boundary-spanning” organizational functions are currently evaluated from a number of different angles. However, the lack of a standardized, commonly accepted evaluation process puts in doubt the potentially positive perception that grant professionals anticipate. In the long run, the pragmatic utility of grant professionals to society will be measured on the basis of the perceptions held by those who use our services. Their perceptions tend to be based largely upon their experiences with isolated individuals. Currently, there is no standardized, commonly accepted method by which these employers (or anyone else) can gauge, a priori, the potential “quality” of any given grants professional. This is because, unlike many other professions, there is no national certification/credentialing process objectively identifying professional competencies.
In a recent article, Deanna Nurnberg provided a good discussion of the notion of professional competencies (Nurnberg, 2003, pps. 25-27). To pursue those thoughts we should note that the word “credential” includes two categories. The first is the more formal, which includes those credentials given by government agencies, and which are mandated by law for certain professions (these credentials will not be the focus of this article). The second category includes those credentials, often in the form of a certificate, which are given by some individual or organization on their own authority, indicating that the recipient has their blessing/sanction to be or to do a certain thing (such as a national grouping or association of professionals, which identifies what constitutes responsible practice, etc.). This is the type of credentialing addressed in this article, as it relates to AAGP.

The theoretical debate over this topic of credentialing/certification will undoubtedly continue in various disciplines for some time (be they certified by the government or certified by some national independent group of like-minded professionals). However, at this juncture in the evolution of the grants profession, it is perhaps more helpful and personally satisfying to examine the question “To be [credentialed] or not to be [credentialed]?” from a purely practical and pragmatic point of view. In an attempt to examine this question, we will now look at three different credentials/certifications. We have sought information from three AAGP members who are also involved in other professional areas, i.e., fundraising (Michael Wells), social work (Paula Maloff) and sign language interpreting (Pauline Anarino). Each will tell their own story, pursuing the following outline guide:

1. Self Introduction
2. The Credential
   a. Credential background
   b. Reason for seeking the credential
   c. Credential acquisition
3. The impact the credential has had.
4. The potential value of a “grants” credential

CFRE: Michael Wells

1. **Self Introduction** -- “My name is Michael Wells. I am a grantwriting consultant in Portland, Oregon. I am involved in researching, developing and writing grant proposals primarily for social service nonprofits, mostly in the Portland area. I have been doing this for about 15 years.”

2. **The Credential**
   
   2a. Credential background — CFRE (Certified Fund Raising Executive). “When I first received the credential, it was from NSFRE (National Society of Fund Raising Executives), which is now called AFP (Association of Fund Raising Professionals). CFRE International has since broken off as an independent organization. They give this distinction to experienced development/fundraising professionals to provide them with a credential in a field where there are no degrees, etc. This is to ‘set them off from the crowd.’”
2b. Reason for seeking the credential — “Basically I got it for fun, to see if I could pass the test, and for professional reasons (see # 3, below).”

2c. Credential acquisition — “I sent in an application showing my education, (formal and continuing education), professional practice (a minimum of five years in the profession), performance (a minimum of $1,375,000 raised), and service (the professional groups or volunteer work I had done). Then there was a multiple choice test. To remained credentialed, I recertify every three years with the same standards, but lower numbers.”

3. What impact has it had on you — “That is hard to say. As a consultant, I deal with executive directors and development officers, some of who know what CFRE means. It may add a little credibility when talking to a new client, although they’re more interested in my experience and success rate. If I were job-hunting (never again, God willing), I think it would be more useful. It’s also a merit badge to show off (on my business card) when talking to peers.”

4. Your feeling about the potential value of a “grants” credential — “CFRE, as we know, puts very little emphasis on grants. They’re much more oriented to individual giving, major donors, planned giving, etc. A grants credential would probably be of more use to me, since all of my work is grant-related. I think it would establish me as a professional, in a field where anyone can say they’re a grantwriter (I have students in the three-credit college course I teach who ask if they can start consulting as a result of taking the course.) For prospective clients, I think there’s a comfort level in having a certificate that shows someone else has approved my work, even if they don’t know what it means.”

ACSW: Paula Moloff

1. Self Introduction -- I am Paula Moloff, the grants coordinator for the city of Glendale, Arizona. I have worked for the city as a grant developer, writer and citywide coordinator for almost a decade. I have a BA in American History, a Masters in Social Work from the University of Nebraska at Omaha, and a Masters in Business from the University of Northern Colorado. Prior to being in the grant field, I managed and developed HO’s and PPO’s, but started my career as a medical social worker.

2. The Credential -- My credential is an ACSW (Academy of Certified Social Workers) issued by the NASW (National Association of Social Workers). At the time it was awarded, it was the highest level of professional credentialing available. I wanted it because I thought it was important to have that status in the medical field where I was working with doctors, pharmacists, nurses and other degreed professionals, and I found that to be true. I took a national test and had to also provide proof of two years of work supervised by an ACSW.”

3. Reason for Seeking the Credential -- When BA Social Work programs came into existence, individuals with ACSW’s were able to obtain better jobs and salaries while those with MSW’s only were classified in the same category as BSWs. In addition, in
those states that licensed social workers, ACSW’s were allowed to grandfather. Medicaid and Medicare also eventually accepted billings from ACSW’s as professionals, while non-ACSW’s were required to submit their claims under other professionals.

4. **What impact has it had on you** -- Social work has always been considered a low status or no status profession. ACSW’s were and still are considered a step above BSW’s and MSW’s who did not have to pass a national credentialing exam and meet specific criteria. I maintain my ACSW even after two decades of not practicing because I am proud of the accomplishment. Credentialing raised the performing bar for all social workers, and opened the door for state and Federal recognition of social workers as the professional equivalent of psychologists. Without a credentialing program, NASW would never have succeeded in gaining acceptance of licensure by state governments. Licensure has been essential in keeping reimbursement and salaries at reasonable levels and elevating credentialed/licensed individuals above those without comparable achievement in the profession.

5. **Your feeling about the potential value of a “grants” credential** -- I feel that since we do not have an identifiable advanced degree (e.g., Masters in Grants Development) or clearly defined body of knowledge that would “identify” us as professionals, credentialing is even more important to the development of a professional identity in the community and the job market. We may say we are professionals with special and identifiable skill sets, but we are not recognized as such outside our own peer circle, and until we are recognized we will continue to see salaries and job descriptions that define us as glorified administrative assistants. Credentialing--both developing the credentialing process and having a credentialing program in place--will help elevate our profession in the public and among employers. That was certainly the effect of ACSW certification.

**CRC & RID & ACCI: Pauline Annarino**

1. **Self Introduction** -- I am a native Midwesterner living in Los Angeles. Long ago in the early 70s, I earned a BS in Psychology and an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling from the University of Wisconsin system. Professionally, I have worked as a post-secondary career counselor for deaf students, headed a Disabled Student Services Department, established an Associate of Arts degree in Sign Language Interpreting, and was a Director of Program Development for a large nonprofit organization. Today, I am the Principal of Nonprofit Navigators, a small but busy consulting firm in Los Angeles. Our primary client pool consists of nonprofit organizations, public institutions and religious organizations. While we provide a wide array of nonprofit and program development services, our most often requested service is grant development.”

2a. I currently hold three certifications: one from the Rehabilitation profession (Certified Rehabilitation Counselor—CRC), and two from the Sign Language Interpreting profession (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf—RID, and the American Consortium of Certified Interpreters—ACCI).
2b. I obtained my Rehabilitation certification because the certification was highly regarded in the field and would make me more marketable. However, in just another one of life’s “twists,” I never entered the field, making a “left turn” into interpreting. Consequently, I professionally benefited from the credential.

My Sign Language certifications, though, were another story. When I first entered the interpreting field, the profession was very much like our grant development profession today. At the time I obtained my first Sign Language certificate, there were virtually no professional degree programs in interpreting. Most interpreters learned their craft on the job through the school of “hard knocks,” very similar to many of us today who are grant professionals. I sought out certification because I believed it would help me overcome the difficulty of demonstrating skill, professionalism, and credibility that occurs when one does not have a readily recognizable degree in the field.

I obtained my certification along with some of the earliest groups of interpreters to be certified. Back then, many other interpreters believed certification to be a waste of time and money. What employer would even know what the certification meant? Why would an employer pay a certified interpreter more when there were plenty of non-certified interpreters willing to work? Would not a certification program only create division and animosity between certified and non-certified interpreters? And in the beginning, many of their concerns were indeed correct.

However, today nearly every state in the nation has enacted laws requiring interpreters to be certified. While some non-certified interpreters do continue to work, their pay is significantly less than a certified interpreter. Given the current professional climate, I suspect within five years only certified interpreters will be allowed to work in the United States.”

2c. The process of becoming a certified interpreter is arduous. Interpreters must first sit for a written test. Upon successful completion of this portion, interpreters then complete an hour-long performance test and answer a slate of ethical questions. In the case of the RID, the interpreter is video taped and the tape is then sent to three evaluators. For the ACCI, interpreters sit before a live panel of three to five interpreters. The CRC test is an all-day written test. All three tests have rigorous certification maintenance programs that result in loss of certification if not completed and documented.

3. What has been the impact on you -- My interpreting certifications are probably the most important investments I have made in this particular field. They have given me the credibility I had initially hoped for. They have opened doors that might not have otherwise been opened. Today, my sign language certifications hold the same degree of regard as my rehabilitation certification. Foremost in the eyes of employers is the prospective employee’s certification. Today, certification drives the interpreting field. Because I am certified, I am not affected by government regulations requiring certification. Most importantly, though, was the “water shed” moment when I finally realized that certification was not about me but about the people I serve. Certification ensures that deaf people receive quality communication services and protection from unethical and unqualified individuals.
4. **Your feeling about the potential value of a “grants” credential** -- Today, there are more than 850,000 charities, 500,000 churches, 725,000 nonprofit organizations and 23,485 educational institutions operating in the United States. Collectively, the exchange of charitable dollars for goods and services represents a national gross product of more than $1.0 billion annually. While an exact figure is not known of the number of individuals serving as the “brokers” between grant fund seekers and grant fund distributors, the number is thought to be 100,000 or more. Given the size and the scope of our field, it is inevitable that an oversight mechanism will be put into place either by government licensing bodies or other professional organizations.

We know that a fundamental role of most professional associations is to establish, maintain and advocate for professional standards within their industry. Many professional organizations develop credentialing or certification standards for their members and support independent certification by others. Developing a certification is an awesome responsibility. I believe there is no other entity out there more qualified to respond to this profession’s need for certification than AAGP, and I am willing to go so far as to say that AAGP has an obligation to the field to pursue certification.

Having been involved in the evolution of two professional credentials and having witnessed the positive growth of a profession as a result of it, I believe a grants credential is necessary if we are to elevate our profession. I also believe it is inevitable. Most importantly, as we carve out employment niches for ourselves, certification will help us keep sight of our goals and why we do what we do--service provision to entities and individuals who are trying to make a positive difference in the lives of people.

**Summary**

The thoughts of these three professionals provide us with some insight into the practical side of credentialing/certification. Notice that there are a few common threads running through all three stories across a wide spectrum of fields. Clearly, the notion of independently established credibility stands as one of the main motivations for seeking certification. This credibility tends to be used as a “professional merit badge” for the reason that the certificate may be the only authoritative independent measure available by which to determine the amount of experience and the level of knowledge possessed. Such is especially true in fields which have no corresponding standard academic degree available. Like many things, credentialing/certification often ends up being a comparative concern between professions. For those who work in fields where others are routinely certified by their profession, certification tends to be seen as a very important issue. Hence, on the most practical level it is, or may well become, a simple question of job marketability.

Inescapably, our jobs as grant professionals impact three domains--ourselves as respective individuals, the “clients” for whom we “work,” and the society in which we live. The small sampling of professionals in this article indicates for these people the practical utility of credentialing in all three domains. It appears to this author that such a conclusion is likely quite generalizable to the larger population of grant professionals. Therefore, perhaps the answer to the question of “To Be or Not to Be?” is that it at least appears to be more comparatively advantageous to be certified than to not be certified in the increasingly professionalized world we inhabit.
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BOOK REVIEW

_Demystifying Grant Seeking_

by Larissa Golden Brown and Martin John Brown

Reviewed by Michael Wells

_Michael Wells is a partner in Grants Northwest, a consulting firm in Portland, Oregon. He is Treasurer of the AAGP Board of Directors._

Books in Print lists over 50 books on grantwriting. Several are excellent, like Mary Hall’s recently updated classic _Getting Funded_, Andy Robinson’s _Grassroots Grants_ and Mim Carlson’s _Winning Grants Step by Step_. They all cover funding sources, needs statements, goals and objectives, etc. There probably isn’t a need for another basic “how to” grantwriting book.

Larissa and Martin Brown don’t cover this familiar ground again. Instead, they tell us what we need to do to seek and manage grants. Intended for the small shop or one-person office, _Demystifying Grant Seeking_ talks about how to set up an office to keep track of deadlines, how to build and maintain relationships with funders, and what to do after submitting a proposal. It’s a guide to how to organize yourself, then organizing your organization for getting grants.

After 15 years as a consultant, I found several practical ideas that helped me when I moved my office, like a card file for deadlines, a bulletin board for active proposals and my nemesis -- keeping my desk clear of distracting clutter (schedule regular filing). There are hints for maintaining relationships -- Don’t just send a thank-you letter to the foundation president when you’ve been awarded a grant -- send one to program officers who were helpful and to your board member who contacted a foundation trustee.

The Browns lead us through the Grant-Seeking Cycle from learning your organization and community, to researching and matching your programs with a funder’s interests, steps leading to the grant proposal and follow-up in your organization and with the funder. They recommend evaluation -- not of the program, but of your grants process, what worked and what didn’t and how to improve next time.

A basic grants library should include _Demystifying Grant Seeking_, one of the “how to books” mentioned above and Berbato & Furlich’s _Writing for a Good Cause_ (reviewed in Fall, 2002). And of course, a complete set of the _Journal of the AAGP_.

BOOK REVIEW

Storytelling for Grantseekers: The Guide to Creative Nonprofit Fundraising
By Cheryl A. Clarke

Reviewed by Iris Coffin

Iris Coffin is the Development Writer for Drake University working with corporate and foundation grants. She has been a grant professional for eight years working in the medical field, in human services, and now in higher education. She is the Chair of the JAAGP Editorial Board and a founding member of AAGP.

The author states, “My goal is to put the joy and creativity back into the grantseeking process.” Ms. Clarke has fulfilled that goal by the end of the book and gives a generous amount of information and examples to re-energize the writing of any grantseeker, even those that have been in the field for a number of years.

Because the author is also a fiction writer she has ample background to equate the writing of a proposal to that of telling a story. She shows how to provide that initial ‘hook’ that will keep the reader reading. We are shown how to provide a creative opening that is interesting and at the same time how to avoid gimmicky or clichéd prose. She shows how to include fundamental information and how to set the location for the reader.

She goes on to demonstrate how to introduce the hero (the agency) and how to write about it, including advice on how to present a start-up agency. Other main characters (the agency’s clients) are introduced and Clarke demonstrates writing about main characters other than people, such as injured marine mammals or old-growth redwood trees.

Clarke goes on to show how to interject the story’s antagonist as the narrative progresses, using tension and conflict as in fiction. She states: “Using the storytelling approach to grantseeking, this is the proposal section where you take the reader up the story arc by showing the conflict between main characters and the antagonist. This is absolutely the most important, necessary section in your agency’s proposal. Without a specifically defined problem or need, there is simply no reason for the funder to award your agency a grant.” The tension and conflict is demonstrated as you describe or define the problem your agency is trying to solve. Clarke covers such topics as telling the back story, joining forces with other heroes, using data and statistics effectively, citing sources and checking facts, and putting a human face on the problem.

The next section discusses the goals and objectives relative to the fiction theme of the book, including some comments on the difference between the two. She then proceeds to the methods section, the evaluation section and the budget section, followed by a section on the summary, titles, and heading and one on packaging.

I felt the most valuable information in the book was contained in chapters 4 through 8. Chapters 1 through 3 and chapters 9 and 10 seemed to contain information that is already widely known about proposal writing and submitting. However, to a new professional in the field, this information would also be of use.

Clarke’s comparisons and information made a lot of sense and will be useful in future proposals. I could see her fiction experience in her writing and this was very interesting reading.
WEBSITE REVIEW

GrantsNet.com
http://www.grantsnet.com
Last Accessed: November 11, 2003

Reviewed by Paula Shambach

Paula Shambach is the Grants Development Coordinator at Cumberland County Schools in Fayetteville, North Carolina.

GrantsNet is billed as “your one-stop resource to find funds for training in the sciences and undergraduate science education.” The site is dedicated to providing information on programs that offer training and research funding for graduate and medical students, postdoctoral fellows, and junior faculty. For undergraduates, they also publicize programs in science, math, engineering, and technology.

The Funding Directory contains a comprehensive listing of grant and scholarship programs. Search functions are wonderfully easy to use and accurate. You can search an alphabetical listing of foundations, type in a text search, or use the more advanced search features that allow you to select areas of interest, type of application, deadline, and/or training level. Searches return grant profiles based on your search criteria. Grant profiles include information such as contact information, restrictions, funding areas, eligibility requirements, deadlines, application process, and much more.

Visitors can sign up for the My GrantsNet feature that provides a means to save search criteria for later reference, save grant profiles, and/or sign up for weekly grant alerts. You must fill out an electronic profile to provide your contact information and to indicate your areas of interest. A nice feature allows you to select automatic log-in so you don’t have to remember yet another log-in code and password. Your information is available automatically when you enter the site.

If you just want to browse current opportunities, you can view the Funding News page. This page lists grant, fellowship and scholarship opportunities available from such agencies as the National Institutes of Health and the United States Department of Energy in addition to foundations.

Under Resources, the site offers four links: Grantwriting Tools and Tips, Index of Profiles, Global Links, and GrantDoctor. These links take you to another website sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. On the Grantwriting Tools and Tips page, you will find several interesting articles that could be useful to grantwriters from any field. One example is the series, “How Not To Kill A Grant Proposal.” Although it looks as if this page has not been updated in quite a while, the information is still pertinent and presented in an easy to read format.

The Index of Profiles section is also very informative. It tells the stories of people who have successfully won prestigious awards. These articles provide information about the awards, but add the personal touch by giving details on the individual winner and the background behind their proposal. This gives great insight into the real stories behind lucrative grants, particularly research grants.

The GrantDoctor page is dedicated to answering questions from readers. Topics cover a wide variety of topics, ranging from how to prepare an RO3 application to
finding funds for mid-career transitions. *Global Links* is self-explanatory. This page links readers to funding resources around the world.

GrantsNet.com is a comprehensive website that provides grant seekers with a variety of tools and resources to find information on grants, scholarships, research trends, and other funding opportunities. Visitors should prepare to spend some quality time exploring this interesting site.
WEBSITE REVIEW

GrantsUSA.net
www.grantsusa.net
Last accessed December 12, 2003

Reviewed by Iris Coffin

The primary feature of the GrantsUSA website is its devotion to individual states. Using its Arizona site as a prototype, GrantsUSA has now constructed the California Guide to Grants Online. Searchers can be assured that all funders searched will provide funding to California programs. Three new states will be added in the near future with more to follow.

The California site is what I used for my test drive. I found the ‘How to Search’ section very helpful and followed that guide to complete several searches. There is no charge for the demo, which does give a true representation of searching the full database.

You can search by keyword, criteria, or a combination of the two. There are also handy ‘View all Funders’ and ‘Pending Deadline’ buttons. The Pending Deadline button is particularly useful for quick identification of funders needing immediate attention.

Further, you can select your search to only retrieve Open, Restricted, or All funders.

I searched on ‘All’ funders using keyword ‘higher education’ and selected the ‘arts and humanities’ category to engage a combination search and received 27 hits in the demo (726 on the full database).

Each hit comes up with a list of core grantmaking priorities that can be scanned for additional priorities other than the keyword or category you searched on. I did not find this particularly helpful since it is repeated when you click on the funder and go to that page.

The funder page is very complete, with sections on contact information, grantmaking information, additional information containing notes on the funder, types of grants given, lifestyle stages funder prefers to fund, specific interests, target populations, and sample grants. The sections are useful and seem to be about 85% complete which is quite comparable to my other databases. My only comment here would be that the lifestyle stages section needs to be further explained. This is an unfamiliar term. It refers to the age or stage of development of the applicant agency -- start-up, growth stage, mature organizations, and turnarounds. I did another search on ‘human services’ checking the start-up category under lifestyle stages and received some solid hits. As everyone knows, funders for start-up agencies are rare.

This database is very user-friendly. I found solid hits with no instruction other than reading the ‘How to Search’ page. The cost is more than reasonable and well worth the expense. Those of you in California have a new, very capable resource. I’m hoping Iowa will be online soon.
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