PART TWO

J.P. Morgan Private Bank

Making an Impact

A GUIDE TO STRATEGIC PHILANTHROPHY

J.P.Morgan

Written by Christine Sherry and Eleanor Wright of Sherry Consulting
with The Philanthropy Centre at J.P. Morgan.

Table of contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Part II: Best Practices in Due Diligence and Impact Measurement

In Part I of our Guide to Strategic Philanthropy, we defined what we mean by strategic philanthropy, outlined approaches to creating an impact, and provided a road map toward maximizing impact in your chosen issue area(s). Part II will take you through the closely related—and, ideally, integrated—processes of due diligence and impact measurement.

IN BRIEF

We've broken this section down into three phases:

- **Performing Due Diligence**
- **Measuring Rigorously and Responsibly**
- **Leveraging Impact**

While approaching due diligence and impact measurement in stages can be helpful, grantmaking is both an art and a science. Effective due diligence on potential grantee organizations should be informed by an in-depth, organized research process that recognizes and respects the time and needs of the nonprofit. At the same time, as you consider an organization's ability to achieve its goals as well as yours, it is equally important to trust your instincts and recognize this work as necessarily iterative. You may need to adapt the following phases of due diligence and impact measurement to the circumstances at hand—and, at different points, perhaps even start over or go back a step.

Performing Due Diligence

The process of evaluating candidates for funding is called **due diligence**. Like choosing a philanthropic focus, due diligence can be a time-consuming endeavor, but one where rigor pays significant dividends. The more comfortable you are trusting your grantees, the easier it will be to collaborate on truly impactful projects.

Once you've defined a focus for your giving, you should determine which nonprofits best embody that focus. You'll probably face a number of options, and for each one you'll want to look carefully at the group's mission and approach, its history, its organizational capacity and its plans for the future.

Many resources exist to help funders assess a nonprofit's mission and activities. These can be useful for getting started. Ultimately, though, effective due diligence should be tailored to particular grants and their desired outcomes. It should be informed by concrete strategies for achieving impact and measuring success, not an isolated, template-driven exercise. Of course, actual impact measurement won't happen until programming begins, but deciding ahead of time—and in conversation with prospective nonprofit partners—how you'll evaluate your work will help you and your grantees formulate collective goals.

Proper due diligence requires that you be proactive and thorough. At the same time, though, due diligence is a delicate process. It is often easy to lose sight of nonprofits' needs and forget to respect their time. Too many funders get caught up in the pursuit of impact and they unintentionally undermine their nonprofit partners, either by imposing onerous restrictions on grants or by putting prospective grantees through lengthy due diligence and then failing to deliver funds that make it worthwhile.

Stories of inadvertent harm abound. In *Higher Impact Philanthropy*, Thomas Tierney recalls an unnamed foundation that demanded a prospective grantee attend multiple meetings, provide detailed reports, and endure months of anxious waiting, only to reward them with the "exciting" news that a grant one-fifth the size of the amount originally discussed had been approved.

To avoid this trap, it helps to see due diligence as an iterative process comprising three phases. Whether you complete all three phases, and the amount of time you spend on each, should reflect a) your starting knowledge of the issue and organization, and b) the scale of your proposed grant. For relatively small grants—especially to larger organizations—you should try to rely on your own independent research rather than methods that require the nonprofit to expend resources. For example, a site visit, which consumes time and energy staff might otherwise devote to programming, may not be necessary.

Being a strategic philanthropist does not just mean thinking carefully about your giving, it means partnering with nonprofits in a responsible, conscientious way that consistently supports their work.

Phase One: Preliminary Research and Reflection

Once you've chosen an issue area and a handful of promising candidates for funding, it is helpful to look individually at each organization, posing the following initial questions:

- Are the charity's mission, programs and services aligned with your philanthropic agenda and values?
- Are its programs and services aligned with its mission?
- Does the program address a clear and compelling need?
- Does it have the right team and resources to do the job?

Responses to these questions should come primarily from independent research. Consult annual reports, mission statements, media coverage, charity reviewer websites, and tax forms (especially Form 990, which organizations in the United States are required to release and which can be accessed on sites like GuideStar, Charity Navigator, and ProPublica's Nonprofit Explorer) to confirm as definitively as possible that the organization fits your criteria. During this phase you shouldn't need to make any demands on the nonprofit.

If you can't answer yes to all four of these questions, it may not make sense to proceed. Moving on to review another candidate will help you avoid wasting your own and the nonprofit's time.

One caveat: If you discover extraordinary organizations or visionaries who are just getting started, or whose work is referred through a trusted source, you may decide to take a bet on an untried idea. Strategic philanthropy should involve taking risks; our point is simply that before you ask a nonprofit to expend time and resources to secure a grant, you should reflect on whether it's a good fit for you. Being a strategic philanthropist does not just mean thinking carefully about your giving, it means partnering with nonprofits in a responsible, conscientious way that consistently supports their work.

Phase Two: Initial Contact

Once you confirm that an organization's work aligns with your goals, you can proceed with more in-depth due diligence by contacting the organization. Typically, initial contact is brief and remote: you might interview an executive director by phone or invite an organization to submit a one-page letter of inquiry. This opportunity to meet the nonprofit and hear more about its interest in your funding should help you gauge its fit, allowing you to narrow your candidate pool to a few, extremely likely organizations.

If that initial contact is promising but you feel more information would be helpful, you may invite the candidate to submit a full proposal. Keep in mind the size of your grant in proportion to the nonprofit's budget. Asking a $10 million organization to assemble a detailed proposal or host a site visit for a $10,000 general operating support grant may not be the best use of resources. But if a nonprofit has a budget of $100,000 and that $10,000 would help launch a new program, then requesting a more detailed proposal—or even a site visit—might make sense.

The most respected funders are mindful of the time and energy required to prepare a proposal, and they work hard to avoid making undue demands at this stage. Keeping a proposal request brief and to the point—or turning to peers to share proposal ideas—minimizes unnecessary drain on nonprofits' resources.

Phase Three: Site Visit

If you've gleaned all you can from public sources and your initial contact with staff, and have deemed a nonprofit a leading candidate for funding, you may want to visit the organization to observe its operations and learn more.

Site visits are not always necessary when the prospective grant is small relative to the organization's budget, especially if the funding would go toward general operating support. However, a site visit may be warranted and wise when:

- You are seriously considering a grant that would constitute a significant portion of an organization's budget.
- Your grant would go toward a specific or new project.
- You're planning a modest grant to initiate long-term engagement with the organization.

If you do decide to schedule a meeting, be sensitive to the power dynamic inherent in funder-grantee interactions. Planning your visit with care will help avoid unnecessarily occupying staff or interfering with a prospective grantee's day-to-day work. Make sure to:

- Give the executive director or staff advance notice and a sense of your timeframe and goals, so the organization knows how to prepare.
- Arrive well-versed in any background materials or proposals that have been submitted to you.
- Know what questions you want to ask.

Asking the Right Questions

Your discussions with staff during or before a site visit will reflect the nature of the proposed funding, your preliminary research and the initial contact. Think about what questions weren't answered during your first rounds of research, and focus the discussion on those.

Depending on the situation, during your site visit you may want to dive deeper into the organization's:

- *Capacity*. Does the organization have the staff, resources and technology to successfully execute projects and deliver services? Does it attract, support and retain talented, committed staff?
- *Management and governance*. Can the leader articulate a brief and compelling case for the organization's work? Does the organization appear to be well managed and have the right team to deliver its programming?
- *Funding and finances*. Is the organization financially stable? Will your grant, along with other existing support, provide adequate resources to cover your project without the risk of diverting money from other work? How is fundraising conducted, and is it integrated into the organization's overall strategy?
- *Results and evaluation*. Does the organization have a clear definition of success? How does it collect, analyze and apply data about its programs?

Additionally, if you're planning a project grant, you may want to ask specific questions regarding details of implementation, evaluation and long-term sustainability.

Consider that not all of these questions can or should be voiced explicitly. You can often assess whether an organization has the capacity to deliver simply by visiting its programs and seeing them in action, and by checking with other funders to see if their impressions of the organization match yours.

The best site visits progress organically, and it's as important to listen to what the organization's leadership and team have to say as it is to ask your own questions.

Think carefully about what you need to know to decide whether a grant is appropriate, and don't request information unless it's necessary. Whatever your questions, it's critical to do your homework in advance of a site visit and listen carefully to the nonprofit's goals and needs while you're there.

Working Together

Due diligence can be a time-consuming task, but there's no reason to face it alone. Many funders, at all levels, make a practice of involving their peers in the process—exchanging ideas, consulting each other about specific organizations, and sharing pertinent reports, statistics and field scans. Collaborative due diligence—whether in the context of a formal group or via casual conversation among like-minded grantmakers—can lighten the burden, inform your strategy and help you avoid duplicative research.

KEY TAKEAWAYS
Strategic Philanthropy

Due diligence often comprises one to three phases (depending on your existing knowledge and grant size):

1. In-depth background research;
2. Preliminary contact with select prospective grantees (where appropriate); and
3. Site visit (where appropriate).

- Reflect on grant size in proportion to the nonprofit's budget when considering the appropriate due diligence process to pursue.
- Be respectful of demands placed on the nonprofit.
- Consider collaborating with peer funders.

CASE STUDY
Big Bang Philanthropy

Formed in 2011 when a group of grantmakers realized they had similar funding interests and philosophies, Big Bang Philanthropy is an informal organization of funders who share leads, due diligence, ideas and networks to find and support organizations with cost-effective, scalable poverty-fighting projects whose impact has been rigorously demonstrated or defended. Members must have five grantees in common with others in the group, but their portfolios can remain otherwise distinct—unlike many collaboratives, Big Bang does not exist to facilitate co-funding. Rather, its power lies in the efficiency with which members can, by pooling information about generic evaluation protocols as well as data on specific nonprofits, conduct thorough and sophisticated due diligence.

One grantmaker that has used Big Bang's resources to enhance its impact is the Peery Foundation. Established in 1978, the Palo-Alto-based funder invests in early- to mid-stage social entrepreneurs working at the local, regional and global levels to address issues of poverty. Membership in Big Bang has helped Peery become aware of promising grantees and access due diligence data—from anecdotal feedback to formal reports—that other funders have already collected, saving time for everyone involved. For instance, another grantmaker may offer records of a site visit or an exhaustive impact report that enhances research Peery has conducted independently. And group conversations about due diligence offer a rich cross-section of ideas and perspectives, complementing Peery's own approach.

All case studies are shown for illustrative purposes only and should not be relied upon as advice or interpreted as a recommendation. They are based on current market conditions that constitute our judgment and are subject to change. Results shown are not meant to be representative of actual investment results. **Past performance is not necessarily indicative of the future result.**

Measuring Rigorously[1] and Responsibly

Most philanthropists and nonprofits appreciate the importance of measuring the results of their work. The challenge is how to put this into practice. Often, the difficulty lies in determining—alongside grantees—which of many possible metrics to track. Articulating your own understanding of success and choosing a nonprofit partner with the same goal can help make this process smooth and productive.

What to Measure?

The best-designed impact evaluations emerge from honest and open discussion between funders and nonprofit leadership about the details of an intervention—specifically, about which measurable elements (**indicators**) are both trackable and meaningful.

Most nonprofits will already have some evaluation protocols in place, and that's usually a good place for funders to start. It's critical to understand early on what an organization's goals are, what it is currently measuring to quantify those goals, and why. If the nonprofit's metrics don't meet your needs, consider what additional information you would require to feel comfortable providing support. Think carefully and concretely about how you'll use that information, and who will fund its collection. Ask yourself:

- What is the cost of knowing this information—and is it an additional burden on the organization?
- Is the organization prepared to implement your proposed changes to measurement protocol?
- Are you willing to pay for implementation?

Many nonprofits have conducted evaluations for other funders. Reviewing existing impact reports can save you and the organization from redundant measurement.

Remember, too, that your personal evaluation goals may be much broader than the nonprofit's. It makes sense to ask a grantee to assess its performance and measure **outputs** (the immediate results of its activities—data like "number of contraceptives distributed"). But be mindful of any gap between your evaluation goals and your grantee's, and keep your expectations reasonable. Small or young organizations, for example, may not be in a position to produce statistics proving long-term impact. Similarly, if a nonprofit is not currently measuring a specific output, don't request that information until you've considered whether you would be willing to fund its collection. And realize that defining and measuring long-term impact (through a combination of evaluation and research) generally falls to the funder, who is more likely to have the perspective, capacity and resources to examine population- and system-wide change.

It's critical to understand early on what an organization's goals are, what it is currently measuring to quantify those goals, and why.

---

[1] If defining impact is an animated discussion, actually measuring it can be confounding. Myriad universal metrics have been proposed, from simple (though ambiguous) calculations like "**cost per life impact**" to comprehensive formulas used by impact investors. Many philanthropists find the concept of "**social return on investment**" (SROI) a useful one; borrowed from finance, SROI treats philanthropic grants like investments, where the desired returns come not in financial profits but in the positive social change the funding enables. High-impact opportunities are those where SROI per dollar invested is large: where a small amount of money produces outsized social good. Of course, comparing different endeavors' benefits to humanity is trickier than comparing financial ROIs, but it can be productive to reflect on how you'd tackle the challenge. Even if you don't quantify your grants' results, the SROI framework can be a helpful reminder to prioritize impact forecasts and measurement as you make philanthropic decisions.

CASE STUDY

Clarifying Impact Through Simple Goals

Kevin Starr stumbled into the world of philanthropy when he was asked to run the Mulago Foundation, a new foundation established for his friend and mentor who had died unexpectedly. Trained as a physician, Kevin was taken aback by the uncertainty surrounding so much nonprofit work: he traveled widely and met passionate leaders spearheading ambitious projects, but many lacked the data to gauge what—if anything—they were accomplishing. Starr and the trustees of Mulago, whose family came from the business world, were determined to do better: to find ways of confirming impact that would be rigorous but feasible, even for the fledgling innovators the Foundation favored.

So Mulago borrowed concepts from the for-profit sector, understanding impact as an analog of profit and insisting that nonprofits track it the same way businesses track income. That means working hard with prospective grantees to explore their vision of impact, agree on appropriate metrics, and provide ongoing support as they monitor their progress. Mulago requires each grantee to articulate its most critical and immediate goals in an eight-word mission statement; then, to keep longer-term goals in sight, it asks that organizations identify a **doer at scale** (the organization itself, other NGOs, other businesses, or the government) that will help grow the project when the time comes.

What do these policies look like in practice? For one partner, Off-Grid Electric, they meant reflecting on the organization's work to isolate its simplest, most concrete and fundamental objective. Off-Grid Electric installs solar panels on customers' roofs and furnishes their homes with lighting systems, then sells them affordable power; the idea is to bring very poor people high-quality light and the host of benefits that accompany it (children performing better in school, fewer accidents with kerosene and candles, and so on). But those benefits are challenging to measure, especially for a grassroots group. So Off-Grid and Mulago agreed to assume that reliable electric lighting is itself a good outcome—that tracking impact could mean simply tallying the number of households that switched from darkness, kerosene, or candlelight to electric light via Off-Grid's system. Once they settled on this metric, they could confidently monitor their results.

While not all work is this easy to quantify, Starr firmly believes that worthwhile organizations should be able to frame their missions in simple and concrete terms—terms that can guide rigorous, ongoing impact measurement. For Starr, achieving and tracking impact doesn't have to be daunting; it's just a matter of thinking clearly and specifically about your work.

All case studies are shown for illustrative purposes only and should not be relied upon as advice or interpreted as a recommendation. They are based on current market conditions that constitute our judgment and are subject to change. Results shown are not meant to be representative of actual investment results. **Past performance is not necessarily indicative of the future result.**

At the appropriate time, and as your grantmaking portfolio grows, it might make sense to look at the overall effectiveness of your approach. This type of **programmatic measurement**—looking holistically at the perhaps interrelated outcomes of many funding initiatives—is different from measuring the impact of one program, and it can take a variety of forms. It requires a particularly sophisticated analysis, one that captures different types of results from diverse interventions across several organizations. For example, there may be multiple programs you'll need to consider, or nonnumeric factors that should be evaluated. If you're interested in conducting comprehensive programmatic evaluation, exploring other funders' approaches is a good place to start.

CASE STUDY

Measuring Impact at Many Levels

Founded in 2001, the Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation uses the principles of venture capitalism to identify, invest in and support promising social entrepreneurs. DRK has a strong focus on results, but recognizes that impact can be a nebulous and multifaceted concept. Accordingly, it looks at impact through several lenses, tracking both its portfolio-wide results and critical indicators for each organization.

DRK's portfolio-wide analysis looks broadly at its total grantmaking: the Foundation has supported 100 social entrepreneurs to date, and by 2021 it expects to have deployed $110 million to over 185 organizations via three funding rounds. So far, grants are almost evenly split between domestic and international groups, with 25 percent focused on education; 15 percent on economic empowerment; 20 percent on health; 10 percent on civic engagement; 12 percent on social justice; and the rest on systemic poverty, food and agriculture, arts and culture, and the environment. Reviewing its grants thus far, DRK estimates that each dollar it invests in portfolio groups gets leveraged by a factor of more than 50;[2] and the collective revenues of partner organizations show a compound annual growth rate higher than 50 percent.

DRK also tracks individual organizations, looking at the number of lives touched by each partner's work; the organization's potential for effecting longer-term systems change; and its prospects of leveraging philanthropic investments at scale—adapting its model for mass distribution. DRK's partner Last Mile Health, which trains Liberian community leaders to serve as village health practitioners, helped contain the recent Ebola outbreak and is now working with the Ministry of Health to integrate its model into national policy. Muso, another partner organization, worked with the government of Mali to develop a rapid health response network that has already helped reduce mortality by more than 90 percent among children in the region where it operates. And DRK's partner Kiva, a worldwide person-to-person lending marketplace supporting microfinance institutions, has so far facilitated over $821 million in loans to 1.4 million micro-entrepreneurs across 84 countries, with an average loan size of $412.26 and repayment rates above 98 percent.

Finally, DRK looks for evidence of possible systemic change as it evaluates prospects. Upstream, a new grantee, seeks to reduce the number of unplanned pregnancies in the United States by training workers at local health clinics to provide more effective birth control; if they are successful, they'll dramatically reduce the downstream effects of poverty associated with unplanned pregnancies and potentially go out of business in a decade or more (a mark of achievement for a nonprofit).

[2] To estimate leverage, DRK divides the total revenue each organization raises by the amount of money DRK invested in it.

Types of Assessments: Formative and Summative

Most evaluations can be classified as either **formative** or **summative**.

- If your goal is to find out midway through a project whether it's working (and course-correct if necessary), you'll want to do a **formative assessment**, digging into the results as they emerge.
- If you've finished a project and want to evaluate it retrospectively (to determine its merit and deciding whether to continue or replicate), you should perform a **summative assessment**.

While both types of evaluations can be useful, formative assessments can be especially powerful in that they uncover a project's inefficiencies early on, before it's been fully implemented. Robust formative assessments can help philanthropists monitor and expedite their progress toward impact.

Unfortunately, many funders ask only for summative evaluations—and, too often, use the results just to validate finished projects. Formative assessments can save time and resources, so funders should always consider them as a possible evaluation tactic. That said, summative evaluations also have their benefits. When they are done well, results can be instrumental in crafting future programming.

When to Measure?

With all the buzz around impact evaluation, it's easy to get metric-happy. But even funders with ample resources cannot and should not measure everything. In fact, too much data can be a paralyzing impediment to productive analysis. So be judicious—especially when requesting data from a nonprofit, but also when designing and conducting your own study. Make sure the benefit of the learning is likely to equal or exceed the cost of the asking in money, time, effort and intrusiveness to nonprofit staff or members of the communities they serve.

Before you request a particular type of information, ask yourself the following questions:

- Will it inform decisions about future funding?
- Will it help express a nonprofit's achievements to other grantmakers?
- Will it make the case for a policy change, or shift public opinion?
- Will it help make your grantee accountable?
- Will it clarify ways to revise programming?

Remember, too, that in a field as nuanced as philanthropy, numbers almost never tell the whole story. Data should be valued not as "calculations that produce 'the truth'" but as "a discipline to sharpen thinking and make more fully considered decisions."[3]

[3] Twersky, Far: "Strategic Philanthropy and the Risk of Certainty," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Feb. 5, 2014. http://ssir.org/articles/entry/strategic_philanthropy_and_the_risk_of_certainty.

CASE STUDY

Building A Field

Founded in 1984 by a prodigious art collector, the Emily Hall Tremaine Foundation is a national grantmaker focused on the arts, the environment and learning differences, all through the lens of education. Since 2003, EHTF's Marketplace Empowerment for Artists (MEA) program has worked with both universities and arts organizations to provide business training to visual artists. Integral to the Foundation's arts strategy is the proposition that business and professional training could free artists from their reliance on patrons, grants and federal funding.

An impact assessment performed during 2011 through 2013 confirmed the program's effectiveness. Over 11 years, MEA brought career training to 18,000 artists; almost all were still making art in 2012, and most said the training enhanced their careers (half were more active than they'd been two years earlier). Following a concerted expansion effort launched in 2007, EHTF's funding helped many of its 33 grantees grow their offerings, making business education accessible to a broad population of artists throughout the U.S. (with 287 training sites in 2012). And a third of the surveyed alumni now teach professional practices training—boding well for the program's sustainability.

But the Foundation has bigger goals, which the impact assessment helped clarify. Since many of its grantees do similar yet isolated work, starting from scratch to create and refine their own curricula, EHTF has launched an effort to connect and align the various arts organizations it funds. Drawing on scholarship around network theory and formative impact assessment, as well as quantitative grantee surveys and input from various stakeholders, program staff are now supplying backbone organizational support as a cohort of arts services providers co-create field-wide rubrics on professional practice. Designed to help artists thrive, heighten society's appreciation for the arts, foster cross-sector collaboration and support artists pursuing community involvement, the rubrics will locate arts services practices along a spectrum according to beneficiaries' performance and success. Stakeholders can update the rubrics at any time with examples of specific arts services programs and their results, helping artists and intermediaries think concretely about what works before implementing their own strategies. To encourage field-wide adoption and maximize effectiveness, the rubrics will be open-sourced and will undergo continual expansion and revision.

By laying the foundations for a national network of arts services groups, EHTF hopes to achieve impact that will transcend the work of its individual partners, helping them share standards and ideas to enable quicker, more powerful and lasting collective progress.

All case studies are shown for illustrative purposes only and should not be relied upon as advice or interpreted as a recommendation. They are based on current market conditions that constitute our judgment and are subject to change. Results shown are not meant to be representative of actual investment results. **Past performance is not necessarily indicative of the future result.**

CASE STUDY

Evaluating A Funding Strategy

The Durfee Foundation, a Los Angeles-based philanthropy with only four staff members, illustrates how candid and targeted self-evaluation can boost a funder's impact by helping it communicate its successes to other grantmakers. Two decades ago, Durfee saw a need among local nonprofit leaders for time off to recharge and rethink; accordingly, they developed a program to offer selected social sector leaders the funding and organizational support they needed to take a three-month sabbatical. The plan worked: not only did chronically stressed executive directors rest and gain new perspective on their work; nonprofits were forced, in the leaders' absence, to step up their organizational capacity, confront the issue of succession planning, clarify various staff members' responsibilities, and demand more active governance from their boards. Organizations and their leaders emerged from the sabbaticals stronger and more confident.

Recognizing that their sabbatical program's success offered valuable lessons, the Durfee Foundation spoke with four other funders from around the U.S. who had tried similar strategies. Together, they undertook a systematic study of the sabbatical approach. Ultimately, the project led to the publication of a report, *Creative Disruption: Sabbaticals for Capacity Building & Leadership Development in the Nonprofit Sector*, which both evaluates these foundations' sabbatical programs and shares their strategy with other philanthropists.

Because it was carefully planned and collaboratively executed, Durfee's study cost relatively little: four funders contributed just $25,000 each to conduct the evaluation and then publish its results. And that small, judicious investment didn't only benefit the report's co-funders; it gave a host of other foundations and nonprofits the inspiration and guidelines to replicate a phenomenally successful and cost-effective program—prompting so many requests for information that Durfee eventually supplemented *Creative Disruption* with a *Sabbatical Guide for Funders* and a nonprofit-geared *DIY Sabbatical Guide* available on their website.

All case studies are shown for illustrative purposes only and should not be relied upon as advice or interpreted as a recommendation. They are based on current market conditions that constitute our judgment and are subject to change. Results shown are not meant to be representative of actual investment results. **Past performance is not necessarily indicative of the future result.**

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Impact Measurement

- Determine a program's indicators (measurable elements) upfront, then measure its outputs (the immediate results of its activities).
- Evaluation can be formative (during a project) or summative (after).
- Measurement and evaluation should be thoroughly planned to enhance your understanding of a project without wasting resources on superfluous data collection.
- Well-conducted evaluations can be cost-shared, and can engage more donors in projects you care about.

Leveraging Impact

Once you've mastered the basic process of strategic grantmaking, a range of other techniques can further amplify your impact as a funder, including:

- Scaling organizations and initiatives.
- Collaborating with other donors and stakeholders.
- Supporting grantees with non-financial resources, such as training and access to networks.
- Providing general operating support rather than project grants.

More broadly, reflective grantmaking practices can help maximize the efficacy of your funding and avoid common pitfalls. That means pushing yourself to develop:

- A learning mindset.
- Sensitivity to the limits and responsibilities of your role as a funder.
- Willingness to seek feedback from your grantees so that evaluation becomes a two-way street.

Conclusion

In this *Guide to Strategic Philanthropy*, we touched on a number of topics and highlighted a series of tools that may help you enhance your charitable impact. By defining strategic philanthropy, summarizing the key components of impact, and illuminating the tactical steps of due diligence and evaluation, we've aimed to provide a friendly resource that will grow along with you and your giving. While strategic philanthropy continues to evolve, you can always come back to these core principles and practices to refine and improve your own road map to impact.

As you dive in, remember to be thoughtful in your approach, set realistic goals for yourself and your partners, and embrace the learning that comes by doing. The more we engage as proactive learners and humble teachers, the better we can be as strategic philanthropists—and the greater impact we can have collectively.

WE CAN HELP

J.P. Morgan Private Bank is committed to helping you enhance your philanthropic impact by offering advice, thought leadership and learning opportunities. To learn more, we encourage you to contact your J.P. Morgan representative.

Cited Organizations

The following grantmakers and nonprofits appear in this article:

Carnegie Corporation of New York
https://www.carnegie.org

The Rockefeller Foundation
https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org

The Tow Family Foundation
http://www.towfoundation.org

The Pugh Family Foundation
http://www.pughfamilyfoundation.org

The Segal Family Foundation
http://www.segalfamilyfoundation.org

Planet Heritage Foundation
http://www.planetheritage.org

- Climate change field scan
  http://sherryconsulting.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/SC_ClimateChangeNationalSecurity.pdf

The John and Wauna Harman Foundation
http://www.jwhfoundation.org

- End-of-life field scan
  http://static1.squarespace.com/static/5607469be4b0c103837a4a92/t/5629bed7e4b0f99eccfdd307/1445576407325/End+of+Life+scan+-+summary+memo.pdf, http://static1.squarespace.com/static/5607469be4b0c103837a4a92/t/5629bf09e4b050fa52c5194d/1445576457258/End+of+Life+scan+-+literature+review.pdf

The John Gogian Family Foundation
http://www.gogianfoundation.org

The Beldon Fund
http://www.beldon.org

The Evelyn and Walter Haas Junior Fund
http://www.haasjr.org

Sesame Workshop
http://www.sesameworkshop.org

Friends of the High Line
http://www.thehighline.org

The Cynthia and George Mitchell Foundation
http://www.cgmf.org/p/home.html

Big Bang Philanthropy
http://www.bigbangphilanthropy.org

The Peery Foundation
http://www.peeryfoundation.org

The Mulago Foundation
http://www.mulagofoundation.org

Off-Grid Electric
http://www.offgrid-electric.com/

The Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation
http://www.drkfoundation.org

Last Mile Health
http://www.lastmilehealth.org

Muso
http://www.projectmuso.org

Upstream
http://www.upstream.org

The Emily Hall Tremaine Foundation
http://www.tremainefoundation.org

The Durfee Foundation
http://www.durfee.org

Recommended Reading

This guide was designed to be readable, pragmatic and concise. To that end, we breezed through concepts experts have spent many years—and hundreds of pages—debating and dissecting. If you're interested in going deeper, the following resources offer some thoughtful perspectives on a range of topics mentioned in our article.

Beyond Compliance: Measuring to Learn, Improve, and Create Positive Change
The Center for High Impact Philanthropy and Wharton Social Impact Initiative, 2013

An in-depth exploration of impact and measurement.

The Chronicle of Philanthropy
https://philanthropy.com

A monthly magazine and regularly updated website covering news and resources on the nonprofit world.

The Foundation: A Great American Secret; How Private Wealth Is Changing the World
Joel Fleishman, 2007

A comprehensive examination of the history and future of philanthropic foundations (from which several of our case studies were drawn).

Give Smart: Philanthropy That Gets Results
Thomas J. Tierney and Joel L. Fleishman, 2012

A primer for philanthropists and nonprofits drawing in part on Tierney's experience with The Bridgespan Group (a nonprofit that provides management consulting to nonprofits and philanthropists).

Money Well Spent: A Strategic Plan for Smart Philanthropy
Paul Brest and Hal Harvey, 2008

A sophisticated guide that draws on examples from foundations and nonprofits to lay out the components of a smart, impact-oriented giving strategy.

Stanford Social Innovation Review
http://ssir.org

A magazine and website covering cross-sector solutions to global problems. Published by the Stanford Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, SSIR is widely viewed as the journal of record in the sector. Recommended articles:

- Kristi Kimball and Malka Kopell, "Letting Go" (Spring 2011)
- Fay Twersky, Phil Buchanan, and Valerie Threlfall: "Listening to Those Who Matter Most, the Beneficiaries" (Spring 2013)
- John Kania, Mark Kramer, and Patty Russell: "Strategic Philanthropy for a Complex World" (Summer 2014)

"What Are We Talking About When We Talk About Impact?"
The Center for High Impact Philanthropy and Women Moving Millions, 2013

A close examination of the term "impact."

J.P.Morgan

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

Purpose of This Material

This material is for information purposes only. The information provided may inform you of certain investment products and services offered by J.P. Morgan's private banking business, part of JPMorgan Chase & Co. The past performance and strategies described in the material may not be suitable for all investors and are subject to investment risks. **Please read this Important Information in its entirety.**

Confidentiality

This material is confidential and intended for your personal use. It should not be circulated to or used by any other person, or duplicated for non-personal use, without our permission.

Regulatory Status

In the **United States**, Bank products and services, including certain discretionary investment management products and services, are offered by **JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.** and its affiliates. Securities products and services are offered in the U.S. by **J.P. Morgan Securities LLC,** an affiliate of JPMCB, and outside of the U.S. by other global affiliates. J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, member FINRA and SIPC.

J.P. Morgan and its affiliates and employees do not provide tax, legal or accounting advice. You should consult your own tax, legal and accounting advisors before engaging in any financial transactions. Contact your J.P. Morgan representative for additional information concerning your personal investment goals. You should be aware of the general and specific risks relevant to the matters discussed in the material. You should independently, without any reliance on J.P. Morgan, make your own judgment and decision with respect to any investment referenced in this material.

In the **United Kingdom,** this material is issued by **J.P. Morgan International Bank Limited (JPMIB)** with the registered office located at 25 Bank Street, Canary Wharf, London E14 5JP, registered in England No. 03838766. JPMIB is authorized by the Prudential Regulation Authority and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority and the Prudential Regulation Authority. In addition, this material may be distributed by: **JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. ("JPMCB"), Paris branch,** which is regulated by the French banking authorities Autorité de Contrôle Prudentiel et de Résolution and Autorité des Marchés Financiers; **J.P. Morgan (Suisse) SA,** regulated by the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority; **JPMCB Dubai branch,** regulated by the Dubai Financial Services Authority; and **JPMCB Bahrain branch,** licensed as a conventional wholesale bank by the Central Bank of Bahrain (for professional clients only).

In **Hong Kong,** this material is distributed by **JPMCB, Hong Kong branch.** JPMCB, Hong Kong branch is regulated by the Hong Kong Monetary Authority and the Securities and Futures Commission of Hong Kong. In Hong Kong, we will cease to use your personal data for our marketing purposes without charge if you so request. In **Singapore,** this material is distributed by **JPMCB, Singapore branch.** JPMCB, Singapore branch is regulated by the Monetary Authority of Singapore. Dealing and advisory services and discretionary investment management services are provided to you by JPMCB, Hong Kong/Singapore branch (as notified to you). Banking and custody services are provided to you by JPMIB. The contents of this document have not been reviewed by any regulatory authority in Hong Kong, Singapore or any other jurisdictions. You are advised to exercise caution in relation to this document. If you are in any doubt about any of the contents of this document, you should obtain independent professional advice.

With respect to countries in **Latin America,** the distribution of this material may be restricted in certain jurisdictions. Receipt of this material does not constitute an offer or solicitation to any person in any jurisdiction in which such offer or solicitation is not authorized or to any person to whom it would be unlawful to make such offer or solicitation. To the extent this content makes reference to a fund, the Fund may not be publicly offered in any Latin American country, without previous registration of such fund's securities in compliance with the laws of the corresponding jurisdiction.

Non-reliance

We believe the information contained in this material to be reliable and have sought to take reasonable care in its preparation; however, we do not represent or warrant its accuracy, reliability or completeness, or accept any liability for any loss or damage (whether direct or indirect) arising out of the use of all or any part of this material. We do not make any representation or warranty with regard to any computations, graphs, tables, diagrams or commentary in this material that are provided for illustration/reference purposes only. The views, opinions, estimates and strategies expressed in it constitute our judgment based on current market conditions and are subject to change without notice. We assume no duty to update any information in this material in the event that such information changes. Views, opinions, estimates and strategies expressed herein may differ from those expressed by other areas of J.P. Morgan, views expressed for other purposes or in other contexts, and this material should not be regarded as a research report. Any projected results and risks are based solely on hypothetical examples cited, and actual results and risks will vary depending on specific circumstances. Forward-looking statements should not be considered as guarantees or predictions of future events. **Investors may get back less than they invested, and past performance is not a reliable indicator of future results.**

Risks, Considerations and Additional information

There may be different or additional factors that are not reflected in this material, but which may impact on a client's portfolio or investment decision. The information contained in this material is intended as general market commentary and should not be relied upon in isolation for the purpose of making an investment decision. Nothing in this document shall be construed as giving rise to any duty of care owed to, or advisory relationship with, you or any third party. Nothing in this document is intended to constitute a representation that any investment strategy or product is suitable for you. You should consider carefully whether any products and strategies discussed are suitable for your needs, and to obtain additional information prior to making an investment decision. Nothing in this document shall be regarded as an offer, solicitation, recommendation or advice (whether financial, accounting, legal, tax or other) given by J.P. Morgan and/or its officers or employees, irrespective of whether or not such communication was given at your request.

J.P. Morgan may hold a position for itself or our other clients that may not be consistent with the information, opinions, estimates, investment strategies or views expressed in this document.

JPMorgan Chase & Co. or its affiliates may hold a position or act as market maker in the financial instruments of any issuer discussed herein or act as an underwriter, placement agent, advisor or lender to such issuer.

References in this report to "J.P. Morgan" are to JPMorgan Chase & Co., its subsidiaries and affiliates worldwide. "J.P. Morgan Private Bank" is the marketing name for the private banking business conducted by J.P. Morgan.

If you have any questions or no longer wish to receive these communications, please contact your usual J.P. Morgan representative.

J.P. Morgan