

Who's Using Evaluation and How?

New Study Gives Insight



How are foundations using evaluation?
What about the nonprofits they fund?
Here are survey results every nonprofit should know.

BY RAYMOND E. ALIE & JOHN R. SEITA

NONPROFIT PROVIDERS ARE FEELING the pinch of federal deficit pressure on allocations for human service programs. The decline in government support of these programs means that nonprofits must seek other funding sources, including philanthropic foundations.

This climate of cutbacks suggests that existing funds from all sources should be used as effectively as possible. Tracking effectiveness further suggests the use of formal evaluation techniques. The question is: How and to what extent do foundations and nonprofit service providers use evaluation tools?

In this article, we report a study designed to at least begin to answer this question. For the study, formal evaluation was defined as follows:

Formal evaluation is “the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of an object; for example, a program, project, or grant proposal.”¹

What Does the Literature Say?

The literature reveals surprisingly few clues about how foundations use formal evaluation.² Yet evaluation in foundations is not a recent concern. As early as 1973, Orville Brim noted, “Here is a major class of American institutions numbering in the tens of thousands, a more-than-billion-dollar-a-year enterprise, and yet there are hardly a half-dozen published reports on any substantial efforts at evaluating foundation activities.”³

Things have not changed much in the decades since. Information on how foundations measure the success of their grants continues to be sketchy at best. The Foundation Center houses a comprehensive database on foundations but doesn’t include information on the extent to which foundations fund or use evaluation.⁴

Although we found little information describing evaluation by foundations, we did find suggestions that foundations are interested in evaluation. The St. Paul Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, the Kaiser Family Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Pew Charitable Trust, to name a few, have evaluation manuals or have been involved in evaluation activities. The Council on Foundations profiled nine foundations that use evaluation.⁵ These profiles, while useful, shed no light on how extensively foundations use evaluation. The study also suggests that even among foundations that use evaluation, it is not highly valued. Excluding one project, for which the evaluation cost exceeded the project cost (\$561,000 for the evaluation; \$470,000 for the project), the foundations allocated only 1.6% of costs for evaluation. Formal evaluation generally represents between 5 and 15% of the project or program cost.⁶

Since there is clearly a linkage between foundations and nonprofits, a United Way of America study is useful for our purposes.⁷ This study, which assessed evaluation practices by United-Way-funded organizations, yielded the following findings:

1. Ninety-six percent of respondents reported that all or most of their organizations measured volume of program delivery (number of clients served).
2. Seventy-six percent stated that all or most of their organizations kept records on program participant characteristics.
3. Fifty-nine percent noted that all or most of their organizations monitor compliance with program delivery standards.
4. Fifty-nine percent reported that all or most of their organizations assess management practices.
5. Twenty percent said that all or most measure participant satisfaction.
6. Nineteen percent noted that all or most assess program outcomes or results.

Measuring service-delivery outcomes seems to be little valued by those purporting to conduct evaluation. Instead, nonprofit evaluation efforts focus on accreditation criteria, such as meeting established resource standards and serving a certain number of clients. Rosana Spagnolo-Rodriguez found in her study of nonprofit evaluation that volume of clients served was the most widely used evaluation practice.⁸

Nonprofits’ use of such soft methods of accountability is understandable, since their funders have expected little more of them.⁹ However, their failure to adopt formal evaluation principles places them outside a mainstream emphasis on quality found among businesses and some classes of nonprofits.

While nonprofits are expected to account for expenditures, they don’t generally have to evaluate specific outcomes for either the organization or individuals. These outcomes are, or should be, the principal



The survey shows that few foundations use formal evaluation. Even fewer have any interest in doing so.

objectives of nonprofit programs. For example, how many people gain new skills and knowledge? How many of those we train find and keep jobs? How many people stay out of institutions?

Whom Does the Survey Examine?

The population for this study was the 959 philanthropic foundations in Michigan. There are three types of foundations:

1. Private foundations are grant-making organizations whose assets come from an individual or family.
2. Community foundations are funded from multiple sources, are managed by a board and often an administrator, and almost always have a specific geographic focus.
3. Company foundations derive their assets from a corporation.

There are 872 private foundations, 43 community foundations, and 44 corporate foundations in Michigan. We surveyed all the community and corporate foundations and a random sample of 139 private foundations. While we can't generalize our findings broadly, we believe that what we found in Michigan probably doesn't differ greatly from the rest of the country.

The most useful evaluation tool

was one of the least used.

We mailed questionnaires to a sample of 226 foundations,

asking whether they used formal evaluation methods, and 59.2% responded. Tables 1 through 7 show the results. We have broken these results into foundation type and size. Size is based on assets: large (over \$1,000,000), medium (\$200,000 to \$1,000,000), small (\$100,000 to \$200,000), and very small (under \$100,000).¹⁰

How Many Foundations Use Evaluation?

Are foundations more apt to use evaluation before, during, or after they fund a project? To answer that question, we asked foundations about three types of evaluation:

1. How Many Use Pre-Grant Evaluation?

As Table 1 shows, less than half of foundations (45.3%) use formal evaluation to select proposals for funding. A higher percentage (55.8) of large foundations use pre-grant evaluation than do their smaller colleagues.

So, what do foundations use in place of formal evaluation to decide whom they will fund? On a scale of 1 to 4, respondents said they were most influenced by the following factors:¹¹

1. Documented need (3.65)
2. Reputation of the organization (3.36)
3. Community priority (3.30)
4. Prior relationship between foundation & organization (2.63)

2. How Many Use Ongoing Evaluation?

As Table 2 shows, only 34% of responding foundations use evaluation to assess ongoing projects.

Table 1
Do You Use Evaluation to Make Grant Proposal Decisions?

Foundation Size	Yes(%)	No(%)	Number Responding	Foundation Type	Yes(%)	No(%)	Number Responding
Large	55.8%	44.2%	52	Community	85.0%	15.0%	40
Medium	45.2%	54.8%	31	Corporate	44.0%	46.0%	25
Small	30.0%	70.0%	20	Private	20.6%	79.4%	63
V. Small	36.0%	64.0%	25				
Total	45.3%	54.7%	128	Total	45.3%	54.7%	128

Table 2
Do You Use Evaluation to Review Current Projects?

Foundation Size	Yes(%)	No(%)	Number Responding	Foundation Type	Yes(%)	No(%)	Number Responding
Large	47.1%	52.9%	51	Community	62.5%	38.5%	40
Medium	35.5%	64.5%	31	Corporate	29.2%	69.9%	24
Small	20.0%	80.0%	20	Private	17.5%	82.6%	63
V. Small	16.0%	84.0%	25				
Total	34.0%	66.0%	127	Total	34%	66%	127

Table 3
Do You Use Postproject Evaluation?

Foundation Size	Yes(%)	No(%)	Number Responding	Foundation Type	Yes(%)	No(%)	Number Responding
Large	46.2%	53.8%	52	Community	65.0%	35.0%	40
Medium	22.6%	77.4%	31	Corporate	24.0%	76.0%	25
Small	25.0%	75.0%	20	Private	14.3%	85.7%	63
V. Small	20.0%	80.0%	25				
Total	41.0%	59.0%	128	Total	41.0%	59.0%	128

Again, large foundations lead the way (47.1%) with remaining groups showing decreasing usage rates. When we consider type of foundation, community foundations use ongoing evaluation at a rate of 62.5%, corporate foundations at 29.2%, and private foundations at 17.5%.

3. How Many Use Postproject Evaluation?

Intuition suggests that postproject evaluation would be the most widely used form of evaluation by far. We would expect foundations to evaluate completed projects much more often than ongoing projects. Our data do not support this view.

As Table 3 shows, only 41% of foundations use postproject evaluation—just slightly more than those using ongoing evaluation. Large foundations have the highest rate at 46.2% with the remaining groups trailing at 25% or less.

What Informal Evaluation Tools Do Nonprofits Use?

If few foundations rely on formal, systematic evaluation, do they use informal, unsystematic methods? We asked survey participants this question. They replied that their grantees sometimes reported their progress in the following informal ways:

Written Reports: Some nonprofits send their funders project summaries, which may include one or more of the types of information shown below.

Site Visits: Some foundations send representatives to the project location to assess the project's effectiveness.

Indirect Contacts: Some nonprofits keep their funders updated on their progress through phone conversations, second-party reports, and media sources such as newspaper articles and TV news reports.

Financial Reporting: Nonprofits sometimes give a detailed listing, by category, of how they spend their grant funds.

Number of Clients Served: Funders may simply ask nonprofits how many clients they serve.

Licensing Standards: Funders may ask grantees if they comply with certain standards or accreditation criteria specified for successful awarding of grants.

Assessment of Management Practices: Grantees may examine their management practices to see if they meet project objectives.

Table 4
What Evaluation Strategies Do You Use, and How Useful Are They?

Strategies	Foundation Size	Avg. Usefulness (4 pt. Scale)	No. of Cases	Foundation Type	Avg. Usefulness (4 pt. Scale)	No. of Cases
Written Reports	Large	3.35	31	Community	3.23	30
	Medium	2.81	11	Corporate	3.00	10
	Small	3.50	4	Private	3.38	13
	V. Small	3.14	7			
Total		3.20	53(23.5%)		3.20	53
Site Visits	Large	3.26	26	Community	3.21	28
	Medium	3.00	11	Corporate	2.33	9
	Small	2.75	4	Private	3.33	12
	V. Small	2.75	8			
Total		2.94	49 (21.7%)	Total	2.94	49
Indirect Contacts	Large	3.31	29	Community	3.26	30
	Medium	2.91	12	Corporate	2.45	10
	Small	3.25	4	Private	3.15	13
	V. Small	2.24	8			
Total		2.93	53 (23.5%)	Total	2.93	53
Financial Reports	Large	3.22	27	Community	3.30	30
	Medium	3.33	12	Corporate	3.32	9
	Small	3.75	4	Private	3.09	11
	V. Small	2.85	7			
Total		3.24	50 (22.1%)	Total	3.24	50
No. of Clients Served	Large	3.25	24	Community	3.22	27
	Medium	3.00	12	Corporate	2.87	8
	Small	3.00	3	Private	3.20	10
	V. Small	3.16	6			
Total		3.10	45 (20.0%)	Total	3.10	45
Licensing Standards	Large	2.94	17	Community	2.90	21
	Medium	2.60	10	Corporate	2.42	7
	Small	3.00	3	Private	3.00	7
	V. Small	2.80	5			
Total		2.84	35 (16.0%)	Total	2.84	35
Assess Mgmt. Practices	Large	2.86	15	Community	2.81	22
	Medium	2.54	11	Corporate	2.66	6
	Small	2.75	4	Private	2.42	7
	V. Small	2.60	5			
Total		2.63	35 (16.0%)	Total	2.63	35
Client Satisfaction	Large	3.00	18	Community	3.12	25
	Medium	3.08	12	Corporate	3.33	6
	Small	3.25	4	Private	2.87	8
	V. Small	3.40	5			
Total		3.25	39 (17.0%)	Total	3.11	39
Meeting Project Objectives	Large	3.44	25	Community	3.50	28
	Medium	3.41	12	Corporate	3.50	8
	Small	3.75	4	Private	3.41	12
	V. Small	3.57	7			
Total		3.54	48 (21.2%)	Total	3.50	48

Client Satisfaction: The nonprofit may ask its clients if the project is meeting their needs.

Meeting Project Objectives: The nonprofit may gather data to determine whether the project has met its stated objectives.

As Table 4 shows, these devices are not widely used by Michigan foundations. Nearly a quarter (23.5%) report using written reports and indirect contacts. Financial reports (22.1%) and site visits (21.7%) follow closely. Next come measures of how well projects meet their objectives (21.2%) and client satisfaction reports (17%).

The least used devices are assessments of management practices (16%) and project conformance to licensing standards (16%).

Large foundations appear to be the most frequent users of these devices, followed by medium and very small foundations.

How useful are these strategies for making decisions about projects? Respondents were asked to assess these devices using a four-point scale (very useful = 4, not useful = 1). Average scores are shown in Table 4. “Meeting project objectives” was rated most useful (3.54), and “assessment of management practices” was seen as least useful (2.63).

The unsystematic evaluation methods were judged most useful by community foundations, followed generally by private and corporate types. While it is noteworthy that these devices are infrequently used, the lack of broad attention to “client satisfaction” and “meeting project objectives” seems particularly disturbing.

Who's Doing the Evaluating?

Foundations report having very few staff, let alone evaluation staff. The mean number of staff across all foundations is 1.04. This finding is consistent with Janet Carter's observation that foundations average less than one full-time professional staff member per foundation.¹² She also suggests that as few as 20 foundation employees have full-time responsibility for evaluating projects.

Nearly two thirds (65%) of Michigan foundations report having no staff with formal training in eval-

Table 5
How Many of Your Staff Have Evaluation Responsibilities?

Foundation Size	Eval. Resp.	No Eval. Resp.	Number Responding	Foundation Type	Eval. Resp.	No Eval. Resp.	Number Responding
Large	72.7%	27.3%	33	Community	72.7%	23.3%	33
Medium	61.5%	38.5%	13	Corporate	61.5%	38.5%	11
Small	68.7%	32.3%	6	Private	52.9%	47.1%	17
V. Small	55.5%	44.5%	9				
Total	67.2%	32.8%	61	Total	67.2%	32.8%	61

Table 6
How Many Trained Evaluation Staff Do You Have?

Foundation Size	Trng.	No Trng.	Number Responding	Foundation Type	Trng.	No Trng.	Number Responding
Large	42.4%	57.6%	33	Community	45.4%	54.6%	33
Medium	23.0%	77.0%	13	Corporate	33.3%	66.7%	12
Small	50.0%	50.0%	6	Private	17.6%	82.4%	17
V. Small	20.0%	80.0%	10				
Total	35.0%	65.0%	62	Total	35.0%	65.0%	62

Ideally, evaluation should represent between 5 and 15% of the project cost.

uation. Yet, at the same time, 67% report having staff with evaluation responsibilities. (See Tables 5 and 6). The use of consultants is also low, with only 1% of foundations using outside evaluators.

Table 7
**How Interested Are You in
 Expanding Your Evaluation Capacity?**

Method	Foundation Size	No. of Cases	Avg. Interest (4 pt. Scale)	Foundation Size	No. of Cases	Avg. Interest (4 pt. Scale)	
Training staff in evaluation	Large	19	2.63	Community	20	2.65	
	Medium	4	1.50		Corporate	8	1.53
	Small	3	2.00		Private	5	1.78
	V. Small	7	1.83				
		Total	33	Total	33	1.99	
Adding evaluation staff	Large	18	1.38	Community	19	2.19	
	Medium	4	1.50		Corporate	8	1.09
	Small	3	2.00		Private	4	1.26
	V. Small	6	1.16				
		Total	31	Total	31	1.51	

How Many Foundations Want to Improve Evaluation Efforts?

A disappointing finding was foundations' lack of interest in increasing evaluation efforts. Only 22.6% expressed a desire to improve their nonprofit grantees' evaluation capacity. It's important to note, however, that there was quite a difference by size, with 61.5% of large foundations showing interest, followed by 60% of small foundations, 33.3% of very small foundations, and 18.1% of medium-sized foundations. Of the interested foundations, community foundations showed the highest interest at 58.6%, followed by private and corporate foundations at 38.4% each.

We also asked respondents how interested they were in training their present staff in evaluation and adding evaluation staff to their organizations. Again, they showed little interest, as Table 7 shows. Only 14.6% of foundations expressed any desire to train their own staff in evaluation. Even those who said they wanted to do so were only mildly interested. They scored a mean of only 1.99 on a four-point scale (highly interested = 4, no interest = 1).

Foundations were even less eager to add evaluation staff. Only 14% of foundations expressed any interest, and they rated their interest at a mean of only 1.51 on the same four-point scale.

What Are the Findings and Implications?

Findings show that few foundations use formal evaluation. Even fewer have any interest in expanding their evaluation capacity—or that of the nonprofits they fund. Although foundations say they want nonprofits to demonstrate results, few are willing to provide evaluation resources to their grantees. Here is a summary of the major findings and their consequences:

FINDING #1: Little information exists about how foundations evaluate the success of the projects they fund.

IMPLICATION: Without an understanding of how evaluation is being used, we have no idea how to improve evaluation efforts.

FINDING #2: Documented need was the most influential factor in deciding whom to fund. Less than half of foundations use formal evaluation in making funding decisions.

IMPLICATION: Although need is a worthy guide to funding, it does not address the merit of the grant request. Demonstrating need and deciding how to meet that need are two entirely different tasks.

FINDING #3: Only 34% of respondents use evaluation to judge ongoing projects.

IMPLICATION: Once a project is funded, it will invariably run its course without interruption, even if a change of direction would save valuable resources and improve results.

FINDING #4: Only 41% of foundations use evaluation to assess completed projects.

IMPLICATION: Foundations are missing out on a vast pool of knowledge on project effectiveness which could guide their future decision-making.

FINDING #5: The most-used evaluation tools are informal methods such as written reports. Yet those devices are rated far less effective than other methods. The most useful evaluation tool—judging whether projects have met their stated objectives—is one of the *least* used.

IMPLICATION: Often, evaluation doesn't produce the desired results because the wrong evaluation tools are being used, and the wrong things are being measured.

FINDING #6: A review of foundations that use evaluation found that they earmarked only 1.6% of project costs for evaluation.

IMPLICATION: Foundations that use evaluation don't allocate enough money for it. They should be spending at least 5% of the project cost on evaluation.

FINDING #7: Few foundations are interested in providing evaluation resources to their grantees. Only 22.6% of foundations expressed a desire to improve their nonprofit grantees' evaluation capacity.

IMPLICATION: Nonprofits interested in evaluating foundation-funded programs will have to use their own resources.

What Do We Need to Do?

This study demonstrates that foundations and nonprofit service providers need to modify their views of formal evaluation. Changes in attitude and practice are necessary to ensure that the limited pool of funds for human services will be used effectively. Here are a few ideas suggested by the study results:

RECOMMENDATION #1: Focus First on Pre-Grant Evaluation. In our study, we asked foundations about three types of evaluation: pre-grant, ongoing, and postproject evaluation. These resemble the three controls used in business—pre-controls, screening controls, and post-action controls. Pre-controls are preventative measures taken before a process is underway to reduce the chance that something will go wrong.

Example: the pre-flight check of an airplane. Screening controls are periodically applied during a process to assure that things are going according to plan. Example: a spending limit which must not be exceeded without permission by a superior.

Post-action controls involve such activities as quality inspections after a part is manufactured. Businesses have found that pre-controls are the most cost-effective of the three types. It costs far less to insure that things don't go wrong in the first place. Applying this logic to foundations, it makes sense for them to spend most of their evaluation efforts *before* they fund a project. Evaluation at the critical grant proposal stage can weed out weak, ill-conceived, and unnecessary projects.

RECOMMENDATION #2: Focus Second on Ongoing Evaluation. The second most cost-effective type, after pre-grant evaluation, is ongoing evaluation. Such evaluation allows grantees to rethink ineffective strategies and change course during a project, thus saving valuable resources. Since the assessment of ongoing projects is currently the most infrequently used type of evaluation, foundations will need to redirect their resources.

RECOMMENDATION #3: Explore What Does & Doesn't Work. If for no reason other than prudence, foundations and nonprofits need to know what does and doesn't work, and why. They need to know where to invest precious resources and ensure that quality services are provided. Kanter and Summers sum up this imperative as follows: "Society has a vested interest in how well nonprofits perform, however difficult at times it may be to determine. A nonprofit organization has difficulty (1)

Evaluation at the critical grant proposal stage can weed out weak, ill-conceived, and unnecessary projects.

knowing when it is doing well, and (2) being able to make changes or to redirect resources when members of the organization suspect that it is not doing well with respect to its ‘market,’ but can still attract resources by non-market means from believing donors.”¹³ Evaluation can solve both these difficulties.

RECOMMENDATION #4: Think Qualitatively As Well As Quantitatively. Private businesses and such nonprofits as hospitals and universities operate in a competitive climate and must use such tools as total quality management (TQM) to differentiate themselves. One element common to all quality programs is the need for feedback on processes and outcomes.

In discussing continuous improvement programs, David Garvin maintains that an organization aspiring to adopt such programs must become a learning organization. He defines a “learning organization” as one skilled at “creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights.”¹⁴

The lesson contained in Garvin’s definition is fundamental to general systems theory. Organizations, like biological organisms, require feedback to know how they are doing and to adjust behaviors accordingly. This process is essential in business organizations with their profit-and-loss statements and cost-benefit analyses.

Of course, we don’t advocate business practice as the model for all activities. In many cases, however, the business model makes sense for nonprofits. Fewer defects make for lower costs, better customer satisfaction, and higher profit margins. Resources are more effectively used.

The knowledge that resources are finite creates a certain exigency in the business sector that seems to be missing in the nonprofit arena. If nonprofits are to be competitive, however, they must take their cue from the business sector and focus on outcomes. That means using evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION #5: Write Money for Evaluation into the Grant Proposal. As a nonprofit, you should always ask for money for evaluation as part of your grant proposal. Use this article (and other research on evaluation as it appears) to make your case for the importance of evaluation. In the end, evaluation will save money.

RECOMMENDATION #6: Put Resources into Evaluation. Foundations and nonprofit organizations need to budget more money to hire people with evaluation skills, to train employees in evaluation techniques, and to use evaluation consultants. Considering the high returns it can bring, evaluation needs to be a much higher priority when setting budgets.

RECOMMENDATION #7: Do Research on Evaluation. National-level studies are needed to show how foundations and nonprofits are using evaluation, to pinpoint which types of evaluation work best, and to measure results.

RECOMMENDATION #8: Create a Clearinghouse. If foundations and nonprofits work together, they can use formal evaluation to enormous advantage. Imagine the priceless body of knowledge they could create. Together, they could compile a database of effective methods, best practices, and lessons learned. Nonprofits and foundations could tap into this database for guidance. Thus, they could serve society in a broader way—a goal frequently cited by foundations. ■

Footnotes

¹Other definitions of evaluation exist. In “References,” for example, see Green and Lewis, who define evaluation as the “comparison of an object of interest against a standard of acceptability” (p. 171). This definition suffers from narrow scope, lack of reference to merit, and failure to consider evaluation methodology with respect to program or project context, implementation, and unexpected outcomes. Therefore, we adapted the more comprehensive definition supplied by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation.

²Smith found, not surprisingly, that larger foundations conduct more evaluations than smaller foundations, yet he notes that the amount of evaluation by foundations in general is unclear. Likewise, Bickel, Eichelberger, and Hattrup found few published sources that address foundation efforts in evaluation. And Michael Scriven, an evaluation philosopher, theorist, and practitioner, observes (p. 262), “Evaluation has a very checkered career in foundations. At its best, no one does it better; all too often, it is done casually or not at all.” (See “References.”)

³Brim, p. 228 (see “References.”)

⁴Janet Carter notes that although 40,000 grants are indexed annually by the Foundation Center in New York City, the number evaluated is not known. Nor do we know what specific foundations mean when they refer to “evaluation.”

⁵In “References,” see Seita; Kroll; and Council on Foundations.

⁶This is the general standard used by professional evaluators. While different evaluators advocate different standards, few would claim that allocating less than 2% of project costs for evaluation (as found in this study) is adequate for meaningful evaluation.

⁷Sumariwalla, Russy & Taylor, Martha, “The Application of Program Evaluation in the Management of the Nonprofit

Sector: An Exploratory Study," prepared for the United Way Spring Research Forum: Leadership & Management, Cleveland, March, 1991.

⁸See Spagnolo-Rodriguez in "References."

⁹One reason for the meager use of evaluation may be that nonprofit organizations provide services rather than tangible products. As Peter Drucker notes, it's harder to measure how much a person's life has been improved than how closely a part meets a certain tolerance (see Drucker in "References"). Another reason may be that funders and the public often judge nonprofits by how closely they adhere to societal expectations. These expectations include beliefs about sound organizational process and the use of appropriate symbols (see D'Anno in "References"). If funders can be satisfied that the appropriate symbols of success are in place—including, for example, the number of clients served—they may conclude that their money is well spent.

¹⁰This is the size classification used by the Council of Michigan Foundations, a membership organization which serves as an information clearinghouse, advocate, and technical advisor to Michigan foundations.

¹¹We found no significant differences by size of foundation: means for documented need ranged from 3.50 to 3.84; community priority showed means from 2.70 to 3.53; means for reputation of the organization ranged from 3.25 to 3.66; and prior relationship with the applicant ranged from 2.20 to 3.10. When we examine responses by type of foundation, documented need again emerges as the most influential factor with means of 3.88 for private, 3.75 for community, and 3.08 for corporate foundations.

¹²See Carter in "References."

¹³Kanter & Summers, p. 155 (see "References.")

¹⁴Garvin, p. 80 (see "References.")

References

- Bickel, William, Tony Eichelberger, & Rosemary Hattrup, "Evaluation Use in Private Foundations: A Case Study," *Evaluation Practice*, 15 (2), 1994.
- *Blickendorfer, Richard and Jane Janey, "Measuring Performance in Nonprofit Organizations," in *Management and Planning, Leadership Series*.
- Bremner, Robert, "Giving for Children & Youth" in Richard Magat (ed.), *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties & Goals*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Brim, Orville G., "Do We Know What We Are Doing?" in Fritz Heinman (ed.), *The Future of Foundations*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Carter, Janet, "Evaluation in Foundations: Some Questions," *Evaluation Practice*, 13 (1), 1990.
- Council on Foundations, *Evaluation for Foundations: Concepts, Guidelines, Cases & Resources*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.
- Drucker, Peter, "Management & Objectives: What Results Should You Expect? A User's Guide to MBO," in Martin Gruber (ed.), *Management Systems in the Human Services*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.
- D'Anno, Thomas, "The Effectiveness of Human Services Organizations: A Comparison of Models," in Yeheskel Hasenfeld (ed.), *Human Services as Complex Organizations*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992.
- Garvin, David, "Building a Learning Organization," *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 1993.
- *Gray, Sandra Trice, *Evaluation with Power*.
- Green, Lawrence W. & Lewis, Frank M., *Measurement & Evaluation in Health Education & Health Promotion*, Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield, 1986.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *Program Evaluation Standards: How to Assess Evaluations of Educational Programs*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1994.
- Kanter, Rosabeth M. & Summers, D., "Doing Well While Doing Good: Dilemmas of Performance Measurement in Nonprofit Organizations & the Need for a Multi-Constituency Approach," in Walter Powell (ed.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987.
- *Kennedy, Larry, *Quality Management in the Nonprofit World*.
- Kroll, Judith, *The Evaluation Handbook*, New York: Council on Foundations, 1993.
- Magat, Richard, *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties & Goals*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Michigan Foundation Directory* (7th ed.), Grand Haven, MI: Council of Michigan Foundations & Michigan League of Human Services, 1990.
- Scriven, Michael, *Evaluation Thesaurus* (4th ed.), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1991.
- Seita, John, *Meta-Evaluation Report to the Kellogg Foundation*, unpublished manuscript, 1991.
- Smith, Nick, "Foundation Support of Evaluation," *Evaluation Review*, 9, 1985.
- Spagnolo-Rodriguez, Rosana, *A Study of Program Evaluation Capacity in Nonprofit Organizations*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1992.
- *Walraven, Gail, *Business Thinking in Not-for-Profit Organizations*.
- *Young, Dennis R., "What Does Feedback Have to Do with Nonprofit Governance?", *Nonprofit World*, November-December 1996.
- *Starred publications are available through the Society's *Resource Center Catalog*, included in this issue, or contact the Society at 6314 Odana Road, Suite 1, Madison, Wisconsin 53719 (800-424-7367).

Dr. Raymond E. Alie is professor of management in the Haworth College of Business at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008 (616-387-5981). He is the author or co-author of articles in the areas of ethics, human resource management, Japanese management, management education, organizational behavior, and organization theory. Dr. Alie has served as a consultant to private and public sector organizations and has also served on the boards of several human services agencies. He received bachelors and masters degrees from the College of William and Mary in Virginia and a doctorate from Western Michigan University.

Dr. John R. Seita is adjunct professor at Western Michigan University. He has been president of the Evaluation and Advocacy Group in Kalamazoo, Michigan, a program evaluator for the Kalamazoo County Human Services Department, and a program administrator for the Calhoun County (Michigan) Community Mental Health Department. Dr. Seita received bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees from Western Michigan University.