

Evaluation of:

The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University

Report Commissioned by Atlantic Philanthropic Services

Virginia Hodgkinson

Mark H. Moore

I. Introduction: The Mandate and the Approach

The Atlantic Philanthropies commissioned Virginia Hodgkinson and Mark H. Moore to conduct an evaluation of the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. The evaluation was carried out under sharp limitations of timing and total amount of effort. The basic aim of the evaluation was to help APS make decisions about pending proposals from the Indiana Center. The evaluators were not instructed to review these specific proposals, however, they were, instead instructed to do a general review of the Center and offer their assessment about the overall strengths and weaknesses of the Center as a key component of the national infrastructure that gives intellectual attention to the "nonprofit sector."

Given the limited amount of time that could be devoted to the task, it would have been impossible to accomplish were it not for the fact that three prior evaluation reports had been conducted on the Center over the last decade; one in 1994, and two in the summer of 1997. The 1997 reviews, in particular, were considerably more sustained and detailed than the current review could possibly have been. They involved extensive interviews with a wide variety of people who had interacted with the Center as funders, collaborators, students, clients, and beneficiaries of the Center's activities. They also involved interviews with those who led and worked with the Center at Indiana. And, they involved, reviews of both planning documents and completed projects at the Center.

In contrast, our review consisted primarily of the following elements:

1. The review of a large number of documents including descriptions of accomplishments, examples of products, and plans for the future
2. a day-long site visit that involved interviews with the leadership and staff of the Center, University officials who oversee the Center, faculty engaged in the Center's work, and students and alumni of the Center's educational programs; and
3. phone interviews with some persons who were not available to meet in person during the site visit
4. a review of an current evaluation conducted by Marnie Maxwell of Maxwell Associates commissioned by the Center which involved interviews with scholars, community leaders and donors

Because our data collection efforts were necessarily less thorough than those that had gone before, it made sense for us to use the prior reports as a basis for our evaluation. What we have done, therefore, is to begin our evaluation with a characterization of what the other reports had found through their more detailed investigations, focusing particular attention on areas where they thought progress needed to be made. We used our limited time to get a quick fix on whether or not there was movement in the directions deemed important by the

prior evaluators, and to structure at a conceptual level the strategic choices that the Center now faces. This is designed to help APS answer three important questions:

1. To what extent can the Indiana Center be relied upon to carry out the projects they have proposed to do?
2. What would the successful completion of those projects do to the development of the Center as an on-going, important institution in the field of nonprofit scholarship?
3. What could and should the Center do more generally to improve its contribution to nonprofit scholarship?

We assume that these are the important questions before APS.

II. Previous Findings and Recommendations

Conclusions of the three prior evaluations of the Indiana Center were contained in the following four documents:

1. *Philanthropic Studies: Retrospect and Prospect* (April 20, 1994)

(This was a self-study carried out by Indiana University)

2. *Report on the Evaluation of the Center on Philanthropy Indiana University* (April 20, 1994)

(This was an external review of the Center carried out by six individuals who had the document described above, plus a site visit to rely on in evaluating the Center)

3. *Evaluation Report: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy: 1987-1997* (June, 1997)

(This was a report prepared for the Lilly Foundation by Ellen Condliffe Lagemann and Sarah Deschenes from New York University. Its findings were based on interviews of 74 people -- 36 outside of Indiana, 38 at IUPUI or IU-Bloomington. It also included a survey of alumni.)

4. *Organizational Impact Study: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy: 1987-1997* (July, 1997)

(This was a report commissioned by the Lilly Endowment and carried out by Johnson, Grossnickle and Associates. It is based largely on 102 "in-depth interviews with practitioners and sector leaders, both nationally and in Indiana." Data collection efforts also included "site visits, careful review of an extensive body of literature and documents, and a telephone survey of 24 program alumni.)

A. The Origins and Commitments of the Center

These documents were invaluable in helping us understand the origins, the accomplishments, and, most importantly, the trajectory of the Indiana Center. Specifically, what we learned about the origins of the program were the following:

1. A key element in establishing the Center was the existence of a nationally successful educational program for practitioners in the nonprofit sector -- namely, the Fund Raising School. This was a large, on-going enterprise with a skillful and determined leader that was brought into Indiana University to guarantee its permanence and to form the basis of an emergent national center on philanthropy.
2. A second key to the development of the Center was the appointment of Robert Payton as the first Director. He had a vision of a *national* program focused on the voluntary sector as a unique part of American life that was important to sustain in America, and perhaps to export to the rest of the world. His vision included the idea that scholarly work on the nonprofit sector should be rooted in the liberal arts, rather than narrowly within social science, or even more narrowly in professional or vocational education.
3. A third key to the establishment of the Center was the interest of the Lilly Endowment in establishing a Center on Philanthropy in Indiana. They wanted that Center not only to become a nationally important Center in the developing field of philanthropic and nonprofit studies, but also a locally important source of ideas and assistance to philanthropic activities in Indiana. Ideally, the Center could show to the rest of the world what could be done for a polity or a community that paid active attention to developing and using a philanthropic impulse.
4. The Center was also helped enormously by the fact that the interests of the Lilly Endowment were closely aligned with the administration and leadership of Indiana University. The academic leaders wanted both a nationally innovative and academically excellent program, and one that played an important role in providing assistance to Indiana's cities and communities. These objectives were served well by locating the Center in

the IUPUI Campus, and focusing the attention of the Center on Indianapolis as a kind of laboratory.

We point specifically to these forces/interests because, in many ways, they have set the stage for the Center's continuing development as well as its continuing difficulties. The reason is that the interests and purposes described above stretch the Center out on many different dimensions of performance. Consider the following as examples:

- On one hand, the origins of the Center were rooted in a *professional, vocational* school for practitioners that focused somewhat narrowly on specific *techniques of fund-raising*. On the other hand, it had significant *scholarly ambitions* to create a new *interdisciplinary field of philanthropic studies* broadly based in the liberal arts including history, philosophy, religion and literature as well as the social sciences. Taken together, these commitments stretched the Center to develop itself in a way that could allow it to address deep philosophical and value questions about the "why" of the nonprofit sector as well as the narrow vocational questions about how to do the tasks that could allow specific nonprofit enterprises to succeed. This ambition is laudable and important, but it helps create a deep tension in the enterprise between its broad academic aspirations on one hand, and its narrower practical desires to support the practice of philanthropy on the other.
- On one hand, the Center was rooted in the ambition to become a *nationally* (and even *internationally*) important center for both academic scholarship and professional training. On the other hand, it was rooted in the ambition to become an important part of a state university and to do the kinds of things that state universities must do if they are to survive in their political and market environments. This means, in the first instance, offering a teaching program that supports a strong diversified curriculum in undergraduate programs, and providing degree programs at the masters level that could meet the needs of Indiana students. It means in the second instance, being prepared to be "of service" to local communities, and to make an impact on the quality of community life in Indiana. To the extent that being of service to the community could also help the teaching and research programs of the University, that would be all to the good. But Indiana had to get something back from its investment in this State University, and that something was local impact as well as educational opportunities for Indiana students. This puts additional pressure on the

- Center to provide services to local practitioners as well as national practitioners.
- On one hand, the Center was rooted in the desire to become a prestigious academic research center offering both descriptions of the size, scope and character of the philanthropic center as well as plausible explanations for why the sector operated the way that it did. On the other hand, the Center was focused on providing high quality teaching both to undergraduates and to practicing executives. These are often difficult to combine effectively since the faculty that is excellent at carrying out the descriptive and explanatory empirical research about the sector as a whole is often not particularly good or interested in teaching practitioners about how to do their jobs.

To make the scope of the Center's commitments visible, and also to reveal some potential tensions among competing objectives, Table #1 presents a matrix describing different kinds of activities the Center committed itself to doing at the moment it was created. To its credit, the Center has managed to put "chips" on the board in many different cells of this matrix. That is a significant accomplishment. But it is also worth noting how wide the terrain is, and how stretched any enterprise would be in trying to cover the entire domain.

Table 1:
Programmatic Activities/Ambitions of the IUCOP

Area of Impact Programs	National	State	Local/ Community
1.0 Research			
1.1 Traditional Liberal Arts Scholarship			
1.11 Social Science			
1.12 Other (History, Literature, etc.)			
1.2 Policy Research and Program Evaluation			
1.3 Clinical Research/Action Learning			
2.0 Teaching			
2.1 Liberal Arts			
2.11 Undergrad			
2.111 Academic			
2.112 Service Learning			
2.12 Graduate			
2.13 Ph.D.			
2.2 Professional Training			
2.21 Masters			
2.22 Executive Education			

One could make the challenge seem even more daunting if one added a third dimension to this matrix -- one that pointed to the substantive fields the Center was trying to cover, as well as the kinds of activities it intended to support in the field. Specifically, it is important for the Center to consider whether it is taking a relatively narrow view of philanthropy that focuses on some of the important sources of money and energy that fuels the voluntary sector (e.g. how wealthy individuals can have an

important impact on the quality of life in our society, how foundations could make grants effectively, or what motivates individuals to give and volunteer). Or whether it intends to address a much broader view of philanthropy (e.g. an understanding of the entire voluntary sector including the role of nonprofit voluntary associations in shaping the quality of democratic governance, and the techniques of leading voluntary associations and managing nonprofit organizations).

The point of these observations is simply that there is lots of intellectual terrain to occupy here. And while the ambition to occupy all this terrain may be grand and inspiring as well as urgent, the actual ability to execute may be quite limited. In fact, this is precisely what the evaluations found.

B. Findings of the Evaluations

The first evaluation of the Center carried out by a committee of six external evaluators working from a document prepared by the Center itself found that the Center was unique among academic centers focusing on the nonprofit sector in terms of the breadth and scale of its activities:

"Only at Indiana has a multi-purpose, integrated program combining research, basic instruction, professional training, and public service been conceived and implemented.

The evaluators commend the Center specifically for:

- Integrating philanthropic studies into the Indiana University curriculum
- Functioning as a nucleus of academic excellence for the liberal arts faculty, especially on the IUPUI campus;
- Establishing a library and archives unique among centers for the study of nonprofit organizations."

The evaluators then went on to discuss four major goals of the Center that they considered particularly important:

- "Institutionalizing Philanthropic Studies at Indiana University;"
- "Integrating Research and Practice;"
- "Reaching out to the Local Community, State and Region;"
- "Contributing to the National University-Based Infrastructure and the National Field."

With respect to the goal of "institutionalizing philanthropic studies," the evaluators found much to praise. They noted the firm structural and financial support provided by the university's central administration, and the real enthusiasm that the university leadership seemed to have for the Center's current activities and long run potential. They noted that a 41 member Faculty of Philanthropic Studies had been appointed that included faculty from many different campuses, departments, and ranks. They also noted that three different degree programs had been created on two different campuses including a master of Arts in Philanthropic Studies, a Master of Public Affairs with a concentration in nonprofit management, and a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with a concentration in nonprofit management. There were also doctoral tracks in the history of philanthropy within the Department of History, and in the philosophy of higher education in the School of Education.

They noted in particular that "establishing the home of philanthropic studies in the liberal arts positions the Center to draw on intellectual, moral and ethical frameworks that complement the policy-oriented perspectives of professional schools." To sustain that important advantage, however, it would be important that the Center succeed in "strengthening the liberal arts base of the curriculum."

The only criticism they offered about the institutionalization of the program in the University was that the Center had not yet established enough linkages with the Department of Psychology and other professional schools including the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, the School of Law, the School of Journalism, and the School of Medicine. They also noted that "Members of the Faculty of Philanthropic Studies have expressed the desire to meet regularly, and they should do so." (This, presumably, would be an important part of "strengthening the liberal arts base of the curriculum.")

With respect to "integrating research and practice," the evaluators came down hard on the importance of "resolving the tension between research on one hand and practice on the other." They noted the importance of the practitioner-oriented Fund Raising School in the origins and continuing operations of the Center on one hand, but worried that "the integration of TFRS with the Center's academic program is somewhat problematic." They urged that the TFRS be integrated into the academic program by broadening the focus of TFRS, adding an academic element to the study of fund-raising as a vocation, and controlling the quality of TFRS courses. At the same time, they recommended that TFRS continue and be expanded *as an important focus for integrating research with practice*. (This meant, presumably, that the Center's faculty now had two important curriculum development goals: developing the liberal arts idea of a nonprofit curriculum, and ensuring that that perspective came to be an important part of an already well established vocational training program.)

With respect to the goal of "reaching out to the local, community, state and region," the evaluators found that "awareness of the Center and its purposes is apparently uneven in Indianapolis and across the state." They considered this an important problem because they thought that "In the long run, the Center's success in accomplishing its mission will depend not only on the quality of its relationships with organizations in Indianapolis, but also on its capacity to work successfully with nonprofits regionally." They also cautioned that the Center needed to keep academic staffing levels high both to support outreach activities, and to avoid having their own academic programs be eclipsed by TFRS. They wanted TFRS to be an important but not predominant part of the Center.

With respect to the goal of "contributing to the national university-based infrastructure and the national field," the 1994 evaluators credited Indiana with the following activities: funding and operating a program to award research grants to faculty and doctoral students across the country, the establishment of an Indiana University Press series on Philanthropy, and maintaining publications such as the *Philanthropic Studies Index*. They concluded that the "Center's greatest contribution to the field may result from the support it has given to a substantial number of mature faculty and young scholars who ... will constitute a critical mass able to attract a continuing stream of new students, scholars and financial support."

The second evaluation, conducted in 1997, found many of the same strengths, and some of the same weaknesses as the 1994 study. The 1997 evaluation was done by two different teams working from somewhat different perspective and sources of information. There was an "academic" team that seems to have been asked to discuss the impact of the program on the "field of philanthropic studies" and on Indiana University. There was also a "practitioner" team that was asked to discover the impact of the Center on the practice of philanthropy at both national and local levels. Because of their different perspectives and methods, they saw somewhat different things about the Center, but, in the end, did not much disagree about the problems the Center faced.

The "academic team" found evidence of the same degree of breadth, and diversity in programs that the 1994 study had found. They wrote:

"IUCOP grew significantly during its first ten years of operation. In 1996-1997, it offered 41 courses and three-degree programs as well as a number of minors and concentrations in other fields. Its faculty numbered 26 (with an additional 33 adjunct faculty members). It had developed an extensive library and archive collection. It had sponsored the publication of 22 books... It had convened more than 60 meetings and was the sponsor of lectures and seminars for IU faculty members, visitors, and others involved in philanthropy. And it operated several student fellowship programs ... and had raised and distributed significant amounts of money for study and research both at IU and at other universities across the country."

The fact that the program had not only survived for 10 years, but had also grown also testified to the effective "institutionalization" of the program. In 1997, the Center remained a large, durable, diverse enterprise.

Despite the fact that the Center had succeeded in establishing itself as a major institution, however, the 1997 evaluators were critical of the Center's performance. They wrote:

"We concluded that although IUCOP is definitely the largest philanthropy center in terms of both its resources and the range and variety of activities, several other centers, notably PONPO at Yale and the Mandel Center at Case Western Reserve, rival or surpass it in research, teaching, and service."

They also wrote:

"Overall, our assessment of IUCOP is mixed. We think it is clear that IUCOP has made an important contribution to IU through its academic programs, its students, its support for faculty and the ... library. Despite that, we do not believe that IUCOP has realized the potential implicit in the resources invested in it."

Perhaps most significantly, they also thought they had an explanation for the problems, and a recommended cure:

"We believe [that IUCOP has not realized its potential] because of: 1.) problems of mission -- a lack of clear priority between and among goals and a "pro-philanthropy bias which has eroded the credibility of its research; 2.) problems of planning and evaluation ... ; and, 3.) problems of administration -- poor record keeping, follow through and organization.

Consistent with this diagnosis, they thought that many of the problems of the Center could be resolved if the next director of the Center was "a person with scholarly standing in the field of philanthropic studies, who is willing to make administration his or her primary and probably exclusive concern."

The 1997 academic evaluators also came down hard on the importance of building a strong *intellectual* base for the Center if it was ever going to become a nationally credible and important center. Specifically, they thought it was very important that the new director "should clarify differences between types of research, and avoid confusions between advocacy and research; establish clear research priorities; and greatly increase faculty involvement in the planning and carrying out of research." They also thought it as important

that "IUCOP needs to continue working toward a clear articulation of what philanthropic studies involves as a field within the liberal arts."

In trying to focus the attention of the Center on key strategic tensions that needed to be resolved if the Center was going to become a major player, the 1997 evaluators nominated three tensions as "especially salient:"

1. tensions between *mission and market* -- between what one plans and hopes to do and what one can actually do in light of available finances, possibilities for collaboration, and the like;
2. tensions between *concentration and scatteration* --- between aggregating one's resources in order to focus on a few activities and research questions, and dispersing one's resources widely in order to pursue many different activities or research questions at the same time; and
3. tensions between *research and advocacy* --- between investigating some phenomenon in order to understand it better and actively supporting or lobbying for some issue or cause."

Rounding out their evaluation, the 1997 academic evaluators pointed concluded that "IUCOP has made an important contribution to Indiana University." Specifically:

- Philanthropic Studies has been established at IU
- IUCOP has provided a highly valued and useful education experience to a relatively small but able group of students
- IUCOP has been a very important intellectual resource for a considerable number of faculty members. It has encouraged and helped shape both their research and teaching agenda, and it has provided them with important collegueship and stimulation
- IUCOP has recruited some able tenured and tenure track faculty members

They also concluded that the "IUCOP has not achieved as much as one might hope from an institution with such unusual financial resources." Specifically, they pointed to the following problems:

- Small student enrollments.
- Degree programs exist for which there is no apparent demand

- [Little success in] gaining support for philanthropic studies at other universities
- IUCOP research does not seem to be based on a well-developed cumulative rationale. Few distinctions drawn between types of research; for example descriptive and interpretive studies. Furthermore, works of advocacy seem confused, at times, with good critical scholarship.
- IUCOP not well-respected among scholars who study philanthropy. Although many believe it is important to have a comprehensive center like IUCOP, few, if any think IUCOP has been a pace-setter
- Little evidence that IUCOP has played an especially important role in bringing [a scholarly community that studies philanthropy] into being or sustaining it.

The 1997 *practitioner* evaluation sought to identify the "organizational impact" of the IUCOP by looking at the "Center's impact on practitioners and organizations in the independent sector" (i.e. non-profit executives, leaders of sector associations and organizations, consultants, philanthropic advisors, philanthropists, and other senior leaders in philanthropy). Their overall assessment of the Center noted the early accomplishments of the Center in "solidifying" the Fund Raising School, and "beginning" to "implement the broad vision of its founding director." They reported that:

"A number of highly regarded programs were established in this period... These include enhancement of the Fund Raising School, the establishment of unique library resources and fellowship programs, and the effective integration of philanthropic studies into the University."

On the negative side, the practitioner evaluators observed that "as the Center grew, a number of critical organizational ingredients were neglected." Specifically,

"Effective governance was not established. Comprehensiveness was allowed to substitute for strategic direction. Solid administrative and quality control procedures were not implemented. Relationships with organizations in the sector did not evolve effectively after an early burst of enthusiasm. External functions such as media relations and resource development did not take hold.

The 1997 practitioner evaluators concluded the following:

"Today, the IUCOP is established as a comprehensive center. The Fund Raising School, strong University connections, and a number of successful programs stand as highlights. However, interviews with leading practitioners and representatives of the philanthropic sector consistently reveal the Center's

credibility and reputation are seriously eroding because critical organizational problems are un-resolved...The five key strategic challenges are:

- Mission clarification and selection of organizational priorities
- Continued progress toward effective governance
- Selection of new leadership and completion of the leadership transition
- Better alliance building and collaborative action with the sector; and
- Improved dialogue with major benefactors

In making their recommendations for the future, the practitioner team focused particular attention on the issues of mission clarification. They noted that "within the practitioner community the Center's *strategy of comprehensiveness* is seen as a failure to focus and a distinct liability." They also noted that the practitioners thought the Center had "done better at establishing itself as an academic enterprise than it has at engaging the practitioner community." To make themselves more responsive and helpful to the practitioner community, the practitioner team recommended that the Center "involve practitioners in setting their agenda," "address attitudinal problems," find new ways to become "more effective as a convener, informant, and spokesperson for philanthropy," and "acknowledge and reflect changes in the sector."

These prior evaluations helped to focus our attention on critical aspects of the Center's recent accomplishments and developments, and allows us to see these in a historical context. It also allows us to see something about the rate at which things are moving at the Indiana Center, and what might now be needed to advance the Center significantly. We set out these ideas first by describing what we found at the Center, and in what ways the Center seems to have changed and in what ways it has remained the same over the last five years, and second, by identifying some key goals that need to be achieved and specific activities that might help the Center achieve those goals

III. What We Found

Our first finding is the same as what the other evaluators have found. We found that the IUCOP is a large, comprehensive, well-established academic center. It has solid, established relationships across the diverse faculties and campuses of Indiana University. It has significant support from the University Administration as well as outside funders and donors. It has established academic programs that seem to be doing reasonably well in attracting students and finding them useful positions in the society. Since many academic enterprises in the field of nonprofit studies have to fight for both their survival and their standing in universities, we think it is an important accomplishment that the IUCOP has established itself as a relatively large and permanent part of the landscape of Indiana University.

Our second finding is the IUCOP has acquired increased academic depth and quality. The faculty specializes in disciplinary-based studies of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector more generally and was being recruited and developed in 1997 has settled into Indiana University and begun to make its presence felt. Under the new leadership of the Center, the faculty has been given a more significant role in defining research priorities. In addition, they have begun to develop some important "signature" research initiatives that will help them make their mark on the national scholarly community in nonprofit studies. Those projects include:

1. The effort to add a module that asks questions about giving and volunteering to a national panel of respondents (PSID) that will provide empirical data on a key element of the nonprofit sector. This data will not only provide descriptive data about trends in this source of social energy, but also support analytic studies using this data as both a dependent variable (what accounts for observed levels of giving and volunteering) and as an independent variable (what does a given level of giving and volunteering do for the people who engage in it, and for the communities in which they live and work.) This study has a national scope and significance, and will help draw economists and other social scientists into the analysis of the nonprofit sector.
2. The effort to develop a comprehensive inventory of voluntary and nonprofit activity in Indiana. This requires both the development and investigation of the properties of methodologies used for finding nonprofit activity, as well as the use of these methods to provide a relatively complete census of nonprofit activity in Indiana. Again, such information is useful in the first instance simply as a description of the size, scope, structure, etc. of the nonprofit sector in one state. But as the data base is maintained over time, it will become possible to analyze the factors that contribute to changes in the structure, conduct and performance of the nonprofit sector overall: e.g. why it is shifting from one kind of activity and form to another, what kinds of firms seem to survive and which disappear, how firms migrate from one kind of activity to another.
3. The effort to create a "reader" that could support the liberal arts contribution to an understanding of the voluntary nonprofit sector. The aim here is to put historical, philosophical, and literary texts into a convenient form to support introductory courses to the nonprofit sector.
4. A joint research project with the Urban Institute on the costs associated with fund raising and administration in nonprofit organizations that will be useful in teaching and to The Fund Raising School.
5. Planned continuation of the Indiana Gives survey.

6. A survey and analysis of various survey techniques used to measure giving and volunteering.
7. The improvement and delivery of estimates for the annual *Giving USA*.
8. The second edition the *The Nonprofit Research Handbook*, co-edited and organized by Richard Steinberg in partnership with Walter Powell from the University of Arizona
9. Review of all proposals with a research component in the Center's service proposals, and oversight of designated research funds granted to the Center (between \$300,000 and \$400,000 annually) to allow it to underwrite research of importance to the study of philanthropy.

These planned/proposed research projects are important for several reasons. First, they take advantage of some of the high quality academic talent that has been recruited to IUCOP. Second, they support both national and local purposes. Third, they are, in fact, multi-disciplinary studies, and do, in fact, draw on the strong liberal arts basis of the IUCOP program. Fourth, they provide a kind of focus that if maintained, will provide the Center with leadership in research in giving and volunteering, and institutional finances related to fund raising. These studies can also inform the massive data project of nonprofit organizations in Indiana. These quantitative projects will be enhanced and deepened by the liberal arts reader on philanthropy and the projects of historians of philanthropy, such as Professor Lawrence Friedman and associate professor, Kevin Robbins. For these reasons, not only is each project important, but the overall portfolio of projects can help establish IUCOP as a viable intellectual enterprise of the type it has long wanted to be. The Center also appointed a research director, Patrick Rooney who administers and assures the oversight and quality of the Center's research projects. In our interviews with faculty and community leaders, many offered the comment that Patrick Rooney has done an excellent job in improving the quality of research for the Center. While we pleased that Patrick was recently appointed COO of the Center to allow Gene more time for his external leadership, we hope that the Center quickly moves to find a staff person in research to assist Patrick in order to maintain the great progress it has made in research focus and quality since its last evaluation.

Our third finding is that the Center has, in fact, resolved many of the leadership and management problems that were the focus of the 1997 evaluations. Gene Tempel's leadership has strengthened the Center's standing with the University, with the funding communities, and with the practitioner communities. The operations of the Center are more visible and transparent. They are being more successfully communicated. The financial operations seem to be under control and a financial officer has been appointed. He has increased and diversified funding. Funds have been raised for two endowed chairs, not an easy task. Among the highlights of the changes under Gene's leadership are:

1. Reconstructed the advisory into a Board of Governors with real authority vested in them by the Chancellor. Among its responsibilities are approval of the Center's budget; reviews of the executive director and approval of the strategic plan. Previously, described a primarily a "university review committee", the board now has 23 members, 16 of whom are external to the university. The Board includes representation from practitioners, scholars, foundation executives. Persons of wealth, major association executives, and fund raising professionals
2. Giving more authority to faculty over curriculum and research: He has established vehicles to provide faculty leadership in curriculum and research by establishing a faculty of Philanthropic Studies with an elected chair and an executive committee with responsibility for academic affairs, graduate programs, research, and faculty development. Faculty representation has also been added to the Board of Governors. Faculty associated with the Center have raised over \$2 million of their own funds revealing the impact of the Center's initial investment.
3. More diversified fund raising: He has also increased donations to the Center from about \$112,000 in 1997-98 to \$3.54 million in 2000-01.. He has also succeeded in drawing the large, diverse faculty closer to the enterprise, has helped many senior faculty members do what they aspire to do, and positioned junior faculty members for advancement.
4. All constituents reported the progress that the Center has made under Gene's leadership. The Chancellor reported that the university had given up one of its "key chess pieces" when Gene was selected the director of the Center. He described Gene as the model of a great law school dean, the type who brings in great talent who advance scholarship in the law and still remain attached to professional ties in the community. Community leaders from grantmakers to the United Way organization to the theatre organization spoke about the leadership and participation that Gene, Kirsten Grønbjerg and Patrick Rooney continuously gave to community organizations. The university administration spoke of Gene knowing the system and how to build effective partnerships and collaborations without needing to take credit all the time; one major donor who thought that continuation of funding to the Center was in question five years ago reported that "Gene took seriously every point made in the 1997 evaluations and built the recommendations into the Center's work with performance reports on a regular basis. I have great confidence in his leadership." Another donor reported that Gene understood collaboration. The example he gave related to community foundation. Early on The Center had rolled out a training programs for funders that totally failed because the planners did not engage with the field. When Gene took up the training, his first approach was to engage with the field and the community foundations institutes have become far more successful over time. In other words, Gene gets high marks for collaborative, for engaging practitioners

throughout program planning and in leadership advisory, and treating practitioners with respect.

5. Visibility: All of the donors and staff and Board have remarked on the improved visibility of the Center. The Center is one of the places press increasingly calls for information on nonprofit stories and Gene has been quoted in major newspapers. He also writes a column for the *Nonprofit Times*.
6. Replication of the Centers programs: the previous evaluations remarked that programs, courses, and curriculum developed at the Center were not being replicated, particularly in relation to the liberal arts base. We assume that most colleges and universities would not directly replicate programs, but perhaps design courses and programs that take pieces from programs. One might look at the diversity in programming among nonprofit management programs as an example, even though Dennis Young and Michael O'Neill have written books about such curriculum. But one might also find, as Naomi Wish did, that there are several kinds of courses that are similar across programs. The influence of the Indiana Center may be more subtle. The only program that has replicated their nonprofit masters degree is the Center at the University of Texas At Austin. But several representatives from universities, both in the United States and abroad, look at their published curricula and course syllabi which have some influence. Furthermore, there seems to be a way that the Center will have direct influence in the teaching of philanthropy through its summer faculty institutes in Philanthropy and the Liberal Arts. One faculty member from Indiana who participated in the Institute remarked how successful it was. Faculty members attending the Institute came from predominately private liberal arts colleges where they may have been the only person on campus interested in the topic. The Institute is helping to build a network for these faculty. These faculty in turn will go back and teach at the undergraduate level. Thus the Center's may have an influence upon undergraduate liberal arts education.
7. Evaluation: The Center has built a system for continuous evaluation from "key indicators to measure effectiveness" each year, to a Total Quality Management system in place for staff, to regular evaluations of the fund Raising School, and external evaluations of its degree program
8. The Center has a five year strategic plan from which all units and staff build the annual plans. The plan is ambitious and builds on the findings of the previous evaluations. Annual goals and progress reports are reviewed systematically. Discussed below in more detail is the most ambitious part of the five-year plan and that is a feasibility study to create a new kind of "virtual" school which will create a new model and demand a campaign to raise from \$50 to \$100 million in endowment. The Board approved the feasibility study as well as approved a proposal for a Ph.D. program. Most of donors, faculty, and administrators are

supportive of such a feasibility study, not necessarily because the goal might be achieved, but because the study itself will lead to more intensified discussion of what such a school would look like; what major areas of knowledge or intellectual content would be needed to include in such a school, and would such a school be staffed ? We discuss more about this school below.

9. The Center has spent much time in nurturing and collaborating. It list over 120 active relationships of different types and depths across a series of interests with nonprofit organizations, foundations, associations, universities, and individual scholars both in the United States and abroad. A significant number of these relationships are fostered by the broad reach and service of the Fund Raising School which has supplied courses to associations, university programs, and associations of nonprofit professionals abroad. Gene Tempel was elected as the first president of the reconstructed Nonprofit Academic Centers Council, an organization of directors of the 40 centers of nonprofit study in the U. S.

Our fourth finding is that the Center is still having some difficulty in finding its center -- its unique identity. To some degree, this is a consequence of the fact that the Center is still trying to be true to its mission to remain a comprehensive center -- one that focuses on high quality academic research as well as one that provides valuable assistance to practitioners, one that is nationally significant as well as locally responsive and helpful, one that shapes courses in traditional disciplines as well as one that provides specialized training to practitioners, one that focuses not only on the narrow idea of philanthropy as giving and volunteering, but also on the big picture of the voluntary and nonprofit sector as a whole -- including the parts of the sector that are sustained by resources other than giving and volunteering. While one commonly recommended solution to this problem is, in fact, to focus more narrowly, and decide to stop doing some of the things the Center is now doing, we are not at all sure that this is the right prescription for the Center.

There are, after all, some advantages in being comprehensive in their ambitions. For one thing, it allows the Center to stay in touch with and be able to respond to developments in the field, and insures them against the prospect of ending up in some narrow niche that disappears as an important intellectual or practical concern. For another, it allows them to look for and exploit potential synergies in their work -- to use the academic ideas they develop to upgrade the quality of their professional training, to use their research interests in the ecology of the nonprofit world as a way to organize placements for students, and so on. Besides, if the industry of nonprofit studies as a whole were stronger and deeper, it might make sense for IUCOP to specialize and develop a particular niche. But in a world in which the whole industry is weak, it may be important for at least one Center to aspire to the scale and diversity of the IUCOP so that none of the pieces of the enterprise are lost. Finally, if the resources available to the Center were completely fungible, so that resources now being used to support the Fund Raising School could be shifted to supporting Academic Research; or if the Academic Research Funds could be shifted to strengthening the curriculum, pedagogy, and placement services of the degree programs, it might make sense to try to focus all the

resources on narrower goals. But the fact of the matter is that the resources are not fully fungible. Specific programs come with specific resources attached to them. The reason that the Center is spread is at least partly because the sources of its resources are spread across different objectives. And that is not a problem that can be overcome simply by saying that the Center needs to become more focused.

Furthermore, several of the people that we interviewed seem to agree with us. The chancellor who believes that great universities always are in the process of reinventing themselves finds that the Center can help in the process of bringing new perspectives in the development not only in the disciplines, but among the disciplines. The Center can help build a literature and data that was not there before in an neglected area of knowledge and help to spur intellectual inquiry in and around disciplines which have paid no attention to this area of inquiry. A faculty member brought into IUPUI in the department of history whose field is pre-modern French history reported that the Center's support of his research has led to his changing his conception about pre-modern French history. In other words, the Center's policy of nurturing the research of junior faculty is leading to new knowledge in various fields.

So, we are not sure that the problem of the Center is that it is spread too widely across a variety of activities. We would focus more attention on the idea of how the Center is set up to *exploit the synergies* that are available to it given the wide variety of activities it is engaged in. In short, we are less worried about how many different parts of the Center there are, and the extent to which the various parts end up covering the entire waterfront of their broad ambitions, than we are with the efforts made to *integrate* the different parts that exist, and use each part to strengthen the others.

For example, on the "academic, intellectual" side of the Center, we note the consistent desire to become a multi-disciplinary center focusing on philanthropy that is rooted in the liberal arts. This has been an important part of the Center's idea of itself from the beginning. It has a faculty that is entirely capable of achieving this. It has to a great degree achieved this result by offering unique courses introducing the nonprofit sector that turn out to be very important in the minds of the students who attend the course. Yet, we also note that as early as 1994 the faculty was complaining that they did not get enough chances to come together to talk about common issues they were addressing. We also note that a review of the courses that are being taught reveals them to be each discipline's take on the nonprofit sector rather than a combined curriculum that adds up to a coherent vision of the sector as a whole. We note that the masters of philanthropic studies has a more coherent set of courses. (We asked how many of the 25 core faculty in philanthropic studies could teach the introductory course on the nonprofit sector, and were told that the answer was five. Contrast this with the answer to the question of how many economists or psychologists could teach the introductory course in their fields.) And when asked to identify the "throbbing heart" of the intellectual community at IUCOP, no one was quite sure where it was located.

These observations suggest that while a "latent community" of scholars exists at Indiana, its

potential as an intellectual community has not been fully exploited. The major research projects continue to be primarily *intra-disciplinary* rather than *inter-disciplinary*. The courses tend to introduce the subject of the nonprofit sector from the vantage point of a discipline rather than use the disciplines to help students understand what is going on in the voluntary and nonprofit sector. As a result, the faculty as a whole finds that it is not addressing the "large" questions about the nonprofit sector, and would like to do so.

There are also many obvious opportunities for getting more out of this latent community. For one thing, curriculum planning for both degree programs and executive programs can be used as a crucible within which faculty members have to talk about their ideas, and the problems they are having with certain concepts being developed by others. For another thing, at least some research programs could be conceived and executed as joint research programs. For example, sociologists and anthropologists might be added to the team focusing on the dynamics of giving and volunteering to help understand how the social meaning of these activities is changing over time, or the mechanisms that actually support the inter generational transfer of such traditions. Similarly, economists might be added to the community studies of the nonprofit sector to help the sociologists understand how competitive pressures for funding might be influencing the patterns of organizational birth and death that they are observing, or how shifts in governmental funding affect the structure, conduct and performance of particular nonprofit sectors such as health care, education, and culture. The faculty doesn't have to do the same thing, or believe the same things, but it might be important for them to interact with one another across disciplinary and teaching boundaries in more ways than they now do.

Another example. The IUCOP has for years run a successful national program providing funding to doctoral students across the country. The IUCOP has been alert in spotting the opportunity to get these students together with one another at ARNOVA meetings. But another natural link to make would be between this national network of doctoral students and the IUCOP faculty and the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council who has recommended as part of its need that there should be a regular meeting of doctoral students with faculty advisors at least once a year. Maybe IUCOP should hold an annual research conference hosted and organized by the IUCOP faculty that invited the doctoral students from across the country along with their lead faculty advisors to explore the intellectual frontiers of philanthropic or nonprofit studies.

On the "pedagogic/practitioner" side of the enterprise, we would note that the problem of integrating the Fund Raising School into the Center as a whole has really still not been addressed. We heard testimony from masters students in degree programs that it had been difficult for them to learn practical things like fund-raising. That seems absurd given the presence of a well developed curriculum and faculty in this area that was focused on training national practitioner audiences rather than local graduate student audiences. Conversely, it may turn out that there are many faculty now teaching in the broadened Fund Raising Curriculum that have the knowledge and skills to teach an introductory course on the

nonprofit sector, and thus might be usefully recruited into curriculum planning and teaching efforts in the degree programs.

The point is simply that there are many occasions as well as many reasons for the faculty and staff of the IUCOP to come together to explore relationships among the varied activities of the Center, to take pride in that variety (rather than struggle over which are more important than others), and to find ways to stimulate one another intellectually and help one another operationally. We think the "core identity" of the Center is to be found in an engaged but diverse intellectual community rather than a specific organizational commitment to one goal rather than another.

Our fifth finding is related to the fourth. Like the other evaluators, we remain concerned about the impact that the Center has had given its resources and its capabilities. We think about trying to register and record the impact of the Center in the matrix presented a Table 2.

**Table 2:
Impact Areas of the IUCOP**

Kind of Impact	Scope of Influence		
	National	State	Local Community
1.0 Academic			
1.1 Research	(Giving Studies)	(Grønberg Studies)	
1.2 Curriculum Development	(Liberal Arts)		(IUPU Curriculum)
2.0 Professional Practice	(TFRSO)		
3.0 Policy Toward Nonprofits	(Lenkowsky)		

In general, we think the largest impact has been on Indiana University -- that is, on the research and teaching that is carried out at a local academic institution. We think that has had an impact on local practice insofar as many of the IUCOP students have joined the ranks of the Indiana nonprofit sector. The Fund Raising School seems to have had an effect on the national practice of fundraising both directly through its extensive programs, and indirectly through the fact that others are imitating the curriculum. The masters programs, in contrast, are too small to have had much direct effect on national practice, and have not yet been copied enough to have had an impact on national training activities.

But we do think that the masters programs have potential over time. In our interviews with current students and alumni of these programs, it was clear that students found that the masters program in philanthropic studies gave them great value added. All of them mentioned the value of becoming acquainted with the literature of the sector, and the value that literature gave them in their ensuing careers. We heard the greatest criticism about the masters of public administration with a concentration in nonprofit studies through the School of Public and Environmental Administration on the Bloomington campus (SPEA). We heard estimates that half the students accepted to the program wanted this concentration, yet the students found that few faculty had any knowledge about nonprofits and little knowledge about nonprofits were integrated into the required core courses. Some students were doing both masters degrees and found the masters in philanthropic studies to be much more stimulating and valuable for their purposes. We found out that four new faculty members have been hired to teach in the program, and we assume that with the leadership of Kirsten Grønberg and the new dean at SPEA, Astrid Merget, that this situation will improve in the future. But this experience is one found in many business and public administration programs around the country that add concentrations in nonprofits, but do not make a significant investment of integrating the inclusion of nonprofits into the basic curriculum of core courses for the masters degree.

We think the IUCOP is positioned to have an impact on the national academic community -- by developing research methods and data bases, by producing cutting edge research, and by developing outstanding curriculum materials. But if they are to accomplish this goal, they have to not only step up the level and quality of research they are doing, but also find the means to take full advantage of their intellectual diversity.

One place where the IUCOP continues to lag, it seems to us, is in terms of an impact on national policy debates. This was a concern of the 1997 practitioner evaluation when they complained about IUCOP's lack of presence in the national policy scene. It is also reflected in recent changes designed to encourage Gene Tempel to participate more actively in the national scene. And the IUCOP has an important potential asset for this work in the form of Les Lenkowsky who is a figure in the national debates, but who has now left the Center to direct the National Corporation of Public Service. He certainly needs to be replaced. But for a Center the size and scope of IUCOP, the national influence and voice in policy-making circles seems modest at best.

Other leaders that we interviewed including IU administrators believed that the Center should provide leading research in tax policy, the role of nonprofit organizations in welfare reform, etc. While the Center has done occasional studies, and some of its current research could be expanded to look at these important policy issues, there is a lot that can be done to fill in this gap in the future.

Another place the Center seems to lag is in the active placement of its students in jobs after graduation. While all of its graduates get jobs within 90 days of graduation and a few are well placed in universities and a few are executives of local nonprofit organizations, part of

the national reputation demands that graduates of Indiana have leadership positions in leading organizations over the next few decades. Such placement does not come by accident.

While the Center program have recruited excellent students according to faculty, we believe not enough attention is being paid to recruiting key organizations in the sector to recruit their graduates. Just as with other parts of the Center's programs, this area needs attention, a plan, and staffing, and follow up to employers to find out whether those graduates have the kind of knowledge and skills they expected. Such attention to this area can help a small number of well-placed graduates build a national reputation for the various degree programs.

1. What's to Be Done?

Our recommendations follow from our evaluation. We think the IUCOP is still a major resource in the national community of nonprofit scholars. We are glad that it exists, and that it has become institutionalized. We are glad that it has succeeded in attracting and developing an outstanding group of scholars. We are glad that has continued to support and improve a nationally important professional/vocational enterprise. We are grateful for the curriculum innovations that have been made in some of the courses in the degree programs -- particularly those that introduce the nonprofit sector with history, philosophy, religion, and literature as well as social science. It would be a great loss if the Center were to disappear or even to falter.

At the same time, we, like the other evaluators that have come before, think that there is more potential to be exploited in the Center. We think that the full advantages of being a comprehensive ambitious center, engaged with a large and diverse and talented faculty, have not been fully developed or exploited. There are many valuable individual research projects, and many valuable courses being taught by individuals, and the sum of these contributions adds up to something significant. But we think there is something greater than the sum of the parts which can be created and has not yet been done. To seize this opportunity, we think the following should be done:

First, we think the signature research projects are excellent projects, and they should be pursued with great determination. (These include the PSID panel study; the Indiana study; the humanities reader and the series of smaller studies around giving and volunteering that can be grouped together.) As noted above, we like the way they use the faculty strengths. We like the way they support both national intellectual and local service goals. We like the portfolio of projects as an interesting expression of what is unique about the Center --- its intellectual diversity, its roots in liberal arts and social science, and its pre-occupation with the philanthropic spirit as a key source of energy to the nonprofit voluntary sector. We also like the fact that this work will not only support local academics, but also provide a base for national academics to use as well.

Second, we think that the Center must be concerned about the integration of core courses across all degrees taught by faculty who have committed to these courses. We also think that more attention needs to be paid to the placement of graduates. The input is good (the quality of

the students), so attention now needs to be placed on the output, where they are placed.

Third, we think that the key leadership challenge now facing the Center is how to help the Center's far-flung faculty become a vital learning community. We have suggested some tasks that could serve as the crucible for creating such a community. These include engaging in sustained curriculum planning and development activities that make the core courses in the masters programs a high quality, integrated program responsive both to the needs of students and the aspirations of the professors; or developing new service learning or executive programs that relied on teaching faculty from the academic programs and the Fund Raising School; or transforming intra-disciplinary research projects into inter-disciplinary projects

Note that these efforts to create a vital learning community might be aided by structural changes that have been suggested by IUCOP: namely, the creation of a doctoral program in philanthropic studies, or the creation of a School of Philanthropic Studies. In each case, the faculty would be challenged to come together to design and execute a program. In our opinion, we think that the idea of creating a school might be better for this purpose than creating a PhD program. The reason is that PhD programs are the places where the disciplines are most fierce in defending their particular approaches. As a result, most interdisciplinary PhD programs become simply the summation of existing degree requirements across the participating disciplines rather than an effort to work out a whole new idea. In contrast, the development of a core curriculum for a group of students who want to make professional careers in a given area provides a somewhat looser framework within which it is possible for academics to wean themselves a bit from disciplinary loyalties, and think through what it is that they think professional students really need to know. We recognize, however, that the creation of a school is a much bigger deal than the creation of a PhD program, and that there might well be important local interests in creating a PhD program either in addition to or instead of a School. Since the Center is already planning a feasibility study for the establishment of a school, we recommend that part of that study should be a seminar around these issues which would engage the IUPUI faculty and the Bloomington as well as participants external to the university. Such a seminar might help to engage the faculty broadly as well as scholars and practitioner-leaders from around the country.

We will not comment further on these ideas about structural changes except to observe that while structural changes can sometimes help transform functions, processes and relationships, they are neither necessary nor sufficient for this purpose. What is important is to transform the latent potential of the Faculty of Philanthropic Studies into a potent learning community that is alive intellectually, focusing on important intellectual and policy questions facing the nonprofit sector, and actively engaged in the development and fielding of a curriculum that can show undergraduates the importance of the voluntary sector, and prepare graduate students and current practitioners to become outstanding professionals in the field. The leadership that is needed now is intellectual leadership. That will have to come from a team that is committed to working together to exploit the full intellectual potential of the

Center, not just from a single individual.

Attachments:

- A. Agenda of groups and individuals we interviewed at the ICOP.
- B. Other individuals interviewed by telephone.
- C. Evaluation commissioned by ICOP by Marnie Maxwell Associates

Attachment A:

THE CENTER ON PHILANTHROPY AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

AGENDA

**Virginia Hodgkinson and Mark Moore
Center Evaluation for The Atlantic Philanthropies (USA) Inc.
August 15-16, 2001**

Wednesday August 15, 2001

3:32 p.m.	Arrive Indianapolis, Virginia Hodgkinson U.S. Airways, No. 991, Hotel Confirmation, No. 4544976 Dwight Burlingame will pick up at airport and bring to University Place Hotel
4:15 p.m.	Arrive Indianapolis, Mark Moore U.S. Airways, No. 4901, Hotel Confirmation, No. 2657221 Gene Tempel will pick up at airport and bring to University Place Hotel
Time?	Dinner, Moore and Hodgkinson, Chancellor's, University Place Hotel

Thursday, August 16, 2001

7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast, Bistro <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gene Tempel, Executive Director, University Place Hotel
8:55 a.m.	Gene and Patrick Rooney escort to the Library
9:15 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Meeting with Center on Philanthropy Cabinet, Library No. 2115E <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dwight Burlingame, Associate Executive Director• Bev Ernest, Director of Finance• Wanda Kay, Director of Development & Communications• Patrick Rooney, Director of Research & COO• Tim Seiler, Director of TFRS and Public Service

10:15 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Meeting, Library No. 2115E
with

- Dean Herman Saatkamp, Dean of Liberal Arts (Indianapolis)
- Gene Tempel

Astrid Merget, Dean of School of Public and Environmental Affairs (Bloomington) is not available during this visit. The Center will arrange telephone contact for Drs. Hodgkinson and Moore with her.

11:00 a.m. – 12 noon

Meeting with selected alumni and current students, Library No. 2115J

Alumni

Connie Baker, Executive MA, Professor of Nursing Administration, IU School of Nursing, Indianapolis

Tonja Conour, M.P.A., Executive Director, Girl's Inc., Indianapolis

Frank Garza, M.P.A., Alzheimer's Association, National Office, Chicago

Frank Huehls, M.A., Librarian, Payton Philanthropic Studies Library, University Library, Indianapolis

Amy Kwas, M.P.A., Alzheimer's Association, Indianapolis Chapter

Jill Kramer, M.A., Lumina Foundation, Indianapolis

Jamie Levy, Dual M.A./M.P.A., Prevent Blindness Indiana, Indianapolis

Current Students

Susan Haber, M.A. Program, Hearst Fellow (1998-1999)

Nina Gondola, M.A. Program, Hearst Fellow (2000-2001)

Rachel McIntosh, dual degree candidate, has completed M.A., Now finishing M.P.A. Program

Grady Jones, matriculating into M.P.A. Program (Fall 2001)

Ben Imdiecke, Jane Addams Fellow Program Allumnus, matriculating into M.A. Program (Fall 2001)

12 noon

Students escorts to the Luncheon

12:15 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.

Lunch with Community Leaders, Conference Center,
Board Room No. 219

Dean William Plater, Host
Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculties

Martha D. Lamkin, Executive Vice President, Lumina
Foundation for Education (formerly USA Group
Foundation), Indianapolis

John Mutz, Vice Chairman and President (retired), Cinergy
(must leave a little early)

Michael O'Connor, Chief Deputy Mayor and Chief of
Staff, City of Indianapolis

Paula Parker-Sawyers, Director, Friendly Access Program,
Health and Hospital Corporation, Marion County,
Indianapolis

Brian Payne, President, Central Indiana Community
Foundation/Indianapolis Foundation

Carol Simonetti, Executive Director, Indiana Grantmakers
Alliance

1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.

Meeting with selected faculty, Library No. 2115E
Wolfgang Bielefeld, Assistant Professor, School of Public
and Environmental Affairs (SPEA), Indianapolis
Sheila Kennedy, Professor, SPEA, Indianapolis
Debra Mesch, Associate Professor, SPEA, Indianapolis
Mark Wilhelm, Associate Professor, Economics, School of
Liberal Arts, Indianapolis
Rich Steinberg, Professor, Economics, School of Liberal
Arts, Indianapolis

Unable to attend but available by telephone at a later date if
desired:

Kristen Grønberg, Efroymson Professor at the Center and
Professor, SPEA

James Perry, Chancellor's Professor, SPEA, Indianapolis

Kevin Robbins, Associate Professor, History, School of
Liberal Arts, Indianapolis

Mary Tschirhart, Associate Professor, SPEA,
Bloomington or any other faculty member listed in
Philanthropic Studies

2:30 p.m.

Meeting concludes, Meet at Bell stand, University Place
Hotel

- Gene and Patrick take to the airport

4:05 p.m.

Virginia's Flight departs Indianapolis, US Airways
No. 729

5:50 p.m.

Mark's Flight departs Indianapolis , US Airways,
No. 4901

Attachment B:

Other individuals that we interviewed

Dr. Kevin C. Robbins
Associate Professor, IU Dept of History

Dr. David H. Smith
Professor, IU Dept of Religious Studies
Director of the Poynter Center

Craig Dyckstra
Vice President Religion
Lilly Endowment

Clay Robbins, President
Lilly Endowment

Robert Long
Senior Program Officer
W. K. Kellogg Foundation

We tried calling several other people, but most were on vacation or away from campus.

Attachment C:

The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University

Qualitative Evaluation Findings

August 31, 2001

Executive Summary:

“Dean”, “Grandfather” and “Flagship” are the terms people use to describe the impact of the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University on the field of philanthropy in general. And, while being the oldest (and best funded) in a category does not automatically mean being the “best”, the participants in this study believe it does have that meaning in the Center’s case.

Because it is perceived as being “*the most highly capitalized of all of the centers*”, expectations about the quality and impact of the Center’s work are extremely high. Respondents in this study acknowledge holding the Center to perhaps impossibly high standards and, in the process, sometimes being overly critical if every program, product or service created by the Center does not only meet, but also exceed, expectations. Nevertheless, most respondents grade the Center’s work as an A- or B+.

“Things can always be better. They have had a lot of resources (more than anyone else), but they have used those resources responsibly and effectively. Indiana has the best program, hands down. When people say, ‘Check with the Center’, they mean I.U.”

Although respondents were not asked to make direct comparisons between the Center and other university-based programs, they volunteered consistent examples of how the Center is different from its peers. Respondents believe that the Center is unique because it:

- is a truly comprehensive program that reaches a diverse audience
- focuses on infusing philanthropic studies into a university’s total liberal arts program
- is willing to explore issues from both liberal and conservative perspectives
- convenes diverse groups of people around ideas
- offers The Fund Raising School program
- is associated with the I.U. Press, which has growing visibility as a significant publisher in the philanthropic studies field
- has an excellent library
- pursues interesting research that has a real impact on practice

Perceptions about the collaborative way the Center does its work, the audiences it serves and the quality and effectiveness of its programs, products and services also were explored in the study. Respondents concluded that:

- Generally, the Center is highly collaborative in all of its work although that operating mode can create some problems with staff follow-through.

- Gene Tempel's leadership is the catalyst for collaboration and one of the major reasons for the Center's excellent reputation.
- Center Board members particularly are concerned about the Center stretching itself too thin as it works with a wide variety of individuals and organizations; that same concern is expressed about Gene Tempel's breadth of commitments.
- The breadth of audiences served is seen as one of the hallmarks of the Center's program; most respondents identify virtually the same list of a half dozen groups when asked to name the Center's "primary" audience.
- Most of the programs, products or services initiated within the past few years are not well known or understood by anyone other than those individuals who are directly involved with creating them. However respondents who are unaware of the new programs agree that the *"sound like the kind of things the Center ought to be doing."*

Finally, respondents (unprompted) offer a diverse group of suggestions for future directions the Center should explore. These ideas range from the practical ("develop a leadership succession plan" or "diversify the funding base") to the more esoteric "assert true leadership by defining explicit normative outcomes for the philanthropic sector".)

All of these issues are described in greater depth in the body of this report.

Methodology:

This independent evaluation is based on in-depth phone interviews with 15 individuals and written responses to essentially the same question set from an additional 15 individuals. (Twenty-three individuals received the written survey in August 2001, a time of year when many participants were vacationing; the 65 percent response rate speaks highly to the value most respondents place on the Center and its work.) All participants were selected by the Center because of their leadership in the nonprofit sector as scholars, practitioners, funders or national spokespersons in the field. A complete list of the individuals who were interviewed or surveyed is included at the end of this report.

The topics explored include the Center's:

- access and responsiveness to others
- individual effectiveness
- products/programs/services and their impact

It is important to note that the nature of qualitative research allows for in-depth exploration of a narrow range of topics; however, there is no statistical validity to the responses. Thus, the information in this report reflects peoples' perceptions of the Center, based on their personal interactions with both the Center and the broader field of philanthropy. The italicized quotes used throughout the report, while capturing the words of a single person, reflect ideas expressed by multiple persons in the study.

Responses to both the survey and the open-ended interviews were examined to determine if respondents' answers varied depending on the role they play in the nonprofit sector ("scholar" versus "funder", for example.) On a few issues, differences were evident; these have been highlighted in the report. In most cases, however, the responses were remarkably consistent across all respondents.

Study Findings:

Perceived Uniqueness:

The Center on Philanthropy is like the proverbial blind man and the elephant: People who know it and work with it usually understand only a small portion of its total work. Individuals in this study generally are well versed about only a narrow range of the Center's work, although they are aware that much more is going on than what they see. Because they recognize the breadth of the Center's work, respondents unanimously agree that the Center is different than all of the other academic centers focused on philanthropy:

"I.U. has built a comprehensive program, not a 'think tank' built around individuals. It's not just research or just courses or just public service. It's like a full-service bank!"

"The focus on the liberal arts – cross disciplinary learning – is really unique. The Center is trying to 'infuse' a university rather than build a monument. They have tried to build an intellectual community – a critical mass of people who work in the nonprofit sector and the university. No other place is known for this."

"They don't take a 'safe' ideological middle ground. They are willing to focus on religion and spirituality – which most other centers shy away from. Bob Payton's values focus (seeing philanthropy as a way of achieving social justice, thrives alongside Les Lenkowsky's conservatism.)"

"The Center is unique as a 'convener'. They are a neutral party in bringing together diverse groups of people. Look at the annual Symposium – you can see all of the audiences that the Center serves together at the same time there! They also are the most active Center in terms of bringing together groups of scholars."

"The Fund Raising School stands alone. It's a noncredit but serious program that's truly a distinctive aspect of the Center's program."

"Because of the Center (I suspect), the I.U. Press has become known as one of the top four publishers in the field of nonprofit and philanthropic studies."

"The Payton library and philanthropic studies index is an incredible service to the entire academic community."

"They are willing to undertake 'boring' research (like the administrative costs study) which has a real impact on the field. Too many researchers only want to do the 'glamorous' stuff."

These responses illuminate a remarkable consistency of opinion among the respondents about the Center being "different". And, while the vast majority sees the Center's interdisciplinary focus as important, a few do point to the "downside" of this approach:

"What is the faculty as a whole producing in terms of scholarship? We hear about Kristen (Grønberg) and Rich (Steinberg) and what they're doing. But what about the rest of the faculty?"

Access/Responsiveness:

People believe the Center has been able to achieve much of its success through the collaborative approach it takes to its work, and many cite Gene Tempel's leadership as the catalyst for this approach. (*"Collaboration is his personal 'default mode'"*, explained one respondent.) Most respondents believe that the Center had a "reputation deficit" when Tempel became director; in the past four years, however, there has been a significant turnaround. Now, people believe that the Center has demonstrated that it truly wants them involved because it has followed through on its promises and, as result, has developed (or repaired) relationships with key constituents. As one respondent put it,

"Centers tend to get identified with their director. Gene, despite some initial concerns about his lack of academic research credentials, has proved to be an extraordinary director. He has brought more people and organizations into the Center, won the trust of funders and hired excellent people. Because of all of this, the Center's reputation has blossomed."

(It should also be noted that Gene Tempel's recent illness has made many people realize how the current reputation for this organization is closely tied with its leader. They see the Center's reputation as having prospered because of Tempel and are concerned – though not alarmed – about the future.)

Across the board, respondents describe their experience in working with the Center as "extremely positive" and see the Center as being open to new suggestions for collaborative undertakings. One respondent summed the experience up best:

"They work from a model of 'abundance' rather than 'self-preservation'. They are happy to advance others' work and not just themselves, and they celebrate and promote the accomplishments of the full range of their associates."

However, the experience of working with the Center, though ultimately positive for all respondents, was not always easy for some. Several respondents described projects that took more time to conclude than the partners had expected or had been told. However, these same individuals acknowledge that they personally had not anticipated the amount of time that it would take to "work through the relationship" between themselves and the Center – to build a level of trust and understanding on both sides that enables a project to develop smoothly. Significantly, These individuals do not blame the Center for this misunderstanding. Rather, they see the "bumpiness" as a natural result of the collaborative process.

Others, however, believe that the Center either does not have adequate staff to carry out all of the collaborative initiatives that it undertakes, or that the staff is not as committed to the process of collaboration as Tempel is. These respondents recognize and acknowledge that Tempel's role and his staff's roles are entirely different and that it is sometimes easier to be committed to collaboration when you don't have to be the one juggling all of the resulting work. A few people singled out individual staff who were "difficult to work with", however; others praised these same staff as examples of people who were "great to work with."

Only the Center's board members indicated any concern about the number of collaborations the Center has entered into.

"They may say 'yes' too often. It's very difficult to turn good ideas down, and Gene and the others rarely do. I am concerned about whether they have the resources to carry out all of the work."

Audiences Served:

Students, academics, foundations, the broader philanthropic community, practitioners, government/public policy-makers... The survey results named all of these groups as being "primary" audiences being served by the Center. Many organizations can point to a single audience as being their most important one and list all others as being secondary. Respondents see the Center treating all of its audiences as "most important."

"It's like juggling – all of the audiences aren't 'up' at the same time. However, they all are important to the Center, and it is able to meet all of their needs and not stray from its core mission."

"Look around the annual Symposium – all of those audience groups are there. That's what the Center does so well – serve multiple audiences well. As long as that focus continues, things will be okay!"

Interestingly, the responses from the various subgroups in the survey all said essentially the same things about audiences. Scholars, who have the greatest knowledge about the Center's academic

programs and research, also believe that the training programs of The Fund Raising School are a vital part of the Center. Funders, who cite the Center's research initiatives as advancing the entire field, also recognize the vital role that the Center's plays in education – both formally, through the master's program and through the training programs of The Fund Raising School. Practitioners and spokespersons in the field are more directly aware of the quality of The Fund Raising School's programs, but see the "cross fertilization" of academics and practitioners as being a unique attribute of the Center.

Each of these groups accesses the Center in different ways, through various programs, products, services and delivery systems. None of them has a complete understanding of the Center's depth of program/product/service offerings for audiences other than its own, but they do believe that the Center is committed to reaching all of these diverse audiences well.

Products/Services and Their Impact:

As noted earlier, the Center is perceived to have a "*disproportionate share of the resources in the field*". However, respondents believe those resources have been put to good use by hiring great faculty and contributing to a "*disproportionate share of the leadership in the field as well.*" Kirsten Grønberg, Rich Steinberg, Patrick Rooney, Dwight Burlingame, Les Lenkowsky and Wolfgang Bielefeld are frequently cited as "great hires" that have helped to strengthen the academic output of the Center.

In the course of the study, several of the newer programs, products and services were tested with respondents to discover whether they were received to be enhancing the field of philanthropic studies or improving practice in nonprofit organizations in any significant ways. The "test list" included:

- *Philanthropy Matters'* magazine
- Community Foundations Institute, launched in January 2001 in collaboration with the Council on Foundations
- Summer Institute for Philanthropic Studies and Voluntary Service held for college juniors and seniors for the past three summers
- Philanthropy and a Liberal Education seminar for liberal arts faculty members from around the country
- Executive Master of Arts in Philanthropic Studies degree
- Forthcoming research results from the philanthropy module to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics
- Indian Nonprofit Sector project

- Doctoral grants program, which has awarded 17 fellowships to doctoral candidates at ten institutions around the U.S.

Like the blind man, the nature of an individual respondent's connections to the Center is the main determinant for how familiar he or she is with any or all of the items on the list. To the Center's credit, its Board is the group that is most familiar with and conversant about the majority of the projects and programs. Other groups' familiarity with individual programs or services is somewhat predictable and, where significant, is highlighted.

Philanthropy Matters, perhaps logically, is the product that the greatest number of people are familiar with. (Everyone remembers having seen the publication, which is sent out semi-annually to the Center's mailing list.) While no one claims to have read it from cover to cover, most people see it as a nice way to expand the Center's image and reputation and share news about its various research projects and programs. While no one sees it as having true "impact" on the field, most agree that it is something the Center should continue because of the public relations value it brings.

The impact of the **Community Foundations Institute** generally is assessed as *too early to tell*". The people who know about it (foundations and Center's board members) see it as potentially having great impact on the field. (Most respondents outside of these two groups have never heard of the program.) However, there is confusion about who the "owner" of the program is – the Center or the Council on Foundations.

The **summer institute**, the **liberal arts faculty seminar** and the **executive master's** program each are known only by people who have a direct connection: a participant at a concurrent Center's program who happened to meet the Institute students, the collaborative developer of the program, or someone who had hired a master's graduate, for example. For these individuals, the high quality of the programs is evident. All others have no knowledge of the programs, although some commented, *"Didn't know about it, but it sounds like a great idea!"*

The Center has dubbed the **philanthropy module to the income dynamics study** as its "signature research project." Given that belief, it is unfortunate that less than a third of those surveyed know about it. Those who are aware of it (board members, foundations and one scholar) believe it will *"give insight to all in the field about fundraising motivations."* The scholar who is aware of it believes it is *"an investment in knowledge in a way that has no immediate return. It won't 'pay off' quickly for the Center or the field – but I like that! It will have a real impact over time."*

Among the few people who are aware of the **Indiana Nonprofit Sector** project, the consensus is that it is *"too early to know the impact"* of the research. Kirsten Grønberg, however, is highly respected even by those who are unaware of this particular study; thus expectations are high for the ultimate impact of the project's work. *"You have to know about your home area before you can be taken seriously around the world,"* explains one person who is aware of the study in explaining the importance of the Center undertaking this type of work.

Finally, the **doctoral grants** program is known only by foundations and a few scholars. The main criticism people have of the program is that the quality of the dissertations resulting from the Center's investment is uneven. Consequently, the link of the research to practice and additional research is *"spotty"*. However, as one person pointed out, *"At least the Center is willing to take risks. Some will pay off and some won't!"*

Because of its longevity, **The Fund Raising School** was not tested as a "new program". Nevertheless, many respondents cite its work in delivering customized programs both in the U.S. and around the world as an excellent new program initiative. However, this effort also is seen as an area that needs refinement. The training programs offered through The Fund Raising School are not seen as being a "neat fit" for different cultures or countries, and some respondents express the hope that more time and effort will be given to ensure that these contract programs truly become "customized" and not "cookie cutter."

The **Jane Adams Fellows**, another "old" program initiative, is consistently cited as one of the Center's exemplary programs. Many believe the quality of graduate students attracted to the program is evidence of the impact the Center is (and will be) having on the field.

Finally, it should be noted that while respondents generally praise the Center's work, there were some individuals who characterized its quality as "uneven". When pressed, however, the critics were unable to cite anything specific that they believed was mediocre or poor. *"Some of the edited books"* is the closest anyone could come to identifying "medium quality" work.

The Center's Future:

Although respondents were not specifically asked to suggest future directions for the Center or its programs, several did so:

- *"The Fund Raising School should explore offering technical assistance as a follow-up to training and explore how to offer its programs more innovatively."* (On-line delivery was suggested as an "innovative" method.
- In addition, some participants suggested The Fund Raising School should evaluate some new metrics:

Do organizations whose staff enroll in the program actually raise more money as a result of the training?"

- *"Are organizations of all sizes served equally well by the program?"*
- *"The Center should develop a succession plan, especially in light the Gene Tempel's recent illness."*
- *"Giving USA information should be spread beyond the academic community."*

- *"The Center should press harder and lead the effort to develop explicit normative outcomes for the field.."*
- *"Continued attention needs to be given to engaging the intended audiences in all stages of program development, delivery and evaluation."*

Others raised questions they believe the Center must address in the near future:

- *"How will the Center finance its future? Key foundations have stayed with it for a long period time. The University's commitment is outstanding as well, but there needs to be a broader base."*
- *"Is there a 'bias of patronage'? Can any institution that raises so much money from foundations really be objective and critical of foundations?"*
- *"Can the Center build a more flexible infrastructure so that it can remain like the Internet – able to build strength by forming good partnership?"*
- *"Should the Center stretch its work internationally or stay focused on the U.S.?"* (Some respondents are passionate about each focus; Board members, however, are worried about the need for even greater resources if the focus is expanded internationally.)

And, while no "question" came out, many wondered if the Center can continue at its current pace without substantially increasing the number of staff in order to support both current and new initiatives.

Conclusions:

Overall, each of the subgroups within the study perceives the Center's programs to be significantly better as compared to 1997 when the last formal overall evaluation of the Center occurred. (It should be noted, however, that a number of the respondents were not actively involved with the Center four years ago; thus, their perceptions are more of a current rather than a comparative analysis.)

"Under Gene's direction, the programs and approaches of the Center have developed to a high quality, and the Center has thereby increased its credibility."

"The Center operates like a model nonprofit organization now. They practice what they teach – board development, connecting with constituents, collaboration, financial accountability – in an excellent way."

The respondents see unique differences between the Center and its university-based counterparts, primarily because of the breadth of the Center's program and the commitment to serving diverse audiences. And while praising the Center for its work as a collaborator without overt self-

interest, some respondents do express concerns about the Center's ability to follow through on all of its commitments. Stretching into new areas (especially internationally) likely will require additional staff and resources, which could compound the follow-through concern.

Many of the newer initiatives are not yet well known, an issue that the Center should address as it determines how to keep all of its various audiences informed about the scope and impact of its work. For some of these programs, such as the Community Foundations Institute, the Center may need to community the relationship of the partners in the project more clearly.

Finally, it should be stressed that while many study participants were willing to offer suggestions for the how the Center's work can improve, all stressed that they were doing so in order to make "the best" center (in their opinion) even better.

Individuals Surveyed for Study:

Individual Interviews:

Dwayne Ashley, Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund
Richard Behrenhausen, Robert R. McCormick Tribune Foundation
Elizabeth T. Boris, Ph.D., Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy, the Urban Institute
Dr. Charles T. Clotfelter, Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy, Duke University
Harvey P. Dale, National Center on Philanthropy and Law, New York University
David C. Hammack, Mandel Center for Nonprofit Management
Christopher Harris, Ford Foundation
Charles A. Johnson, retired from Lilly Endowment
Dorothy A. Johnson, Ahlburg Company
Barbara D. Kibbe, David and Lucile Pachard Foundation
Paulette V. Maehara, Association of Fundraising Professionals
Dorothy S. Ridings, Council on Foundations
Dr. Paul G. Schervish, Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College
Curtis R. Simic, Indiana University Foundation
Russell G. Weigand, Campbell & Company

Individuals Surveyed:

Eammon Cregon, University of Limerick
Dr. Kenneth L. Gladish, YMCA of the USA
Janet S. Greenlee, Ph.D., University of Dayton
Helmut Heinzl, Donau Universitat Krems
Tanya Howe Johnson, National Committee on Planned Giving
Andrea Kaminski, Women's Philanthropy Institute
Irvin S. Kaztz, National Assembly of Health and Human Service Organizations
Dr. Robert F. Long, W.K. Kellogg Foundation
Janis Masaoka, CompassPoint Nonprofit Services
William C. McGinley, Ph.D., CAE, Association for Healthcare Philanthropy
Sara Melendez, Independent Sector
Astrid E. Merget, Ph.D., School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University
Judith O'Connor, National Center for Nonprofit Boards
Margaret O'Donnell, University of Houston
Dr. Joel J. Orosz, W.K. Kellogg Foundation
Michael J. Poston, CFRE, Baptism Medical Center, Wake Forest University
Dr. Walter W. Powell, Scandinavian Consortium for Organizational Research,
Stanford University
Dr. David O. Renz, Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership,
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Rebecca W. Rimel, the Pew Charitable Trusts
Dr. Mark Rosenman, Office of Social Responsibility the Union Institute
Dr. Burton A. Weinsbrod, Northwestern University
Dr. Julian Wolpert, Princeton University
Daniel Yoffe, Tzedaka, Argentina