

The Transatlantic Community Foundation Network

BEYOND MONEY & GRANTMAKING: THE EMERGING ROLE OF COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful,
concerned **citizens**
can **change** the world. Indeed it
is the only thing that ever has.”

Margaret Mead

THE TRANSATLANTIC COMMUNITY FOUNDATION NETWORK

During the last decade, the community foundation concept has spread rapidly around the globe. Community foundations constitute one of the fastest growing forms of organized philanthropy. This powerful global trend and the enormous potential of community foundations to stimulate and support inclusive local philanthropy led the Bertelsmann Foundation and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation in 1999 to establish and jointly underwrite the Transatlantic Community Foundation Network (TCFN).

The TCFN provides a platform for the exchange of experience and expertise among community foundations on both sides of the Atlantic. It seeks to identify good practices and share them with emerging and existing community foundations. In addition, its goal is to foster the development of this form of philanthropy in countries where the concept is still new.

Given these objectives, the TCFN is an issue- and product-oriented network designed to pursue a variety of program strategies such as pooling intellectual resources, benchmarking and developing new, innovative approaches to contribute to the growth and advancement of the field. The products of the network are presented in cooperation with the European Foundation Centre on its Web site.

Network activities are organized around the work of core groups, which focus their efforts upon broad functional areas central to the missions and operations of all community foundations. Each of these working groups includes community foundation representatives from North American and European countries, as well as community foundation support organizations. For the current phase of the program, three working groups, dealing with the issues of community leadership, marketing, and organizational development and effectiveness, function as the heart of the TCFN enterprise.

Working Group 2: The Non-Grantmaking Roles of Community Foundations

This working group defined the various non-grantmaking roles community foundations play and the obstacles to playing such roles, and seeks specific examples of successful leadership roles community foundations have played. The group established that there are **common non-grantmaking roles and leadership activities** performed by community foundations within our working group, and increasingly, around the world.

The group identified issues that are central to better understanding how and why community foundations engage in leadership roles. The issues selected were also ones for which there is very little literature specific to community foundations. The group looked at a variety of ways to compile this information and to make it accessible to the field.

This book is a result of this work.

THE NON-GRANTMAKING ROLES OF COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

Working Group Participants

Doug Jansson, Working Group Coordinator
The Milwaukee Foundation
United States

Lewis Feldstein
The New Hampshire Charitable Foundation
United States

Orietta Filippini
Fondazione della Comunita' Bresciana
Italy

Irena Gadaj
Bilgoraj Community Foundation
Poland

Chris Harris
Community Foundation for Calderdale
United Kingdom

Avila Kilmurray
Community Foundation for Northern Ireland
United Kingdom

Tomás Krejci
Community Foundation of Euroregion Labe
Czech Republic

Joe Lumarda
California Community Foundation
United States

Andy Morikawa
Community Foundation of the
New River Valley
United States

Richard Mulcaster
The Vancouver Foundation
Canada

Stoyan Nikolov
Open Society Club of Varna
Bulgaria

Svetlana Pouchkareva
Togliatti Community Foundation
Russia

Klaus Rollin
Bürgerstiftung Hamburg
Germany

Ruth Shack
Dade Community Foundation
United States

Nina Spallek
Stadt Stiftung Gütersloh
Germany

Colleen Fitzgerald
Working Group Facilitator
United States

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	10
Introductory Essay: Beyond Money and Grantmaking <i>Avila Kilmurray and Lewis Feldstein</i>	11
When to Step Up: Important Operational Questions	11
Role of Bridge Builder	
Activating Support Groups for Victims of Violence — Belfast, Northern Ireland	21
From Riots to Dialogue — Los Angeles, California/US	23
Role of Community Catalyst	
Save It Campaign — Calderdale/UK	25
Introducing Laws on Philanthropy — Togliatti, Russia.	27
Role of Asset Builder	
Building our Greatest Future Asset: Youth — Bilgoraj, Poland	29
Using Our Assets to Serve Our Mission: The Housing Land Trust — Los Angeles, California/US	31
Role of Social Entrepreneur	
Youth Forum: Organizing Voices of the Future — Gütersloh, Germany	33
Four Pillars for Recovery — Vancouver, Canada	35
Role of Expert on Community	
The Vital Economic Engine of the Nonprofit Sector — Miami, Florida/US	37
Building a Civil Society Infrastructure — Togliatti, Russia.	39
Role of Philanthropic Educator	
Teaching Corporate Social Responsibility — Togliatti, Russia	41
Speeches, Seminars and More — Hamburg, Germany	43
Role of Responder	
Community Action: What Started with a Survey...—Belfast, Northern Ireland.	45
A Tax Break for the Working Poor — and more...—Milwaukee, Wisconsin/US	47
Role of Steward	
Protecting, Preserving and Promoting Community Assets— Miami, Florida/US	49
Role of Convener	
Bringing Foundations Together to Address the Needs of Abused Children — Brescia, Italy	51
Community Care On the Road: The Wandering Bus of Dialogue — Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic	53
Closing Remarks	55
Appendix A The Case for Community Foundations as Bridge Builders and Lessons and Examples on How to Do This Critical Work <i>Lewis Feldstein</i>	57
Lessons on How to Build Bridging Social Capital	59
Resources and References.	65

*The Working Group Dedicates This Book
To Unsung Heroes Around the World:
Non-Governmental Organizations, Donors
and Community Leaders Who Make
Our Work Possible and Meaningful*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As community foundation workers, we focus on the local—local people, organizations, community issues and donors. This is the primary life of a community foundation person. We come to this work because of our love of local community and our dedication to make it better for generations beyond us.

But it was the Transatlantic Community Foundation Network that allowed us the opportunity to look beyond the local to the regional, national and international work of community foundations. These international connections will make us all better in serving the local.

Through TCFN we travelled the world. We met people from Western and Eastern Europe and North America. We learned about post-socialist-countries, different legal structures, cultures of giving and community service. We spent hours on minibuses, on site-visits, in conference rooms, on conference calls, and in front of the computer to exchange experiences. We learned to listen. We found similarities and differences. We met people who are all passionate about the work and potential of community foundations. We exchanged know-how, experience and best practices. In the end, we share a tremendous feeling of satisfaction and gratitude.

We give our heartfelt thanks to the **Bertelsmann Foundation** and the **Charles Stewart Mott Foundation** for making this possible.

We thank **our own foundations**, especially our colleagues and volunteer leadership, who gave us the support and time to go on this journey.

We thank **community foundations around the world**. They continually give us stories of innovation, inspiration and hope.

BEYOND MONEY AND GRANTMAKING: THE NON-GRANTMAKING ROLE OF COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

Avila Kilmurray and Lewis Feldstein

“I envisioned a national, and later an international, community of servant leaders — a community of enlightened, committed people who could join hands in fact and in spirit and literally change their communities and the world”

*Joseph Jaworski
Synchronicity — The Inner Path of Leadership*

The Question: Is there life beyond writing the cheque?

Community Foundations are “For Good, For Ever.” They raise and steward funds and make grants to improve life in their communities. They exist for the long haul. They will outlive their donors, their Board members, their staff and their grantees. They will be there to contribute to the well being of their communities not just tomorrow or next year, but in thirty, fifty or a hundred years time.

And that’s all there is to it — Or is it?

Throughout Europe, North America and increasingly in other areas of the world, community foundations are skillfully taking action to benefit their communities in other ways alongside grantmaking. Whether they are working in small towns, rural villages or large cities, and irrespective of whether they have large financial investments or depend on limited resources, community foundations have found that with information, imagination and initiative, there are many ways to make things happen.

When to Step Up: Important Operational Questions

“It is better to ask some of the questions than to know all of the answers” —James Thurber

While many community foundations, both large and small, routinely exercise various community building roles, choosing whether and when to assume these roles is no simple task. Listed below and throughout this essay are some of the iterative questions to be seriously considered when determining whether the foundation can or should take on a role beyond grantmaking in addressing a community issue or need.

What non-grantmaking roles has your community foundation adopted over the past 5 years? Has this situation changed from the approach adopted by your Foundation 10 years ago? And if yes, why?

- * In the Czech Republic, where the provision of community care for people with mental illness was virtually unknown in the early 1990s, the Community Foundation of Usti Nad Labem initiated the “Project Wandering Bus,” which brought 30 representatives of hospital management, non-governmental organizations and local government (including two deputy mayors) for a one week tour of community care services in Great Britain. A direct result of the study tour was the adoption by Usti City Council of the first community care plan in the Czech Republic, while two hospitals developed sheltered living accommodation as well as new NGO-managed community care facilities.
- * The Greater Milwaukee Foundation in the United States was concerned that no organization or agency in its area seemed to be assessing the needs of new immigrants from rural Laos and Cambodia. The Foundation hired a consultant to interview key leaders in the refugee community to encourage them to identify the problems that they were encountering. The report findings were then used by the community foundation to convene a local task force in order to take action to address the issues and problems raised.
- * The Community Foundation for Northern Ireland quietly worked to ensure that both victims of the 30 years of conflict, and the many politically motivated ex-prisoners, could come together across sectarian divides to identify common issues and concerns, as well as to contribute to the ongoing peacebuilding effort in the region.
- * In Canada, the Vancouver Foundation developed the Four Pillars Fund to address the politically charged issues of drug abuse, drug-related crime and harm reduction (safe injection sites and needle exchange). By raising money for the Fund, they drew in a wide range of stakeholders into the initiative, thereby raised consciousness and involvement. An advisory committee of community experts was set up to oversee the Fund.
- * In Gütersloh, Germany, the Stadt Stiftung Gütersloh brought together teachers from nine high schools, each one offering its own independent career planning program, out of which was created a single comprehensive career planning program for all of Gütersloh. Similarly, Stadt Stiftung convened patient self help groups and hospital administrators to jointly plan and establish “Patient Learning” programs in three Gütersloh hospitals.

Who currently makes decisions within your community foundation about what role(s) the community foundation should adopt?

Who are the main stakeholders in your society who might influence your decision to adopt a non-grantmaking role?

Very different initiatives in very different contexts—but just a small example of the ability of community foundations to make a difference that is not solely tied to their ability to make financial grants.

The reality is, however, that this doesn’t just happen. It requires the Board, staff and donors of Community Foundations to make certain decisions and to be open to the many and varied needs within their local area. It requires the Foundation to have a sense of purpose as well as “an ear to the ground,” and while a secure financial base can help, it is not essential. Community foundations can work to achieve change in many ways.

Defining the Non-Grantmaking Role

Community Foundations grow out of their community as well as being there for it, and consequently reflect both the experiences and challenges of that community. Given the wide variety of areas where community foundations are based, the opportunity to exercise a non-grantmaking role will differ from one situation to the next, and from foundation to foundation. Thus it is crucial that the Board and staff of each community foundation are acutely aware of their environment, both the strengths and challenges within their society and the other organizations, agencies and community groups that operate there.

Where there is a rich local infrastructure of NGOs and other agencies, the non-grantmaking role of the community foundation may well be simply ensuring that one organization is aware of what another is doing — the role of **Communicator**. At other times this could require helping organizations understand and reconcile differences — the role of **Bridge Builder** (see Appendix A). Whereas if there are issues or challenges that need an advocate, and where no other organization is stepping forward to take that role, the community foundation may provide that type of leadership — the role of **Advocate**. Another approach may be for the Foundation to encourage a more appropriate organization (or organizations) to take on the advocacy responsibility — the role of **Catalyst**.

There are a number of examples of this work in practice:

- * To draw together information that would build a recognition of the important impact of the work of non-profit organizations in the community in Miami, Florida (USA), the Dade Community Foundation published a study on the economic impact of the area's non-profit sector, comparing its services, payroll, taxes paid and products to traditional areas of commerce and industry.
- * Faced with the decision of local government to close an environmental re-cycling program that was employing adults who had learning difficulties and people who were long-term unemployed, the Community Foundation for Calderdale, in Yorkshire, England, organized a community wide effort to bring together local government representatives, business people, the Member of Parliament and local community organizations to save the program. Within six months, the Kerbside Program was restored and was serving 6,000 homes as well as providing employment.
- * The Togliatti Community Foundation in Russia became an active and visible advocate for the benefits of local philanthropy. They created a series of prestige-enhancing events, including a "Philanthropist of the Year" Award, a Charity Ball, the Ceremony of "Opening the Charity" season. These events raised awareness about local needs and contributed to a doubling of private philanthropy in the first year, and an increase of 33% in each of the following three years.
- * The New Hampshire Charitable Foundation (USA) convened representatives of business, the electric power producers, low-income citizens and environmentalists in a two-year, mediated negotiation to broker a solution in the difficult process of the deregulation of the state's electric power industry.

Are there potential partnership organizations in your community that could work with you in a non-grantmaking initiative? Can they share any of the risks involved and add legitimacy to the initiative?

Has your community foundation ever adopted a role where it was seen as (a) a Communicator between others; (b) a Bridge Builder; (c) an Advocate; or (d) a Catalyst? What happened and what lessons did you learn?

- * Community foundations in Poland act as a catalyst to bring together young people from 11 different Polish communities in a “Collect for Change” program. They encourage the young people to raise money, which the community foundations then matched, doubling the funds. The young people involved advise on the allocation of the charitable funds.

In your circumstances when do you think it would be most appropriate for your community foundation to take a proactive, non-grantmaking role as compared to a supportive (or reactive) role?

How can you most effectively work with your community (in an inclusive and participative manner) rather than working for the community?

How can you ensure that marginal or unpopular issues in your community are given greater visibility?

It is clear that the potential non-grantmaking role of the community foundation can range over a number of different approaches, varying from taking the lead in either initiating action or adopting the role of advocate, to facilitating the lead of other organizations, or indeed taking up the role as **Convener**. What may be an appropriate role in one set of circumstances will differ from what is appropriate in another situation. The important thing is for the community foundation to ask itself the question — Can we usefully fulfill an effective non-grantmaking role concerning this issue, or in these circumstances? And if “yes” — what is the most appropriate role?

Community foundations can find themselves being both proactive and reactive in their non-grantmaking roles depending on the specific circumstances — and what they reckon their most appropriate contribution might be. Where possible, however, it is always better to adopt roles that work with the community rather than seeking to do things for the community, or on behalf of the community. This may be particularly a challenge for wealthy, well-endowed community foundations who have established positions in their communities. They may be expected to take the lead much of the time. Nevertheless, the challenge of empowering other organizations may require foundations to adopt a supportive rather than an initiating role. There is of course a balance to be achieved between passively accepting how a community perceives itself and taking the initiative to highlight less popular issues or causes. Where the latter is the challenge, then community foundations can use their reputation and credibility to both educate society and champion social change.

What a Community Foundation Can Bring to its Non-Grantmaking Role

- * The community foundation of the New River Valley in Virginia (USA) has served as co-convener and co-facilitator with the Montgomery County Public School System of the Montgomery County Diversity Forum over a period of six years. The only community-based body of its kind in Virginia, the Diversity Forum received the FitzTurner Commission for Human Relations and Civil Rights in 2003 for its “outstanding contribution in intergroup relations.” The foundation developed a Youth Civic Engagement project under the auspices of the Diversity Forum to encourage young people to proactively address diversity issues.

At the core of the work of each community foundation is our own community. Our foundation may prioritize work in housing or education, arts or the environment, job training or social development. Our main focus may be on donors or grantees. We may be new Foundations with pennies to our name, or heavies with big bank balances and asset bases. Our communities may be world capitals or quiet rural villages. But what we all have in common is our focus on, and our knowledge of, our community. The entire community. All the work that we do ties back to our mission, our capacity, to build and improve our home communities — although this may sometimes be realised by reaching out to other communities. Thus an essential contribution that a Community Foundation can bring to a non-grantmaking role is its knowledge base.

Community foundations are distinguished by a mission statement that is to serve an entire geographical community — albeit they may prioritize their grantmaking in certain areas of it. Notwithstanding this, Community foundations work with and through all sections of society: business, non-governmental and public. While they exist to respond to the needs in society, they also work with individual and collective donors, as well as with the public sector. They seek to reach across every group and interest in the community, every faith and belief; to work with major interests as well as with tiny, often ignored minorities. Where this takes place in practice, it means that community foundations do not only bring expert knowledge of their local community to their non-grantmaking role, but they also bring a knowledge base that can draw from the diversity of the sectors and groups that the foundation is in regular contact with.

- * Duke Energy is using Vancouver Foundation to handle all of its philanthropy in Canada. Duke purchased West Coast Energy some years ago; the pipelines run all across Canada and over many Indian Reserves. The corporate head office of Duke is in North Carolina, three time zones away, but the Vancouver Foundation is working with Duke to explain the First Nations' issues in Canada, and how corporate philanthropy can be best utilized to assist Indian tribes to build community capacity.

And then of course, no matter how limited it might be in newly established or under resourced community foundations, there is still the power of the check book. Community foundations do tend to be seen as a stakeholder given their financial resource base. They also have the ability to broker additional resources from the private sector, from other charitable institutions and from the public sector. They can bring their experience of asset building and leveraging partnership funding. They can also gather in-kind resources and make them available to the local community.

What are the main strengths and weaknesses in the knowledge base of your community foundation about your local community? If there are weaknesses, how can you remedy these?

What are the range of contacts that you have with different sectors and individuals throughout your community? How can these contacts contribute to your non-grantmaking role?

What potential does your community foundation have to leverage additional public and private money and/or expertise to develop an effective social change strategy?

- * In the German city of Hamburg, the community foundation collects musical instruments from people who no longer need them. These instruments are repaired and are made available through the local schools to children who would otherwise be not able to afford them. The community foundation also contributes to the cost of music lessons.

Are there in-kind resources that your community foundation can mobilize to augment your contribution in the local community?

What Board members, donors, staff or supporters do you have that could help the community foundation in its networking role?

What is the reputation and standing of your community foundation in your local community? How can this be used to make your non-grantmaking role effective?

What aspects must you take into account in deciding to invest your community foundation's credibility in a non-grantmaking role? Outline both the potential return of a successful investment and the implications of failure.

Other tangible resources that community foundations can bring to a non-grantmaking role include time, staff and Board member capacity and identifying other individuals and organizations that either have — or might be persuaded to have — an interest in an issue. With its links at all levels of society, a community foundation can play an important networking role. It can build bridges between individuals and organizations that might not otherwise meet, and break down stereotypes and negative perceptions. Through its networking role, it can ensure that difficult issues and problems have a human face.

A rather more intangible, but no less important resource, can be the attention that the reputation and credibility of the community foundation can bring to a controversial issue. The good will of the community foundation is a resource in itself, and it can provide protection and a sense of secure cover to other organizations or individuals. With the security of its independent endowment, community foundations are sometimes in the position to take risks that other non-governmental or public bodies might find difficult. The decision to take risk — as well as a clear understanding of what the cost as well as the benefits may be — must be carefully calculated.

In summary, what community foundations can bring to a non-grantmaking role includes:

- * The knowledge, interest, connections and expertise of their board members, staff and donors
- * Resources, both money and in-kind, as well as being able to leverage or broker additional resources
- * The contacts and credibility that they have developed with their grantees and their donors
- * The contacts and credibility that they have built with other sectors or organizations in both the local community and beyond

Needless to say, the investment of these important assets in a non-grantmaking role requires careful consideration and calculation.

Factors in Deciding on a Non-Grantmaking Role

What examples do you have of cases where your community foundation developed a complementary grantmaking and non-grantmaking program of action? What was the learning from these?

There is only so much that the investment of money can do, but when the challenge is to highlight an injustice, change existing public policies, motivate a shift in the values that underpin policies or even to build communities that are prepared to be open and inclusive, then a grant may not be enough. What is often required is a mix-and-match approach — the provision of a grantmaking program but with a greater emphasis on complementary, non-grantmaking work.

- * When the Belfast Agreement in Northern Ireland held that a Bill of Rights should be drawn up it became a divisive issue, often drawn along sectarian lines. Increasingly, the Bill of Rights was seen as a “win” for the Nationalist community and consequently a “loss” for the Unionist community. In an effort to address this situation, the community foundation for Northern Ireland developed a proactive approach to promote the positive value of a Bill of Human Rights. A time limited grants program made available small grants to local community and social action groups so that they could contribute to the consultative process for the drafting of the Bill of Rights. The Foundation sponsored awareness-raising seminars across the various communities, and brought experts from other divided societies, such as South Africa, to explain the important unifying potential of a Bill of Rights.

Much will depend on whether the issue or challenge to be addressed is something that is already receiving attention or whether it remains unpopular or perhaps virtually invisible. It is inappropriate for a community foundation to use its potential leadership role to usurp that which more appropriately rests with another organization. In such cases, the foundation’s non-grantmaking contribution should be one of moral or practical support. However, where a more controversial or unpopular issue is in question, then the community foundation may well have to decide whether it should step into the role of being an advocate or adopting a pioneering leadership approach. If there is a leadership void then, after careful consideration and consultation, the community foundation may want to fill it.

Another important factor in deciding on a non-grantmaking role is the often unique position that a community foundation is in to see opportunities to achieve policy change as well as challenges. If a community foundation has its pulse on the needs of its community and is open to issues being raised by people, then it is likely that they will be aware of new areas of need. Given their wide range of contacts, community foundations are in a good position to build strategic alliances and new partnerships around such issues. Having taken this initiative, however, the foundation does need to think through the implications of the expectations that may be raised about the foundation’s longer-term commitment to a specific issue. There is a need to think through exit strategies as well as to prioritize points of intervention.

Non-Grantmaking Strategies

Like the opportunities to adopt non-grantmaking approaches, the strategies identified will also depend on the context in which a community foundation is working. What may be effective and acceptable in one community will undoubtedly vary from that of another. However, the obvious options might include:

When do you feel it would be appropriate and important for your community foundation to fill a leadership void around an issue?

What forthcoming/new issues is your community foundation aware of in your community that might necessitate you to take a leadership role?

What non-grantmaking strategies and approaches do you feel would be successful and effective in your society or region?

- * Convening meetings, seminars or conferences
- * Hosting expert speakers in public settings
- * Organizing travel-study groups to examine examples of work
- * Commissioning research studies
- * Designing “Demonstration Projects” that can pilot different approaches
- * Lobbying — and facilitating others to lobby — policy makers
- * Establishing task forces to encourage a range of stakeholders to address an issue
- * Facilitating activities that ensure the participation of those in the community that might otherwise be excluded
- * Providing information linking people with organizations and issues

What groups or sections of the community are most likely to be excluded from representation in your community? Why is this so, and can your community foundation do anything to include them?

A community foundation is well placed to ensure that its meetings and initiatives will attract a wide range of diverse interests, which in itself will help to ensure synergy and networking. However, it is also well positioned to pose the question: Who is not at the table that should be? And to issue them an invitation.

- * As one of its early initiatives, the Stadt Stiftung Gütersloh in Germany organized a Youth Forum. More than 1,000 young people assembled to discuss their issues and concerns as well as to identify projects that would improve their situation. The proposals and suggestions from the annual Youth Forum helped shape the community foundation’s program. It also enabled young people to meet with local politicians and other decision-makers. A Youth Parliament has since been established to structure the contribution of the Youth Forum, and funding has been provided for a Youth Café in the Watertower in Gütersloh.

How would your community foundation go about deciding on agreed measurable outcomes for the investment of grantmaking and non-grantmaking resources in any theme or issue that you might identify as a priority for you?

Many community foundations adopt a themed grantmaking program, which enables projects to be funded, but which has the added value of benefiting from an advisory committee, which can bring together experts on the subject or theme. This can facilitate a drawing together of existing knowledge, a drawing out of new knowledge based on the evaluation of the funded projects, and a sharing of ideas around policy development or change. Appropriate PR/marketing work can serve to ensure that there is a growth in public awareness about the issue, while — if required — relevant advocacy or lobbying work by both the community foundation and other organizations can seek to change existing policies. This is basically an in-house approach. However, it is also possible for the community foundation to finance another organization to adopt a similar approach, where it is felt to be more appropriate. This might be described as an out-sourcing model.

When would an in-house community foundation approach be more appropriate than an outsourced non-grantmaking approach?

What imaginative approaches might work in your community and is the community foundation best suited to develop them?

There are also a range of imaginative approaches that can be adopted. Encouraging a well-established and respected institution, such as an opera house or a library to exhibit information about a less well-known or possibly unpopular cause may prove useful. Funding and supporting a television program or public awareness campaign about an issue may be as effective — and often complementary — to funding remedial project work. Educating and encouraging local or national personalities to become advocates of a case or issue may be another effective strategy. All of these approaches are in the lexicon of the potential non-grantmaking strategies of a community foundation.

Making the Decision and Calculating the Odds

Choosing to play a non-grantmaking role is rarely a simple Yes/No decision. It can — and should — involve a series of choices about the appropriate role for your foundation and the priority for investment of resources. To make these choices responsibly, it needs the board of the foundation to be engaged in the discussion about the respective odds of success with each choice as well as the risks that the foundation might incur — risks of acting as well as of not taking action. Clearly not all issues can be judged to be of equal importance, and in taking on a proactive leadership role it is important that the board and staff are convinced that the issue itself is critical and that by tackling it successfully, the foundation can have a significant positive impact on the community.

This short analysis has attempted to list a number of points of choice and decision that community foundations might face in deciding to engage in a non-grantmaking leadership role. There will undoubtedly be others related to the specific circumstances that a community foundation is working on. This is particularly true today, as community foundations are set up and are operating in many different societies across the globe. Despite such diversity, there is still the shared opportunity to maximize the contribution to local communities by going beyond grant making.

At the heart of both the grantmaking and the non-grantmaking roles of a community foundation there are still decisions to be made about:

- a) What are the Mission and Values of the community foundation?
- b) What resources (in the broadest sense) does the community foundation have to make a significant difference?
- c) Who else could, should or will do something about the issue?

The final decision to adopt either a grantmaking or a non-grantmaking (or both) roles may be Yes/No/Maybe, with certain conditions; or Later. But it will undoubtedly be taken in the understanding that the work of the community foundation is “For Good, For Ever” — and that to achieve “the good” means making the right decision at the right time.

Does your community foundation have sufficient staff time, expertise and resources to take on a leadership non-grantmaking role? Do you have a board champion, or interested donor, for any area where a non-grantmaking role is agreed on?

How will your community foundation decide what are the important areas and issues in your community that will result in the foundation taking on a non-grantmaking role and what is less important?

What are the consequences for your community if your community foundation decides not to take action (whether grantmaking or non-grantmaking) on an issue?

ROLE OF BRIDGE BUILDER

Community Foundation of Northern Ireland

ACTIVATING SUPPORT GROUPS FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

Avila Kilmurray

CONTEXT The Community Foundation for Northern Ireland has worked since 1979 within and between the divided communities of Northern Ireland. In the main city, Belfast, many of the most deprived communities are divided by 30 ft. high “Peace Walls.” The community foundation has funded and supported community action both during the years of violence, and more recently over the period, which has been marked by transition from violence. In this context the community foundation has prioritized work around peacebuilding initiatives, believing that local communities and previously marginalized groups must be involved in the peace process.

ISSUE Two groups that were crucial to the work of peacebuilding were the victims of the political conflict and the politically motivated ex-prisoners and ex-combatants. As little recognition or support for victims of violence had been provided prior to the Belfast Peace Agreement in 1998, the foundation took the initiative in funding self-help Victims’ Support Groups. Brendan Bradley, who lost five family members in the conflict, runs the Survivors of Trauma Group in North Belfast. The Group both remembers those who died, and works to support their family members. The Foundation funds the work of a range of different victims’ groups that often have very different political aspirations and experience of the impact of the violence — some having been victims of paramilitary groups and others of the State forces.

CF ROLE The Foundation realized that the pain of the victims could be used to undermine the early peace process, consequently it created opportunities to encourage the victims’ groups to meet together, and also to meet with other communities that had suffered in the conflict. This was a difficult process and often attracted negative political comment. Nevertheless the Foundation took the initiative in organizing a series of conferences and seminars to which all the groups were invited, irrespective of their political viewpoints. The Foundation brought in speakers from South Africa, Central America, Cambodia and Eastern Europe to share their experiences of both victimhood and the difficult issues of dealing with truth and justice issues.

OUTCOME While the work is still ongoing, the government has now set up a mainstream funding program to meet the core costs of victims’ groups. The Foundation still funds networking and project initiatives undertaken by the groups. The Foundation has joined in partnership with a number of other organizations under a Healing Through Remembering consortium to explore ways to address the challenge of truth and justice.



ROLE OF BRIDGE BUILDER

California Community Foundation

FROM RIOTS TO DIALOGUE

Joe Lumarda

CONTEXT In 1992, Los Angeles experienced the worst civil unrest in the 20th century. These events were set off by the not-guilty verdicts of the police officers involved in the taped beatings of the suspect Rodney King. The community of Los Angeles suffered greatly: more than 50 killed, 4,000 injured, 12,000 people arrested and \$1 billion in property damage.

ISSUE How did the community foundation respond to this? The main issues at that time were general mistrust, division between and among the various communities and civic entities, and the violent response. The unrest was sparked by the outcome of the King/LAPD trial, but the fires, looting and violence were a manifestation of the deep institutional and interethnic tensions growing throughout Los Angeles. African Americans, Korean Americans, Latinos and many other groups and neighborhoods both clashed and created fortresses around their communities.

CF ROLE After the riots, the community of Los Angeles was in shambles in terms of its infrastructure, civic confidence and emotional well-being. The California Community Foundation took on the role of healer by creating the Community Bridges Fund. As a conduit for funding from its donors, corporations and local and

national foundations, the Foundation created a grantmaking program that would support the healing process. A \$1 million fund from a wide variety of sources was created in order to support dialogues between and among communities and to develop neighborhood leadership sensitive to the challenges and opportunities of a multicultural community. The grantmaking process included a cross-community advisory committee who struggled through developing a program that was both transparent and efficient. Through this process, the Foundation was recognized as a key philanthropic and civic leader willing to step forward as a community healer.

OUTCOME The California Community Foundation made 50 grants totaling \$1 million, ranging from training youth for dispute resolution to developing a cultural program involving various communities experiencing post-riot tensions. The Community Bridges Fund and the California Community Foundation were recognized with a prestigious award from the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission. Moreover, since that difficult time in Los Angeles' history, the Foundation has stepped forward or been asked to serve as convener around many difficult issues facing the community. We are seen as a trusted partner by many of the communities of Los Angeles.

ROLE OF COMMUNITY CATALYST

Community Foundation for Calderdale SAVE IT CAMPAIGN

Christine Harris

CONTEXT In 2003, the community foundation for Calderdale, U.K., was 11 years old, having raised £2.5 million and distributed over £1 million in grants. Most grants were small and while helpful weren't the kind to really make a difference, and we were conscious that some donors needed to see that we could do more. The Kerbside Project gave us the opportunity to go for a higher profile, flagship project.

ISSUE When a door-to-door waste recycling service, which employed adults with learning disabilities and long-term unemployed people, ran into financial difficulties and folded in August 2003, the Community Foundation for Calderdale recognized this opportunity to bring people together and adopt a role that was wider than simply grantmaking, in a bid to salvage the scheme.

ROLE The Foundation initiated a meeting of community organizations, local public officials, the local Member of Parliament and business people. In November 2003, a steering committee was formed to turn the dream of a kerbside recycling plan to benefit the community both socially and environmentally, back into a reality.

Through the Foundation, funding was secured from the Henry Smith Charity to pay for a Foundation volunteer to become a full-time interim business manager working solely on the Kerbside (Calderdale) Project. A board of directors was formed, which included Foundation assistant director Steve Duncan, as well as a local councillor, local businessman, a voluntary sector leader, and an attorney.

OUTCOME By bringing people together, the Community Foundation for Calderdale has made a real difference for the good of the community with the remarkable resurrection of a multi-beneficial recycling project. The "Save It" campaign began in conjunction with the local press in mid-January in a bid to reestablish a recycling scheme across Calderdale that would benefit the community, the environment, provide work and training opportunities for adults with learning difficulties, and help the local council achieve its recycling targets.

Widespread support for the campaign was demonstrated through generous offers of funding, knowledge and time. When the appeal reached almost £50,000 a service was able to begin sooner than had been expected.

In March 2004, a collection service commenced, initially serving 6,000 homes. Paper, glass, textiles, steel and aluminum are now being collected from specially distributed Eco-Boxes, which householders fill with their recyclable waste and leave outside their homes.

Enough funding is now in place to employ four staff to provide this interim service for two months, after which time it is hoped European funding and lottery funding will be secured.



ROLE OF COMMUNITY CATALYST

Togliatti Community Foundation

INTRODUCING LAWS ON PHILANTHROPY

Svetlana Pouchkareva

CONTEXT The Togliatti Community Foundation was established in 1998. As the first Community Foundation in Russia, it faced a vast number of challenges brought by the post-Soviet era of distress. These included mistrust towards the new notion of institutional “charity,” community spirit replaced by individualism, and absence of adequate laws, operational standards and mores relating to the new philanthropic environment. New traditions of philanthropy had not evolved while old ones were either forgotten or corrupted by the Soviet state support system. Business was concerned with the initial stage of capital accumulation, government was struggling with finding new approaches to public and social program management, and emerging NGOs were characterized by their weak organizational capacity and low level of public interest and participation. The infrastructure for philanthropy was still to emerge.

ISSUE In 1999, a new Law on Philanthropy in Samara region was adopted. If a company gave 7 percent of its profits to charity, the overall tax duty was reduced, thus the company paid 4 percent less taxes on profits than usual. Unfortunately, neither local branches of Federal Tax Inspection, nor the local government

or business nor NGOs had a clear idea of the law’s nuances. Business and NGOs began to use the tax benefit granted by the law in the region. However the Tax Inspection officials were suspicious and perplexed by legitimacy of its use by business, fearing that it was a new scheme of illegal tax evasion. They stated that business had to present them with extra documentation including a report on how the money was used in detail by the NGOs. While, according to the law, all that was required was a proof of money transferred or given to the NGO. This situation, fueled by the lack of knowledge and unfounded over-scrutiny by the tax authority, caused uneasiness and reluctance by businesses to use this tax advantage. As a consequence, it negatively affected the nascent willingness of businesses to become involved in philanthropic endeavors.

ROLE The Togliatti Community Foundation sent enquiries to the Tax Ministry in Samara Region. A clarification on this issue and an official confirmation were received. The Foundation conducted a range of meetings with businesses, then it brought together tax inspectors, representatives of local government, NGOs and business people to the round table discussion where the issue was resolved.

OUTCOME Four more major business in Togliatti (FIA Bank, Stroi Zhakazchick, Automobile Banking Centre, Rinok-Agro) have used the new tax advantage and therefore increased the support to socially important, not-for-profit projects by 49 million roubles. Business also recognized the NGO sector as their partner, capable of taking a stand and advocating for their common goal.



ROLE OF ASSET BUILDER

The Bilgoraj Community Foundation

BUILDING OUR GREATEST FUTURE ASSET: YOUTH

Irena Gadaj

CONTEXT The Bilgoraj Community Foundation (BCF) is a small but growing institution with ambitious goals for the future of its region in Southeastern Poland. With only \$180,000 in endowment and \$40,000 to spend for grants annually, this five year old organization serves a community of 100,000 people. BCF is playing a very important dual role: grantmaking (more than 130 important projects were supported with small grants: \$100–\$2,000, plus more than 400 scholarships) and non-grantmaking community development.

ISSUE Which one role is the most important now in Poland? Both roles are crucial, but the Foundation realizes that there are relatively wealthy people in its community. Additionally, most of the country's wealthy is new, accumulated within the past 15 years (and most wealthy are young, less than 60 years old). Moreover, there is no secular tradition of giving back to the community.

CF ROLE BCF is mostly engaged in its non-grantmaking role: teaching the nuts and bolts of philanthropy, engaging and involving people, and facilitating conversations about the emerging culture and practice of philanthropy and civil society. While working to involve the emerging wealthy class, BCF also identified young people as a key asset of the community foundation's future.

BCF is involving youth in philanthropy to identify current problems in the community and, more importantly, to develop solutions through creativity and partnerships. After 50 years of communism, our youth are hungry to be optimistic about their future and to work in new ways to get there — a key to this is philanthropy through the community foundation.

OUTCOME This focus resulted in various successful programs. Moreover, these programs have highlighted the new ways philanthropy and the community foundation can improve the quality of life in the region.

- * BCF set up a **scholarship** program with the support of local government, business, wealthy individuals and banks. In 2001, BCF had 21 fellows, in 2002 it had 101, the next year, 127, and this year, 157. Though the scholarships are small (\$10 to \$100 per month), they help children to fulfill their dreams.
- * BCF set up a “**Scholarship Fellow Club**,” where our fellows have an opportunity to learn quietly (sometimes they do not have support for such activities at home) with easy access to the Internet. This club allows students in a broad range of activities, from helping their schoolmate do homework to general support in their new work.
- * BCF trained youth in **fundraising** methods so they may establish their own fund. The name of that fund is UFO (**U**czniowski, means “students,” **F**undusz, means “fund” and **O** - **O**swiaty, means education). This works by committee and consensus. This fund allows them to act entrepreneurially in their fundraising efforts and also to ask their parents and relatives for money, explaining to them the applicable tax benefits.
- * BCF started a **special grant program** for groups of youth. They can apply for small grants from \$100–\$1,500 for broad range of projects addressing local community problems.



ROLE OF ASSET BUILDER

California Community Foundation

USING OUR ASSETS TO SERVE OUR MISSION: THE HOUSING LAND TRUST

Joe Lumarda

CONTEXT For more than 20 years, the California Community Foundation has taken on a grantmaking and program related investment (nonprofit loans) in the area of affordable housing. Just in the past ten years, the Foundation has made more than \$8 million in grants and \$3 million in loans from a revolving loan fund used for site acquisition. There are many nonprofit affordable housing developers in Los Angeles County using standard (and rather expensive) models of building and financing projects. Three years ago the Foundation began to explore ways to not only make grants but use its assets to serve its mission.

ISSUE The County of Los Angeles is facing a housing crisis of unprecedented proportions. The problem is straightforward; there are not enough homes being constructed to meet the current demand for housing. This inequality in supply and demand has been the driving force behind the continued escalation in pricing over the past decade. Of the major cities in the United States, only New York ranks lower than Los Angeles in its percentage of homeowners. If current trends continue, these percentages are likely to decrease. In the past twelve months alone, the average price of a single-family dwelling has risen 20% statewide. The median price of a home in Los Angeles today is \$474,000, which only 17% of LA County residents can afford to buy.

CF ROLE The California Community Foundation has created an Affordable Housing Land Trust to acquire and hold parcels of land for the benefit of a community and to provide secure affordable access to land and housing for low-income, working residents. A Land Trust acquires the land and leases it back to the homebuyer on a long-term ground lease. This assists low-income families to qualify for conventional mort-

gages, as they do not have to acquire the land beneath the dwelling. By removing the land from future speculation and ensuring that future sales will be to similar low-income buyers, the Land Trust model helps ensure long-term affordability to future generations. The main objectives of most urban Land Trusts are to:

- * Gain control over local land use and reduce absentee ownership
- * Provide affordable housing for lower-income residents of the community
- * Promote resident ownership and control of housing stock
- * Keep housing affordable for future residents
- * Maintain strong stewardship in the community

OUTCOMES The process has been long in refinement, but outcomes worth noting are:

- * The Foundation has committed a special affordable housing field of interest fund as seed capital to the Trust.
- * The Ford Foundation, Fannie Mae Foundation and other national foundations have expressed high interest in the model.
- * There are six projects totaling 340 houses currently being developed.
- * Two cities have donated the trust parcels of land and other government agencies are interested in doing the same, thus adding to the assets of the foundation.
- * With this program, the Foundation is positioning itself as an innovator and builder of community assets.

ROLE OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR

Gütersloh Community Foundation

YOUTH FORUM: ORGANIZING VOICES OF THE FUTURE

Nina Spallek

CONTEXT The Stadt Stiftung Gütersloh was founded in 1996 with an endowment of one million euro. It was the first community foundation in Germany, though the concept was virtually unknown in the country and in Gütersloh especially. But the foundation's board was a diverse, highly motivated and connected group of people. Because of board reputation on the one hand and the foundation's non-partiality on the other, it became possible to talk with young people about contents without getting into party politic issues. When the preparation for the forum started, the Foundation was only three months old and had no grant funds.

ISSUE Two years before the Foundation was established, local politicians discussed the matter of establishing a youth parliament. The whole issue became a controversial issue within party discussions and was soon abandoned. The Foundation saw the need of giving young people a chance to stand up and speak for themselves.

CF ROLE In order to identify future fields of focus, as one of its first activities the Stadt Stiftung organized a Youth Forum. More than 1,000 adolescents assembled to discuss their specific problems and to develop initiatives to improve their situation. The proposals and suggestions resulting from the Youth Forum held in 1997 and again in 1998 substantially helped to shape the Foundation's program activities.

The Foundation utilized the whole board in the first activity. Board members recruited adolescents for the first meetings, convened different workshops and asked for small donations, etc. The young people identified several topics: no recreation venues/opportunities, driving while intoxicated, integration of ethnic groups, career planning, generation conflicts and political involvement.

A core group of more than 45 young people have been involved in the planning process. They have built working groups, invited experts, shaped the agenda and led the public relations for the forum. Together with these young people, the Foundation was able to mobilize more than 1,000 of young people to visit the Youth Forum and join the discussion. At the forum, they came together to meet with professionals, politicians, manager, employees and social workers.

OUTCOME From the first forum, the idea of continuously getting young people actively involved in the community was born. One result of the efforts is that a youth parliament has been established, which is now an official panel of the local government. The Stadt Stiftung was involved in and credited for its founding. The youth parliament has 32 members, ages 12–18, who are elected for two years. They represent nine different schools and are elected by their schoolmates. More than 10,000 pupils have a right to vote. They learn in their early years about the system of voting, about democracy and about responsibility for the community and themselves.



ROLE OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR

The Vancouver Foundation

FOUR PILLARS FOR RECOVERY

Richard Mulcaster

CONTEXT Vancouver Foundation has been funding community organizations in the Downtown Eastside for many years and has developed a trusting relationship with the community leadership on the street as well as with the police and local government officials and politicians. Trust is not a value that exists in a community wracked by addiction, but is necessary to create in order for the community to begin to work together to reduce the level of harm suffered by its addicted citizens. The Downtown Eastside is an important part of our community and the Board of Vancouver Foundation agreed that the foundations should utilize its reputation capital to help create support for a solution that had a high degree of risk.

ISSUE Over the past ten years, the City of Vancouver was experiencing an open drug market at Main and Hastings streets in Vancouver's Downtown East Side. This manifested itself in a rising level of property crime and an emerging high-profile public health crisis.

CF ROLE In response to this emerging urgent situation, the City of Vancouver developed a plan: "A Framework for Action: a Four Pillar Approach to Drug Problems in Vancouver." The Four Pillars approach includes prevention, treatment, enforcement and harm reduction. The approach represents a comprehensive, evidence-based strategy to prevent and reduce the harm associated with problematic drug use. The Vancouver Foundation established the Four Pillars Fund with seed capital of \$250,000 and invited the Government of Canada, the City of Vancouver and the VanCity Credit Union to join the Foundation as funding partners.

As this initiative went forward, it became clear that innovative ways of addressing this problem would need to be explored. And while the entire community wanted to see

an improvement to the conditions in the area, the Federal and Provincial Governments, the police and many citizens were initially very unsure about the new methodologies introduced in the harm reduction aspect of the plan. Harm reduction includes providing injection drug users with clean needles and operating safe injection sites. It is a pragmatic approach that meets substance users where they are. It reduces the spread of deadly communicable diseases, helps prevent drug overdose deaths, while increasing users' contact with healthcare services and drug treatment programs. There was no legally sanctioned facility of this type in North America and the United States Government communicated its strong disapproval of Canada changing its drug laws to accommodate the operation of safe injection sites in Vancouver.

The president of the Vancouver Foundation had the opportunity to witness the effectiveness of drug abuse intervention safe injection sites in Frankfurt, Germany. The president spoke to the Board of the Vancouver Foundation, other nonprofit leaders and government officials about the effectiveness of this approach to drug abuse in Germany.

OUTCOME Vancouver Foundation was able to leverage its reputational capital to enable the community to come together and make progress by using an intervention method that was politically controversial. People were prepared to trust the Foundation's judgment on the Four Pillars issue and to encourage the different levels of government to change the law and financially support the operation of the safe injection sites in Vancouver. The Canadian government has undertaken a comprehensive evaluation of this component, and while it is still early to draw any full conclusions, it is clear that a number of lives have been saved from overdosing and many addicts are now in treatment.

ROLE OF EXPERT ON COMMUNITY

The Dade Community Foundation

THE VITAL ECONOMIC ENGINE OF THE NONPROFIT SECTOR

Ruth Shack

CONTEXT Established in 1967, Dade Community Foundation has a mission to encourage philanthropy and develop a permanent endowment to meet Greater Miami's emerging charitable needs. Over time the Foundation has added to its responsibilities that of bringing together diverse groups in Miami-Dade County across arbitrary boundaries of race, ethnicity, class, jurisdiction, gender and language to improve the quality of life and build a more cohesive community by supporting local nonprofit organizations with grants and technical assistance.

ISSUE When analysts put together economic impact studies surveying the economy of the region, rarely is the nonprofit sector included or even mentioned. Often, the nonprofit sector is seen as a passive provider of rudimentary services as opposed to a respected participant and partner in the local economy. This is subtle distinction, yet its negative implications are far-reaching in terms of perceived value and real influence in Dade County.

CF ROLE In an effort to dignify the sector's contribution to the economy on beyond its provision of services the Foundation produced the Sector of Impact Report — Economic Impact of Nonprofits in Miami-Dade County.

The genesis for the Sector of Impact report occurred during the Mayor's Economic Summit in January 2002, and its nonprofit workshop. A recommendation calling for the completion of an economic impact study of the nonprofit sector similar in scope to the reports compiled for other industries was a priority identified by the participants. As a result, Dade Community Foundation took the lead, partnering with the Beacon Council, Miami-Dade's official economic development organization, in order to gather the necessary data.

OUTCOME The Economic Impact of Nonprofits study concludes that Miami-Dade's nonprofit sector directly impacts the local economy in a number of positive ways. By comparing the nonprofit sector with other traditional areas of commerce and industry we demonstrate this sector's influence beyond its traditional role as provider of needed services. Contributing to the overall health of our economy, nonprofits serve as consumers of product, employers and vendors, a vibrant taxpaying workforce, a network of community leaders, policy makers and businesses. Along the way, this study focuses in a different direction and, as a result, tells a compelling story on one of our community's most often overlooked economic engines.

In an addendum report, the Foundation provided a snapshot of the sector's influence from an employment perspective. The report demonstrates the varied professions and wide-ranging talent employed by the nonprofit sector. Additionally, by providing a sample list of the professions and trades involved in the nonprofit sector, this report shows that a person trained in any field can find employment and career fulfillment in the nonprofit sector.

During this process, the Dade Community Foundation further enhanced its role as advocate for and strengthener of the nonprofit sector. The report led the community to recognize the unique position the Foundation holds.

Sector of Impact

Economic Impact of Nonprofits in Miami-Dade County



When analysts put together economic impact studies surveying our local economy and industry sectors rarely is the nonprofit sector included or even mentioned. Yet, as our recently completed Sector of Impact study concludes, Miami Dade's nonprofit sector directly impacts the local economy in a number of positive ways. By comparing the nonprofit sector with other traditional areas of commerce and industry we demonstrate this sector's influence way beyond its traditional role as provider of needed services. Contributing to the overall health of our economy, nonprofits serve as consumers of product, employers and vendors, a vibrant taxpaying workforce, a network of community leaders, policy makers and businesses. Along the way this study focuses in a different direction and, as a result, tells a compelling story on one of our community's most often overlooked "economic engines." We share this information to demonstrate how our non profit sector is indeed serving as a sector of impact.

Ruth Shack, President, Dade Community Foundation

 **DADE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION**

ROLE OF EXPERT ON COMMUNITY

Togliatti Community Foundation

BUILDING A CIVIL SOCIETY INFRASTRUCTURE

Svetlana Pouchkareva

CONTEXT The Togliatti Community Foundation was established in 1998. As the first Community Foundation in Russia, it faced a vast number of challenges brought by the post-Soviet era of distress. These included mistrust towards the new notion of institutional “charity,” community spirit replaced by individualism, and absence of adequate laws, operational standards and mores relating to the new philanthropic environment. New traditions of philanthropy had not evolved while old ones were either forgotten or corrupted by the Soviet state support system. Business was concerned with the initial stage of capital accumulation, government was struggling with finding new approaches to public and social program management, and emerging NGOs were characterized by their weak organizational capacity and low level of public interest and participation. The infrastructure for philanthropy was still to emerge.

ISSUE When the Foundation was created there was no tradition of secular organized philanthropy or operational infrastructure to support its initial development. The Foundation had a nominal Board that was not aware of its true capacity and role. Business did not see a reason to use professional “agents” — institutions like community foundations — in assisting them in their charitable aspiration or community involvements. There were a small number of NGOs, mostly inexperienced in project management and organizational development. Even if the Foundation had ample resources to grant to NGOs at the time, there was no organization that could properly manage such gifts. Government and legislative bodies were learning the benefits of organized philanthropy. The tax system had yet to develop laws to give tax benefits to donors.

CF ROLE The Foundation organized its educational work on five levels: business, government, NGOs, community leaders of other regions in Russia and former Soviet states, and local mass media. The methods used by the Foundation varied. For example:

- * For NGOs, a training center was developed to provide education regarding board development, project management, etc.
- * The CEO of the Foundation became a member of the Governor’s Council on Philanthropy to advise on related issues. A deputy of the city Parliament became a board member of the Foundation.
- * To generate interest of mass media towards NGOs and philanthropy, the Foundation organized a grants competition among local media. The media were competing for a grant to fund coverage of less lucrative topics like civil society, philanthropy, etc.
- * The Foundation conducted an annual ceremony featuring a “Philanthropist of the Year Award” in order to help to promote the prestige of supporting community initiatives by business. Business leaders took trips abroad and meetings with foreign colleagues to help the corporate community to better understand the value of social corporate responsibility.
- * The Foundation taught initiative groups from all over Russia at trainings and seminars, either as speakers or by bringing them to Togliatti. First-hand experience was most helpful, including site visits either to or from regions of initiative groups. As we say in Russia “It’s better to see once than hear 100 times.”

OUTCOME The outcomes have been far reaching:

* Charitable giving in the community has grown. In 2001, donors gifted 1,381,000 rubles to be distributed at the grant competition; in 2003, the amount was 3,062,000 rubles. Donors entrusted 240,000 to be endowed at the Foundation in 2001; in 2003, they provided 18,179,000 rubles.

* The board has become active in its work as a whole and in the development of hard-working committees. Board members now advocate for, care about and contribute (both financially and intellectually) to the Foundation.

* Twelve community foundations emerged throughout Russia and formed a nationwide partnership, increasing visibility of the community foundations individually and as a whole, and helped to disseminate best practices. A



ROLE OF PHILANTHROPIC EDUCATOR

Togliatti Community Foundation

TEACHING CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Svetlana Pouchkareva

CONTEXT The Togliatti Community Foundation was established in 1998. As the first Community Foundation in Russia, it faced a vast number of challenges brought by the post-Soviet era of distress. These included mistrust towards the new notion of institutional “charity,” community spirit replaced by individualism, and absence of adequate laws, operational standards and mores relating to the new philanthropic environment. New traditions of philanthropy had not evolved while old ones were either forgotten or corrupted by the Soviet state support system. Business was concerned with the initial stage of capital accumulation, government was struggling with finding new approaches to public and social program management, and emerging NGOs were characterized by their weak organizational capacity and low level of public interest and participation. The infrastructure for philanthropy was still to emerge.

ISSUE There is a vacuum of information and approaches to community development in modern Russia. A few leaders are knowledgeable about corporate social responsibility or three sector partnership (government/business/civil society), and there is general desire by the corporate sector to improve communities but seldom a clear idea or the experience to do it.

CF ROLE The Togliatti Community Foundation identified the need for guidance, exposure and education on the emerging issue of corporate social responsibility. Therefore, specialists from the Foundation (including, the CEO, senior staff and board members) on numerous occasions were presenters at conferences, trainings and other such events across Russia and neighboring states. For example:

- * During the first NGO Forum called for by the president of Russia, Vladimir Putin, CEO of the Foundation, Boris Teyrulnikov, led a discussion on new methods of territory development regarding overall economic and social development.
- * Convened meetings with major businesses of different regions like Siberian Ural Aluminum Holding or SUAL Holdings and mayors of cities to assist initiative groups in those regions to bring progressive ideas of community development to key players in the community.
- * Responded to an invitation by local government to conduct a grants competition, which believed the Foundation was the most experienced institution to do so, and teach about this method, unusual for the government.
- * Conducted workshops for NGOs on various issues such as board development and led seminars with businesses on corporate social responsibility and volunteerism.

OUTCOME Several outcomes from this activity include:

- * The local government has adopted a range of philanthropy-friendly measures and laws. The Mayor of Togliatti chairs the board, which encouraged more business to join the Foundation’s philanthropic efforts.
- * NGOs strengthened their capacity. There are now reliable grantees. In 2003, 25 projects of these organizations were given organizational development grants.
- * Donor base increase from 20 supporters in 1999 to 120 in 2003.



ROLE OF PHILANTHROPIC EDUCATOR

BürgerStiftung Hamburg

SPEECHES, SEMINARS AND MORE

Dr. Klaus Rollin

CONTEXT The Community Foundation of Hamburg (BürgerStiftung Hamburg) started as one of the very first in Germany in March 1999. Its beginning seed capital was 50.000 €. At the time, the Foundation was unknown and without funds. In order to support the Foundation's initial operations, a member of the board gave a loan without interest. If we would not be able to pay it back within 6 months, it would be converted into a gift. This personal challenge provided the spark for the Foundation to increase its profile (and hopefully, its assets).

ISSUE Beyond the need for operational and endowment funds, the foundation noted the need to build a culture of public giving in the greater Hamburg area. Funds would not come to the Foundation unless there was a general increased knowledge, appreciation and awareness of the Foundation's role in private giving for the public good. Through publications about our good work in different forms of media, (newspapers, TV, radio, etc.), the Foundation became known and received more gifts — however, not enough. A more personal strategy was needed.



ROLE The Foundation began a personal education campaign to come into direct contact with people — talk to them, convince them, enlighten them. Along with the one-to-one contact, the Foundation also began to proactively pursue public presentation opportunities, such as speeches and lectures. Mainly, the chair of the board made himself available for these presentations, and did so on dozens of occasions. The main themes of these presentations were, “The Special Role of Foundations (With Special Consideration of CFs),” and, “Inheritance, Last Will and the Common Good.” The best audiences are tax consultants, advocates or public chartered accountants and banks. Additionally, the Foundation targeted service clubs such as Rotary and Lions or elderly people in hostels and institutions. Normally, these events include discussions and are interesting and animated. Beyond the obvious asset development and fundraising opportunity, the foundation began a long overdue education campaign and community conversation regarding the role of philanthropy in building community and creating a culture of giving.

OUTCOME Though we cannot easily and scientifically measure how the culture of philanthropy has grown in the Hamburg region, we can see that our capital rose from 50.000 € to 2.800.000 € within six years and that pass-through contributions amounted to 600.000 € within the same time. Also, we already know of 16 last wills where the Foundation may become heir or receive a bequest. Moreover, the Hamburg Community Foundation is becoming known as the champion and resource for the development of community philanthropy.

ROLE OF RESPONDER

Community Foundation of Northern Ireland

COMMUNITY ACTION: WHAT STARTED WITH A SURVEY...

Avila Kilmurray

CONTEXT In the autumn of 1994, both the IRA (Irish Republican Army) and Loyalist paramilitary groups called ceasefires. The community foundation saw this as an opportunity to work to address issues of peacebuilding and social change. The community foundation drew on the credibility that it had built up as a funder of community action across the most disadvantaged communities of Northern Ireland since 1979.

ISSUE The question was how local community and social action groups might be encouraged to express their hopes, fears and aspirations about the future. It was also important that these views would be presented in such a form that they could influence both policy making and political considerations.

CF ROLE The Community Foundation for Northern Ireland took the initiative in contacting two local NGOs: The Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action and the Rural Community Network. A survey and related series of meetings were carried out with community and voluntary groups throughout Northern Ireland under the name of the three organizations. The range of issues identified from the responses included building a socially and economically inclusive society; prioritizing policies that would promote equality and would protect human rights; addressing the legacy of the violence by working with victims of violence and ex-prisoners; and developing community-based initiatives that would facilitate inter-community understanding and reconciliation.

OUTCOME The survey findings were compiled and circulated in a publication. Meetings were held with representatives of the European Union, and with political parties within Northern Ireland, Britain and the Republic of Ireland. The EU Special Support Program for Peace and Reconciliation (1995–1999) took a number of issues prioritized by the survey and designed funding Measures around them. The point was made that while the peace negotiations that were being carried out by elected politicians were crucial, there was also an important role for community-based and NGO organizations in the peacebuilding process. This role continues.



ROLE OF RESPONDER

Greater Milwaukee Foundation

A TAX BREAK FOR THE WORKING POOR — AND MORE...

Doug Jansson

CONTEXT The Greater Milwaukee Foundation was founded in 1915 and at the end of 2004 had assets of roughly \$400 million. The Foundation in Florida serves a population of 1.4 million. In the last 10 years the Foundation has more than quadrupled in size and its grantmaking has increased in step. It today ranks among the top 25 community foundations in the nation in terms of total assets. In 2004, the Foundation made more than 3,000 grants totaling \$26.5 million to organizations in Milwaukee, Waukesha, Washington, Ozaukee counties and beyond — all in accordance with the directions given by the donors who have established funds within it.

ISSUE Over one-fifth of the City of Milwaukee residents and nearly a third of the City's children lived in poverty, according to 1999 figures. To better understand the plight of low-income families the Foundation commissioned several studies to better understand local trends and the effectiveness of local programs designed to alleviate poverty. The studies indicate that:

- * Poverty in Milwaukee persists despite the availability of strong programs that provide various kinds of assistance and regardless of improvements to the area's overall economy.
- * The most effective way to move poor people out of poverty is to help the working poor.

The studies also examined the utilization rates for a variety of governmental programs that are designed to help the working poor, particularly the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC provides tax relief for low-income families. The EITC is targeted to working people with annual incomes below \$31,152 who meet other qualifications. The Foundation's research showed that 10.7% of the general Milwaukee population qualifies but does not apply for the EITC.

CF ROLE To help tackle the persistent poverty, the Foundation brought together a coalition of nonprofit and governmental agencies to determine how to increase utilization of the EITC. Subsequently, the Foundation provided \$175,000 over two years to create three Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) Super Sites. In "one stop" people are now able to file their taxes at no cost, apply for the EITC and connect to available but currently underutilized health and social service programs. An additional \$25,000 was used for a study to evaluate the program's impact and success. Finally, the Foundation helped secure an additional \$200,000 in grants from other funders to help support the VITA Super Sites.

OUTCOME In the past year, the three VITA sites supported by the Foundation secured \$2.8 million in tax credits for low-income working families. Together the three sites generated 44% of the tax credits secured by all 20 of the VITA sites in the City. For many families the tax credits made a significant difference as in the case of Nilsabel Rivera shown in the picture below.



ROLE OF STEWARD

Dade Community Foundation

PROTECTING, PRESERVING AND PROMOTING COMMUNITY ASSETS

Ruth Shack

CONTEXT Established in 1967, Dade Community Foundation in Florida has a mission to encourage philanthropy and develop a permanent endowment to meet Greater Miami's emerging charitable needs. Over time the Foundation has added to its responsibilities that of bringing together diverse groups in Miami-Dade County across arbitrary boundaries of race, ethnicity, class, jurisdiction, gender and language to improve the quality of life and build a more cohesive community by supporting local nonprofit organizations with grants and technical assistance.

ISSUE Bob Graham is a former governor of Florida who represented the state in Washington, D.C. He was born in Florida and is a Harvard Law School graduate who never lost a campaign. He started as a Florida State Representative first elected in 1966, reelected in 1968, was elected a Florida State Senator in 1970, and was reelected in 1974. In 1978, he became the 38th Governor of Florida and was reelected in 1982. He then went on to represent Florida as a United States Senator, elected in 1986, reelected in 1992 and then again in 1998.

He brought to all his public service a passionate sense of ethical behavior and knew the boundaries of special interests. As an elected office holder, he knew he was constrained from accepting a gift from a constituent.

CF ROLE Dade Community Foundation has taken seriously its role as steward of community assets. And when, more than a dozen years ago, the then-United States Senator Bob Graham was offered a gift of a large acrylic painting of the Florida Everglades to be

hung in his Washington, D.C. office, it was to the community foundation that he turned. Dade Community Foundation accepted the painting with a pledge to exhibit in Senator Graham's office as long as he was an elected official. The painting was featured prominently in his office and elicited this response:

"This amazing painting by Henry Parker depicts the beauty of Florida," said Senator Graham. "It is wonderful to look up from my desk and see the tranquility of the Keys before me. It makes me feel as though I am back in Florida. Dade Community Foundation was very generous in loaning it to us and we will treasure it with Floridians who come to visit us in Washington."

OUTCOME The Senator has retired to private life. The painting by Florida artist Henry Parker, which was given to the Foundation by Miamian Susan DuPuis and who wished to have it displayed where many people would see it, has been returned to the Dade Community Foundation offices where it is now hung in their conference room.

This example is one which demonstrates the Foundation's ability to be in strategic positions with members of the public sector. The Foundation prides itself on working with all levels of government by conducting studies, serving on committees and advisory boards and working at the highest levels to effect public policy.

Dade Community Foundation is nimble and flexible so as to meet all sorts of emerging opportunities to be of assistance in the community. It was an honor to work closely with a United States Senator and to be considered a resource to him.



ROLE OF CONVENER

The Brescia Community Foundation

BRINGING FOUNDATIONS TOGETHER TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF ABUSED CHILDREN

Orietta Filippini

CONTEXT The Brescia Community Foundation (BCF) was officially born in December 2001, one of the many community foundations in Italy created by the Cariplo Foundation. The Cariplo Foundation has developed several community foundations in the Lombardy Region. In 2004, there were 12 funds in the BCF totalling about 2.5000.000,00. In the Brescia Province there are more than 2,000 nonprofit organizations; 90 of them are operating foundations and 10 of them grantmaking foundations. The BCF has worked in partnership with the foundations in the region. Two grantmaking foundations and two operating foundations have created funds at the BCF.

ISSUE In its first three years, BCF received more than 1,000 proposals for grants, many of them focused on the needs of teens and abused children. Considering this trend, BCF reviewed the needs of children in the region and found a set of interconnected details describing a weakness in the local system serving children.

- * There are many organizations serving the psychological needs of children in the plain regions of Brescia Province, and there are fewer such organizations in the mountainous region.
- * There are two basic types of these child psychological treatment organizations, residential (live-in) and outpatient (by appointment).
- * Some of these organizations have vacancies and others have a long waiting list.
- * When child welfare institutions (such as juvenile court, welfare workers, etc.) face an emergency situation regarding abuse, they seem to always call the same organizations because of familiarity and/or perceived quality of service.

ROLE The community foundation shared its findings with other grantmaking institutions in the region in order to discuss ways to change this system, which underutilized precious resources serving children. It was clear that the BCF did not have the funds to independently support a program that could change the system. The BCF explained to the local foundation community the need and the potential solution, a program coordinating these services regionally. After long and difficult discussions and negotiations, four grantmaking organizations decided to finance the newly developed INT.ESSERE plan for two years totalling 100,000 (Total sum 200,000 with BCF disbursement).

OUTCOME A network of children-psychological service organizations was born. It was created by the BCF after a careful review of the proposals received, the needs of the region, the interests of the local foundation community and the potential of a system-wide network recognized and utilized by all child welfare institutions. INT.ESSERE now provides balanced, holistic services to the whole region. The results have proven significant:

- * An excellent distribution of the organizations throughout the full territory of Brescia.
- * Guaranteed quality psychological treatment for children in all organizations.
- * The child welfare institutions have knowledge of both the organizations and the quality of the treatment.
- * More children leave treatment and return to their families.
- * Children and their families are receiving more treatment.
- * The Network is growing and developing.

ROLE OF CONVENER

The Community Foundation of the Euroregion Labe

COMMUNITY CARE ON THE ROAD: THE WANDERING BUS OF DIALOGUE

Tomás Krejci

CONTEXT Community Foundation of the Euroregion Labe, Czech Republic, was established in 1993 by a group of people who previously worked for different NGOs in the social sector. The primary reason the Foundation was established was to support community care for the mentally ill, drug addicted and mentally disabled people in the region of northwest Bohemia. With local leaders seated on the advisory boards and in close cooperation with the city council and the labor office, the foundation gradually has been recognized as an important intermediary in the process of transforming social and health services in the region.

ISSUE The institutional and cultural infrastructure to provide community-based mental health service after the fall of communist regime in Central and Eastern Europe (early 1990s) was not working. The state institutions, which should have been fully occupied by patients, were not effective at best, and dysfunctional at worst. The dominant public opinion was that mentally ill or drug addicted people should be kept out of sight. Though this was happening in the state environment, enlightened NGOs struggled to provide these services in new and innovative ways (especially in areas of drug addiction and mental illness). These NGOs were usually met with distrust and skepticism by the status quo.

CF ROLE In 1995, the Foundation met some experts in community care services from Great Britain and Holland. The foundation translated some books about community care and disseminated them to the Local Authorities. Skeptical state representatives and politicians said, "That's theory and totally different conditions. Our NGO sector is weak and inexperienced." Since these politicians and state workers could not be convinced by research, we decided to bring them to the models with a new "Wandering Bus" program.

Thirty representatives of hospital treatment facilities, city council and directors of new community care NGOs were put on a bus. In the U.K., they spent one week experiencing site visits and taking part in discussions with providers of social services, local politicians and officials and end-users of services. Participants could see that building a strong social/health system could be important part of community building. This dynamic process of planning community care should involve all target groups — users of services, service providers (both state agency or NGO), representatives of local institutions and politicians.

OUTCOME Our "Wandering Bus" tour resulted in several key community actions.

- * The city council started a multidimensional, inclusive process of community care planning.
- * This process created a network of 70 representatives of NGOs, local institutions, state providers of social/health services and also users of services.
- * After two years of common work, the first regional community care plan was established in the Czech Republic. In this plan, NGO providers of social services are accepted as the equal partner to state providers with almost the same opportunities for funding of their activities in social/health field from the local authorities.
- * Two hospital treatment facilities (state institutions) started community care services inspired by the U.K. model (sheltered living houses for the mentally handicapped).
- * The most important result of the journey was the building of trust and personal relations between and among representatives of institutions and NGOs.



CLOSING REMARKS

Doug Jansson, Working Group Coordinator

In Closing...

Our Working Group was charged with identifying the non-grantmaking roles performed by community foundations on both sides of the Atlantic. Apart from giving money to worthy causes in our respective communities, are there other common ways in which our community foundations seek to improve our communities?

This deceptively simple question was not easily answered. The Working Group participants represent incredibly diverse communities, ten different countries and community foundations that ranged in age from 90 years old to less than five years old. Nor did we share a common vocabulary. The word, “leadership,” for example, had very different meanings in Germany and the Czech Republic than in the United States, the United Kingdom or in Canada.

Yet as we compared our knowledge and experience and our observations from the meetings we held in Gütersloh, Belfast and in Los Angeles, we began to better understand what we hold in common. Each of us, we discovered, does more than make grants. We choose, in a wide variety of ways, to address pressing needs in our respective communities. Common strategies include bringing people together, commissioning research, influencing policy makers, bringing in experts to consult on community projects and leveraging support from other donors and so forth.

In many cases, we found that our non-grantmaking roles were easily as important as the money we give to local projects and that the size of a community foundation’s assets or annual grants is not a meaningful measure of the foundation’s community impact. It is often the non-grantmaking roles that produce the greatest impact, as demonstrated in many of the case studies included in this report. We know that this report only begins to describe and catalogue the many non-grantmaking roles assumed by community foundations and it is our hope that it will help stimulate a continuing examination of this important subject.

This report could not have been produced without the patience and perseverance of the members of this Working Group who, in spite of enormous variations in experience, language and culture, saw beyond their differences to what we share in common and what we can learn from each other.

Special thanks are due as well to Nina Spallek, Avila Kilmurray and Joe Lumarda for hosting meetings of the Working Group in their respective communities, to both Colleen Fitzgerald and Joe Lumarda for facilitating meetings of the Working Group, and to Andrew Morikawa for capturing some of the richer discussions on videotape.

APPENDIX A

The Case for Community Foundations as Bridge Builders And Lessons and Examples on How to Do This Critical Work

Lewis Feldstein

At the core of the work of each community foundation is our own community. Our foundation may work in housing or education, arts or environment, job training or business development. Our focus may be on donors or on grantees. We may be novices with pennies to our name, or heavies with big bank accounts and asset bases. Our communities may be major world capitals or quiet rural villages. What we have in common is our focus on our community. The entire community. All the work that we do ties back to our mission, to our capacity to build our home communities.

Community foundations are distinguished by a mission to serve an entire geographical community. Community foundations work with and through all three sectors of society: business, non-governmental and public. To not be limited to any single field (e.g. education or arts or health...) but to respond to all of the needs in our community. To be inclusive vertically and horizontally, serving the wealthiest and the poorest among us, and to reach across every group and interest, every faith and belief; to work with major interests and tiny, ignored minorities.

There are times where the most useful role that community foundations can play is to bring together different groups. It is easiest, of course, when these groups share common roots, values, ideas and get along with one another. The connections among people who are most like one another are called “Bonding” Social Capital (SC) The great majority of our connections, in our personal lives and in our work lives, are with people like ourselves, where we enjoy the benefits of this bonding SC.

Far, far tougher is the work of bringing together groups that are unlike one another, different by reason of religion, race, class, ethnicity, beliefs, etc. Connections among people who are unlike one another is called “bridging” SC.

We believe that the need to build bridging SC is among the most critical challenges facing our communities. There is hardly a nation among those in Transatlantic Community Foundation Network that does not face violent rifts arising from differences among isolated, angry, fearful or suspicious groups in our communities. The work of our institutions to build our communities can be rendered marginal or irrelevant by the violence and hostility arising from these differences. The greater the animosity, the more deeply rooted the differences, the more difficult the task of building a working relationship. Building bridging SC is far more difficult, far rarer and far riskier than building Bonding SC. But the potential benefit to the community in building this bridging SC can be huge.

We believe that all of us can, and should, do more of this difficult work of building bridging SC, we believe that one can learn how to do this work better and more skillfully. There are lessons that transcend borders and languages in how one builds trust and working relationship

among hostile groups. We have tried to extract and iterate these lessons. We have been very pleased to uncover a number of cases on both sides of the Atlantic where bridging SC has been built by community foundations.

The piece that follows sets out what we have learned about how to build bridging SC. We give special acknowledgement to two sources.

- a) The basic organizing spine and principles are taken from “the CONCORD Handbook,” published 2003, authored by Barbara Nelson, Dean of the UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research, health and human rights attorney Katheryn Corver, and Linda Kaboolian, faculty member at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University (<http://concordsprr.ucla.edu>). The handbook, published in 2003, is a part of the Concord Project, “an international research and action program whose mission is to strengthen ‘concord organizations’ which brings together people with fundamentally opposing views or identities for the purpose of promoting civil society while recognizing group differences.”

The Handbook is based on the work of more than 100 such Concord organizations in the U.S., Northern Ireland, South Africa, Israel and Palestine. We have adapted these principles to our experience as community foundations, and have illustrated them with examples drawn from community foundations.

This is our adaptation of this work. The authors created the basic principles. The adaptation to the work of community foundations is our own, and does not reflect approval or review by the authors.

- b) We give special credit to the work of our colleagues at the Community Foundation of Northern Ireland (CFNI), whose 30 years of work includes some of the most powerful and inspired examples of building bridging SC. For most of us, the chance to see first-hand the streets and neighborhoods of Belfast, and to hear directly from those involved on all sides, went beyond a learning experience and challenged us on how far we had reached to bridge communities of conflict in the work of our own Community Foundations. We “field tested” the Concord principles against the work and experience of CFNI.

LESSONS ON HOW TO BUILD BRIDGING SOCIAL CAPITAL,

adapted from the work of the Concord Project
(<http://concordsppr.ucla.edu>); illustrated by examples
drawn from the work of community foundations

1. Design Principle: Find Common Ground and Shared Values.

“Successful Concord organizations find and continually enhance overarching shared values.” Often founders of such organizations stumble on these shared values by getting to know individuals from other communities. The shared values are reigning beliefs, such as the belief that all people are children of God, or disgust for violence. These can lead to very concrete objectives, such as a shared desire for children to be able to walk to school safely.

EXAMPLES:

- * Community Foundation of Northern Ireland (CFNI).
In Belfast, we walked streets where these values were tested, saw where children and their parents had to move through neighborhoods where 30 foot high “peace walls” (sic) were erected, where guard towers with machine guns and constant surveillance were required, where huge metal gates swung to and fro opening and closing streets, and where neighbors had to establish the chance to walk to school unhindered despite high inflamed feelings of neighbors and others by whom the children had to pass.
- * The CFNI actively recruited its staff from all sectors, and stringently interviewed all staff about their views and their willingness to work in all areas.
- * After initially choosing not to work with the political prisoners because they appeared to be the most radical and intransigent, CFNI chose to work with political prisoners from both sides. We did so because CFNI realized that the prisoners were the real leaders, that there was no chance of real progress if we did not involve them; and that both loyalist and nationalist prisoners felt they were maltreated by their British jailers.
- * Gütersloh
There was strong interest that came from both hospital administrators and patient self-help groups in creating a “Patient Learning Center.” However, neither group had reached out to the other in shaping their proposal. This created the possibility that if the Foundation supported either one of the groups it risked creating a program that lacked either participation from stakeholders or full support from the hospital administration. Through a process in which the Foundation brought the two different interests together, a single Patient Learning Center was established, with the Foundation playing a critical role in not only convening the two different interests, but also contributing key funding to launch the program.

2. Design Principle: Balance Bridging and Bonding Values.

Bonding SC connects people of similar identities and values (similar race, ethnicity, income, religion). Bonding SC is far more common than bridging SC, which connects people who are different than one another on important dimensions. The far greater ease of creating this

bonding SC in divided societies creates a dilemma for democracies. On the one hand, the bonding ties create or reinforce mutual obligations and ties and rights among members of a group, but it also can create a strong sense of differentness from “others” — those who are unlike the group in important ways. Where these differences are reinforced by political, economic tensions and issues of access to jobs, services and the ways that government and business treat people, it can lead to recurring cycles of competition and antagonism, which further divides people.

The solution is to balance the bonding and the bridging, by intentionally working to link people outside their natural networks and connections. To bridge away from homogenous groups to heterogeneous groupings. To make this happen requires taking the time to learn about different groups, to negotiate norms on how to work with these differences and to build understanding of the values of the other groups that are different than your own.

For all this to happen, people have to first discover that they have common interests with people from groups that are different. Then they need to take the personal risks that those who cross these lines face. It is easy and tempting to be a “free rider,” to sit back and let others take the risks of crossing the lines.

Concord organizations always deal with issues that divide their members as well as issues that bring them together. They do not avoid conflicts, they contextualize them. They help people to hold several competing views of the same problem simultaneously, and to keep the shared view uppermost in their work.

EXAMPLES:

- * Gütersloh faces the problem of how to get elderly Turkish women to participate in local services, which requires these women to bridge to a service system that is foreign to them. One possible way to do this would be by beginning with those Turkish women who were already in group home care settings, getting them to bond with other Turkish women who might be eligible for services and help these women then bridge to the German service system.
- * CFNI talked about their experience not just to accept grant applications based on which were the best written, but to go past that to assure that they were getting grant applications from all sides, even if some were not as well written. In effect, the CFNI had to learn to keep an informal “score” to be sure that their work and their staff and their resources were balanced and distributed to both sides in some roughly fair measure and not to expect that everyone would be happy or “Love one another.”
- * A different form of this need to move to bridging as well as bonding was the recognition voiced by CFNI of needing to start to think about how to handle problems of immigration, before they become too big, and to learn from others who have lived with far more immigration. This challenges CFNI members to go beyond their bonding ties with one another, and to enter into a whole new set of bridging relationships with new immigrants
- * Hamburg, as one of the larger communities in Germany and Western Europe, has a parallel set of challenges in building bridging ties to new minorities — Turks, Arabs, Africans and refugees from former Yugoslavia among many others.

It’s worth noting that there are often instances where people and groups can bond on one dimension even as they differ on important other dimensions, thus opening the chance to use the bonding connection to get to issues that require bridging.

EXAMPLES:

- * The Community Foundation for the New River Valley (USA, Virginia) had an interesting version of this, using the bonding connection of one community foundation to another to bring in a group of leaders from the Alabama Community Foundation, and then drawing on their experience as black leaders to help the mostly white New River leadership bridge to the black community in New River.
- * Similarly, the Milwaukee Community Foundation had the experience of a former director, who was black, using her connections as a former director (bonding) with her peers on the board, to help them see the need to bridge with the black community.
- * A different and powerful example of how this can play out is offered by the work of the Dade Community Foundation (DCF) in linking local nonprofits in the Miami area with those in Latin America and the Caribbean doing similar work. The shared interest domestically and internationally was in doing community development work. In this case, DCF built on organizational ties (bonding) with the InterAmerican Foundation, a US government agency, and DCF's own extensive connections with community based organizations in Miami. They bring together activists in the Miami area who retained strong ties to their homelands with representatives of the US government agency, which was a supporting organization doing similar work overseas.

3. Design Principle: Set the Rules of Engagement Up Front, and Be Explicit about Them.

Spend time at the beginning to be clear on how the discussions/meeting/process will work, how you will deal with conflicts. Don't leave it to chance, or expect that you will work each problem out as you get to it. You need to do this at the start when there is enough good will. Get the decision making clear; pay special attention to leadership selection and transition and how to solve future conflicts.

Be aware that this work puts people at risk. Risk from others including their own allies who may resent and dislike the work they are doing to try to bridge. Talk through with people what their fears are. Draw up rules based upon people's needs and concerns.

EXAMPLES:

- * Community Foundation of Northern Ireland (CFNI) had to limit the transparency of some negotiations. CFNI chose not to let communities know who was involved in some of the discussions because the simple act of talking to the other side would have put some people's lives at risk. Parties had to agree to not to reveal who they were talking with.
- * One interesting consideration of designing rules of engagement was raised by Svetlana Pouchkareva of the Togliatti Community Foundation in viewing board diversity in all its advantages and challenges. One must ask the following practical representative questions, such as: "Who is on the board and why?" or "How much legitimacy do they have among all parties?" This led to discussion of diversity on the board. Svetlana EXPRESSED A CONCERN that SOME board members, who are present to represent their particular "group," MAY become more rigid, less flexible to change their point of view in order not to disappoint their constituents. Their sense of representation MAY take priority over the common good. What may be important is to recruit those who have a firm experience and voice, yet resolve to find a solution for the good of the whole community. These individuals truly see that, "A rising tide will lift all boats."

- * Representation is important but it is not the whole solution. The group identified other “rules of engagement” that helped to create a vehicle through which “bridging” could occur. For example, CFNI told of creating eight panels drawn from many interests to review the Peace I plans for funding. There are always some groups not directly represented on a board. We need to find ways for all groups within our community to express their point of view and — we cannot say it for them with the same conviction
- * A different form of this question of the need to establish rules of engagement was posed by Andy Morikawa of the Community Foundation of the New River Valley, when he asked, “How do we restrain ourselves so as to let new groups emerge, without smothering them? Especially if we have a close tie with a leader of the struggling emerging group?” CFNI talked of similar problems in dealing with prisoner groups, and with the new women’s group.

Avoid “Gotcha.”

“Gotcha” is American slang. It means “I got you,” as if you said “I caught you doing something you should not be doing,” or using a word that is loaded or offensive. Gotcha looks to catch people and expose and embarrass them, and prove that they don’t understand your point of view. When groups who are hostile to one another come together everyone has to agree to overlook unfortunate words or ways of speaking that people fall into, rather than trying to call them out every time they slip into using an ethnic slur or a phrase that speaks ill of a different group, and not try to embarrass the speaker for the words that they used. It requires you to be generous and forgiving and flexible.

As one person said to us, “I had to be economical in what I said. As dear as I hold honesty, integrity, truth — I couldn’t say everything I believe. And I had to learn to eat all the food served at the table.”

Acknowledge and Receive Legitimacy

The key here is not to expect personal acceptance of the position or the value of the other. Create a setting that assures that one’s own narrative is heard, in a way that is not diminishing or dismissive, and provides the same assurance to the other side in getting their narrative heard. The goal is not to argue for the superiority of either side, but to learn the sources of deeply held values and the effects of the conflict on one’s self. This happened when both Irish and Protestant prisoners shared the effect of their actions and of their internments, on themselves and on their families and communities, of the costs that all endured.

This kind of legitimizing effect can be advanced by using the language of the other side in making points, of refraining from using words or terms that are loaded and dismissive, of assuring what feels like equal time and attention to both sides, or allowing people to change their minds without belittling or penalizing them.

4. Recognize and Reward Investment.

To do this work of building organizations that do bridging SC requires adopting a long time frame. It requires recognizing that rewards won’t come in the short term, that this is an investment over the long run. People make investments to build these fragile organizations, knowing that there will not be immediate payoffs. People have to reach beyond their immediate individual interests. This is high risk, but can be high gain as well.

EXAMPLES:

- * CFNI's experience with funding the prisoners provided a powerful reminder of the very high initial costs involved, the persistence or duration of the problem, and the time that it may take to ultimately change views. Said Avila Kilmurray of the CFNI: "We knew that funding the prisoners would be a problem, but we had no idea how strong the reaction would be nor how long it would last. The issue continues to come up. We took some big hits here. We could have been better prepared. The anti-agreement groups really hit us, as did those where victims were Police relatives, etc. Many felt that it was far too early to do what we did. We didn't do an adequate scan. We didn't look out far enough."
- * The group's discussion of how to gradually move an organization to bridge on a different dimension — gender — was instructive on how long it can take, but also on the many different options that one might pursue to get there.

5. Proactive: Prevent Proselytizing

People involved in Concord organizations cannot seek to impose their views on others. This is important both personally and organizationally. It keeps the bridging viewpoints in the foreground, preventing organizations from drowning in the whirlpool of conflicting views. By agreeing to forego efforts to proselytize to others, it honors the legitimacy of other points of view. This self-restraint in not proselytizing spills over to a larger practice of restraint, of listening, and of efforts to mutually problem solve.

This can mean NOT taking a stand, not standing up always for principles.

6. Learn to "Not Understand" and to "Not be Accepted."

Learn to expect that complete understanding and acceptance by the other side is not always going to happen. Nor is it necessary. In fact, you probably won't even arrive at a totally satisfactory joint definition of reality. Often the best you can hope for is that multiple realities will reside simultaneously and with respect and acceptance.

Create the expectations that differences are accepted and acceptable.

The value is in relationship building rather than to convince others of a political position.

EXAMPLES:

- * In Northern Ireland, parents of children in an integrated (Catholic and Protestant) Belfast school (in itself quite rare) gathered and talked about symbols of both sides which were displayed in the room — posters, military medals, weapons. People talked about what these symbols meant to each. Without either side expecting to persuade the other that their take was right. Factors considered while addressing this issue includes:
 - * Language of whether prisoners are victims or heroes.
 - * Agreement without ever agreeing on what the cause of the problem was: Some saw victims as victims of war. Some see those same people as the causes of the problem. No agreed on culture of why this happened. Faced huge backlog of anger and hopelessness and bitterness.
 - * While facilitating, acting the fool (a balance of humor and ignorance) can be effective

- * Doug Jansson conveyed a story that powerfully illustrated an example of this in his experience with the Milwaukee Community Foundation Board. A Milwaukee African-American former board member talked about feeling like a “token,” and a white male board member saying, “Isn’t it enough that I speak for the whole community?” “No! You cannot know my journey. You cannot know what I have been through.” The white board member needed to accept this, just as the African- American Board member had to accept that she could be on the Board as a Director, but this may not mean that her white colleagues fully understand her experience.

7. Support Single Community Work.

Being a leader can be personally risky for people in this divided world, especially for those who try to bridge.

- * Avila Kilmurray of Northern Ireland worked through this issue through the following experiences and recommendations:
 - * Help individuals and communities develop strong positive single community identities. This requires two things; first, be sure to include single community opportunities as part of the programming, and second, by strengthening the capacities of single community organizations to do cross community or bridging work. By doing this, you protect the individuals who try to bridge.
 - * A number of people talked about the risks they felt while trying to work with prisoners of the other group, especially once released from jail. It was important to have support from their own kind when they tried to bridge with “the others.”
 - * Get several people to attend these meetings not just one person. This represents and protects the group — you don’t just expose or put the burden on one.

8. Develop leaders.

Develop leaders who can maintain legitimacy while arranging engagement and bridging. Requires leaders who have enough political resources to withstand suspicions of loyalty. Leaders who are weak in their position, who have a tenuous hold on their own positions of authority are seldom able to withstand attacks for participating in bridging activities or cross community work. Successful leaders know the basic needs of their followers, and who encourage their followers to learn and think with them.

- * Avila Kilmurray made a special point here of emphasizing that this requires development of a plurality of leaders, of reaching down and not leaving this work to a handful of a talented few leaders at the top — going deep and spreading out the leadership work. As Avila put it, “We need to be aware that leaders can jeopardize their reputations — and even their lives — by speaking out in ways that seek to transcend their communities.” We heard from several of the prisoner leaders about just this sense of vulnerability and risk.
- * One example is the mobile phone network set up in Belfast to enable rapid response to rumors and reports of tension and violence so that information can be passed within a community, and where possible between communities to reduce the number of incidents and the interfaces between communities, and to lessen the likelihood that those incidents that do occur will escalate.

RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

Working Group Members' Organizational Web Sites

Doug Jansson, Working Group Coordinator
The Milwaukee Foundation
www.greatermilwaukeefoundation.org/

Lewis Feldstein
The New Hampshire Charitable Foundation
www.nhcf.org/

Orietta Filippini
Fondazione della Comunita' Bresciana
info@fondazionebresciana.org

Irena Gadaj
Bilgoraj Community Foundation
www.flzb.lbl.pl;

Chris Harris
Community Foundation for Calderdale
www.ccfound.co.uk/

Avila Kilmurray
Community Foundation for Northern Ireland
www.communityfoundationni.org/

Tomás Krejci
Community Foundation of Euroregion Labe
www.komunitninadace.cz

Joe Lumarda
California Community Foundation
www.calfund.org

Andy Morikawa
Community Foundation of the
New River Valley
www.cfnrv.org/

Richard Mulcaster
The Vancouver Foundation
www.vancouverfoundation.bc.ca/

Stoyan Nikolov
Open Society Club of Varna
oscvn@tnt.bg

Svetlana Pouchkareva
Togliatti Community Foundation
www.fondtol.infopac.ru

Klaus Rollin
Bürgerstiftung Hamburg
info@buengerstiftung-hamburg.de

Ruth Shack
Dade Community Foundation
www.dadecommunityfoundation.org/

Nina Spallek
Stadt Stiftung Gütersloh
www.stadtstiftung.de

OTHER HELPFUL RESOURCES

The Transatlantic Community Foundation Network
www.tcfn.efc.be

The Council on Foundations
www.cof.org

The Concord Project
<http://concord.spsr.ucla.edu>

Community Change Makers: The Leadership Roles of Community Foundations
2004 Ralph Hamilton, Julia Parzen, Prue Brown
The Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago
http://www.chapinhall.org/article_abstract_new.asp?ar=1366&L2=63&L3=109

“What Does it Take?”
Attributes of Effective Community Foundation Chief Executives
(Based on Lessons From the Community Foundations Initiative, 2003)
Published by The James Irvine Foundation, www.irvine.org

A Learning Organization – “How do we assess our organization?”
<http://www.dist.maricopa.edu/users/bleed/learnin.html>