Beyond Compliance

Annotated Resource List

A Collaboration Between

The Center for High Impact Philanthropy
School of Social Policy & Practice | University of Pennsylvania
In collaboration with alumni from the Wharton School

Wharton University of Pennsylvania

SOCIAL IMPACT INITIATIVE

APPENDIX A: ANNOTATED RESOURCE LIST

Our scan returned over 50 publicly available web-based resources, most of which were partly or completely free to users. The majority of those resources address a specific piece of measuring and managing to impact; they are usually designed for a specific audience type (such as funders, non-profits, or advisors) and/or with a particular purpose such as resource allocation, data collection, activity tracking, or project management. There are also some tools, though fewer, that assist with the conceptual frameworks that underpin strategic planning and programmatic implementation; these include logic models, balanced scorecards, theories of change, and more.

The following represent conceptual tools and foundational frameworks that can be used across multiple sectors and activities along the path to impact.

Logic Model

- Purpose: To illustrate how an organization does its work by linking outcomes (both short- and long-term) with program activities/processes, as well as identifying the theoretical assumptions and principles underlying the program. This framework facilitates effective program planning, implementation, and evaluation through identification of an organization's planned work and intended results.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Examples: W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide[1]

Theories of Change

- Purpose: To provide a framework that highlights presumed causal relationships between actions, short-term outcomes and long-term outcomes for a defined population. A theory of change should include an organization's intended outcomes as well as the logic model for producing these intended goals. Some practitioners use the term 'logic model' and 'theory of change' interchangeably; however, for the sake of this report, we define these frameworks as follows: logic model refers to the intervention/program level, whereas theory of change refers to the community/strategy level.
- Audience: Nonprofits, Foundations
- Examples: Theory of Change: A Practical Tool for Action, Results and Learning[2]

Balanced Scorecard

- Purpose: A performance management system for nonprofits that replaces financial measurements with organizational mission indicators to capture long-term value creation. This tool provides a framework that not only provides performance measurements, but helps planners identify what should be done and measured. It is a decision-making tool that balances four areas: 1) learning and growth; 2) internal processes; 3) 'customer' perspective; and 4) financial perspective.[3]
- Audience: Nonprofits, industry, government
- Examples: Balanced Scorecard Institute, GEO listserve

---

[1] http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2006/02/WK-Kellogg-Foundation-Logic-Model-Development-Guide.aspx

[2] http://www.aecf.org/upload/publicationfiles/cc2977k440.pdf

[3] http://www.balancedscorecard.org/BSCResources/AbouttheBalancedScorecard/tabid/55/Default.aspx

The following represent practical applications and adaptations of these conceptual frameworks. These are either web-based tools or collections of tools, meant to be used by nonprofits at specific stages along the path to impact.

Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT)

- Purpose: To measure operational capacity and identify areas for improvement.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Developed by: McKinsey and Venture Philanthropy Partners
- Click here to access online

Performance and Quality Improvement (PQI)

- Purpose: To assist agency programs and services to meet annual goals and objectives, and to guide quality operations, ensure safe environment and high quality of services, and meet external standards and regulations.
- Audience: Nonprofits (with a specific focus on maternal and neonatal health)
- Click here to access online

Point K Tools

- Purpose: To provide tools and resources for nonprofits to plan and evaluate programs, such as the Organizational Assessment Tool, Logic Model Builder and Evaluation Plan Builder.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Developed by: Innovation Network (Innonet)
- Click here to access online

Strategic Impact Framework

- Purpose: The framework is comprised of four components: program performance, financial sustainability, management effectiveness, and community engagement. This framework helps users think holistically, rather than programmatically, about measuring impact, achieving goals and staying true to the mission.
- Audience: Corporations, nonprofits, philanthropic foundations and public sector organizations
- Developed by: Mission Measurement

The following decision-making tools integrate cost in measuring and/or estimating social value creation. Most of these approaches draw on concepts from cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

- What it is: CBA monetizes the costs and benefits associated with an intervention, and then compares them to see which one is greater. This requires a comprehensive measurement of costs and program impacts (e.g., primary and secondary, direct and indirect, tangible and intangible impacts), and the ability to place a dollar value on program impacts across stakeholders. Thus, CBA provides a full accounting of the net benefits to society as a whole, as well as various stakeholders.
- Purpose: to help decision-makers prioritize or decide among various uses of funds for programs and projects.
- Audience: public, private, and nonprofit sectors

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

- What it is: CEA involves the calculation of a ratio of cost to a non-monetary benefit or outcome. However, measures of cost-effectiveness can only account for one area of program impact at a time. And, since program impacts are measured in natural units, unless those units are common across all areas of impact, it is not possible to aggregate across them.
- Purpose: 1) to combine appropriate measures of outcomes with costs so that program and policy alternatives within the same domain can be ranked according to their effectiveness relative to their results; and 2) to side-step the uncertainties about how to value different aspects of program benefits by looking at the ratio of benefits to costs without reducing them to common units.

REDF SROI

- Purpose: To demonstrate the social, value accrued to society compared to the total investments for each of the social enterprises in its portfolio on an ongoing and retrospective basis. SROI can be applied to any type of organization or company in any industry. It accounts for social and/or environmental value created for individual stakeholders
- Developed by: Jed Emerson/REDF

BACO ("Best Available Charitable Option") Ratio

- Purpose: To help portfolio managers assess the prospective merit of an individual investment opportunity versus making a charitable grant. BACO is the only tool that compares market-based solutions to nonprofit solutions and compares the relative (quantified) social output of each option.
- Developed by: Acumen Fund

The following sites list sample sector-specific indicators and proxy measures

Nonprofit Organizational Dashboard

- What it is: A library of sample performance indicators used by community-based organizations.
- Purpose: Helps nonprofits choose their own indicators by providing examples of metrics that other organizations use.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Developed by: CompassPoint
- Click here to access online

Outcome Indicators Project

- What it is: A clearinghouse for outcomes and performance indicators for 14 specific program areas. It also provides generic outcomes and indicators.
- Purpose**:** Provides information that assists nonprofits that want to create new outcome monitoring systems or improve existing evaluation systems.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Developed by: The Urban Institute and The Center for What Works
- Click here to access online

Success Measures Indicators List

- What it is: A set of 122 outcome indicators and 312 data collection instruments used to measure change in individuals and communities in eight specific community development fields.
- Purpose: Provides a wide range of indicators to nonprofits that can be used immediately or customized.
- Audience: Nonprofits, funders, intermediaries, and policy makers
- Developed by: Success Measures
- Click here to access online

WhatWorks Outcomes Portal v1.0

- What it is: A portal that provides a repository of outcomes and indicators used in 14 specific fields. Users can access outcomes and indicators through two online tools: the Outcomes Framework Browser and Impact Measurement Framework.
- Purpose: Facilitates sector-wide benchmarking for nonprofit outcomes and indicators of success.
- Audience: Nonprofits.
- Developed by: The Center for What Works, and The Urban Institute
- Click here to access online

The following are clearinghouses for tools for NGOs

IdeaEncore

- What it is: An online sharing platform for nonprofits to exchange ready-to-use tools, templates, training resources, policies and program materials. Users can sell their knowledge, receive peer reviews, and share documents.
- Purpose: Encourages information sharing among nonprofits and across sectors.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Developed by: Good Done Great
- Click here to access online

Tools and Resources for Assessing Social Impact (TRASI)

- What it is: An expert-reviewed database of over 150 tested tools, methods and best practices for impact measurement. The TRASI database is searchable, provides access to measurement tools and connects users with a network of peers interested in assessment.
- Purpose: Helps nonprofits find tested strategies for measuring impact.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Developed by: Foundation Center
- Click here to access online

The following web-based tools attempt to explicitly align expectations and enhance communication amongst key stakeholders including nonprofits and donors

Charting Impact

- What it is: A web-based tool that produces a "Charting Impact Report," answering the following questions: 1) What is your organization aiming to accomplish; 2) What are your strategies for making this happen; 3) What are your organization's capabilities for doing this; 4) How will your organization know if you are making progress; and 5) What have and haven't you accomplished so far?
- Purpose: Encourages strategic thinking about how an organization will achieve its goals and shares concise, detailed, standardized information about plans and progress with key stakeholders, including funders and the general public.
- Audience: Nonprofits, Foundations
- Developed by: BBB Wise Giving Alliance, GuideStar USA and Independent Sector
- Click here to access online

NewDea

- *What it is: An integrated, cloud-based platform ("Impact Platform") that streamlines proprietary* monitoring and evaluation software, grant management software, as well as integrated web services (all segmented/customized by organization type). Facilitates data collection and management on the project, program, and program area level.

- *Purpose: To connect d*onors and funders directly around the delivery of program-level information, metrics and results of their grants, thereby creating transparency, efficiency and collaboration amongst organizations. By working in real-time on the same platform, those stakeholders working on the same or similar problems (or even those playing different roles in the value chain) can share rich information through interconnectedness.

- *Audience: Nonprofits, social enterprises, impact investors, funders/grantmakers, government*

- Click here *to access online*

Ongoing Assessment of Social ImpactS (OASIS) Project

- What it is: The OASIS Project is a blueprint of how funders might build a customized, comprehensive, social management information system within grantees.

- Purpose: OASIS (as a system) is designed to be a process that leads to a comprehensive, agency-wide, state-of-the-art client tracking system that provides real-time data to staff at all levels of an organization. It is intended to break the traditional silo approach in nonprofit measurement efforts.

- Audience: Funders and grantees

- Developed by: REDF

The following web-based tools serve primarily to enable donors to find organizations to which to donate by providing information about various nonprofits.

Guidestar

- What it is: A central repository of nonprofit information, including: verification of status and legitimacy validation, financials, forms 990, annual reports, management, programs, and news.

- Purpose: To provide information that advances transparency, enables donors to make better decisions, and encourages charitable giving overall.

- Audience: Funders

- Click here to access online

Financial SCAN (A service of Guidestar)

- What it is: An online tool and printable report that provides information on financial health of organizations (draws its data from publicly available financial information such as IRS forms). This information showcases a nonprofit's and peer group's financial condition over time.
- Purpose: 1) Presents a comprehensive picture of financial health, illustrated through dashboards and charts, an educational guide, and questions to shape conversations; 2) focuses on the most meaningful metrics and trends for assessing a nonprofit's financial strengths and weaknesses; and 3) allows comparisons regarding the condition of multiple nonprofit organizations.
- Developed by: Guidestar and Nonprofit Finance Fund
- Audience: Primarily funders, donors/investors, but also secondarily nonprofit organizations
- Click here to access online

Philanthropedia (A division of Guidestar since 2011)

- What it is: A nonprofit rating system. This open-source technology platform that utilizes expert-driven recommendations and ratings to help direct funding to high-impact organizations in specific mission areas. The organization's proprietary research methodology has been utilized by a network of over 1,400 experts to evaluate 1,700 nonprofits in 15 different cause areas.
- Purpose: To improve nonprofit effectiveness by directing money to and facilitating discussion about expert recommended high-impact nonprofits.
- Audience: Funders
- Click here to access online

Charity Navigator

- What it is: A nonprofit rating system that provides information on nonprofit organizations to guide donor giving
- Purpose: Rates charities across two broad areas: financial health and accountability/ transparency. Note: Charity Navigator plans to rate impact in the near future (version 3.0) by adding "constituency voice" criteria.
- Audience: Funders
- Click here to access online

Great Nonprofits

- What it is: Largest database of user-generated nonprofit reviews. Meant to promote transparency and help funders and volunteers find "trustworthy" nonprofits.
- Purpose: Allows users to rate and review nonprofits (out of 5 stars) directly on its website, or via syndication on partner sites such as Guidestar, Charity Navigator, and GlobalGiving.
- Audience: Funders, volunteers
- Click here to access online

GiveWell

- What it is: A nonprofit evaluator to help funders select effective nonprofits to support.
- Purpose: Rates charities (both U.S. and internationally-based) on evidence of impact (with a focus on empirical data), cost-effectiveness, and capacity for increased funding.
- Audience: Funders
- Click here to access online

Giving Library

- What it is: An online forum includes videos from 250 nonprofits hoping to catch the attention of donors who visit the site. The videos detail each organization's history, mission, challenges, and plans, as well as the results they have achieved. Donors who find them interesting can choose to anonymously seek out more information.
- Purpose: to help philanthropists learn about charities and connect with the ones that interests them.
- Audience: Funders
- Click here to access online

Social Impact Exchange (SIEX)

- What it is: A community of members (funders, intermediaries, and nonprofits) interested in funding and developing practices for scaling-up social solutions.
- What it does: With the ultimate goal of scaling successful innovations, SIEX: 1) facilitates collaborative funding of well-vetted, scalable programs; 2) develops and shares knowledge on best practices, tools, templates and resources; and 3) builds marketplace infrastructure by developing common standards, creating distribution channels, etc.
- Audience: Funders and funder intermediaries (secondary audience is nonprofits that are interested in scaling their social impact)
- Click here to access online

S & I 100 Index (A program of Social Impact Exchange)

- What it is: A web-based platform featuring high-performing nonprofits. Each nonprofit has been nominated, reviewed, and assessed by multiple experts, and have both third-party evidence of their impact and are growing and scaling up their impact.
- Purpose: to help funders find high-performing organizations with an evidence of impact. .
- Audience: funders and funding intermediaries
- Click here to access online

Root Cause Social Impact Research (SIR)

- What it is: Modeled after private sector equity research firms, SIR produces research reports on social issues and conducts analysis of high performing organizations. For each issue area (health and well-being; economic empowerment; education and youth development; environment and sustainability), SIR partners with various organizations to conduct research and ultimately produce a report based upon qualitative and quantitative indicators.
- Purpose: To meet the information gap for donors and funders by providing actionable information/research; meant to guide funder giving decisions.
- Audience: Funders
- Click here to access online

Innovations for Poverty Action Proven Impact Initiative

- What it is: A website highlighting selected program in the field of international public health and education with a rigorous evidence base. Donors can select specific projects to which to direct their giving. Program areas focus on school-based deworming, chlorine dispensers, and remedial education in the developing world. All qualifying organizations have been evaluated by IPA or have been endorsed by a Research Affiliate or Research Network Member highly knowledgeable of their activities.
- Purpose: Allows donors to support proven, scalable programs (reviewed and selected by the Proven Impact Initiative) via the Proven Impact Fund.
- Audience: Funders
- Click here to access online

The following are sector specific intermediaries.

Child Trends

- What it is: The nation's only independent (nonprofit, nonpartisan) research and policy center focused *exclusively* on improving outcomes for children at all stages of development. Its mission is to provide research, data, and analysis to the people and institutions whose decisions and actions affect children.
- Purpose: To provide stakeholders with trends and research on over 100 key indicators of child and youth well-being, resources on programs that have an evidence of impact, as well as those that don't.
- Audience: Nonprofit program providers, researchers and educators, the policy community, the media, government, philanthropic funders, etc.
- Click here to access online

CORE Group

- What it is: Within the field of public health (and amongst its member organizations), the CORE Group: 1) systematizes and standardizes best practices; 2) generates recommendations, guidance and challenges for better programming; 3) creates and disseminates practical tools and approaches; 4) builds capabilities of global health organizations and their in-country partners; 5) offers practical training and development for the global health workforce; and 6) fosters partnerships and collaborative action.
- Purpose: To bring together 50+ member organizations and network of partners to generate collaborative action and learning to improve and expand community-focused public health practices.
- Audience: Public health nonprofits, philanthropic and public sector partners, researchers, etc.
- Click here to access online

Success Measures (A program of NeighborWorks America)

- What it is: Supports community-based organizations and their funding and intermediary partners to plan and conduct evaluations using participatory methods and a set of 122 indicators and 312 data collection instruments. Organizations using Success Measures have web access to the Success Measures Data System's (SMDS) library of tools to measure the results of community development programs. SMDS also structures data collection tools for fieldwork or online delivery, and tabulates, aggregates and stores the resulting evaluation data for easy retrieval or download for further analysis.
- Purpose: To provide the community development field with a practical, credible and accessible way to collect, analyze, and use data for continuous evaluative learning, to tell stories of change, and to demonstrate results.
- Audience: Community Development nonprofits, philanthropic and public sector partners, researchers, etc.
- Click here to access online

MDRC

- What it is: A nonprofit, nonpartisan education and social policy research organization dedicated to learning what works to improve programs and policies that affect the poor. Policy areas include: 1) improving public education; 2) promoting children, families and low-income communities; and 3) supporting low-wage workers and communities.
- Purpose: MDRC was created to learn what works in social policy — and to make sure that evidence informs the design and implementation of policies and programs.
- Audience: Nonprofits, funders, policy makers and researchers focused on the low-income communities, families, and public education.
- Click here to access online

The following are data collection and management tools for nonprofits (some of which require proprietary software, some of which are available online for clients/subscribers)

Efforts to Outcome Software (ETO)

- What it is: Performance management software for human service organizations.
- Purpose: ETO software was developed by direct service professionals, and helps organizations *monitor, measure and improve* the impact they have on the participants they serve. Software can be tailored to support case management, performance measurement, and outcomes assessment.
- Audience: Human Services nonprofits
- Developed by: Social Solutions
- Click here for more information

PerformWell (formerly Outcomes & Effective Practices Portal)

- *What it is:* PerformWell provides measurement tools and practical knowledge for human services organizations to use to manage their programs' day-to-day performance.
- *Purpose:* To leverage research-based findings that have been synthesized and simplified by experts in the field. By providing information and tools to measure program quality and outcomes, PerformWell helps human services practitioners deliver more effective social programs.
- Audience: Nonprofits in the field of human services (e.g., education, housing, health and safety, etc.)
- Developed by: PerformWell is a collaborative effort initiated by the Urban Institute, Child Trends and Social Solutions
- Click here for more information

CitySpan

- What it is: A software development firm that provides web-based client tracking and grants management solutions to public agencies, nonprofit organizations and foundations.
- Purpose: To streamline agency workflow, by enhancing accountability, promoting collaboration and enabling outcomes-based evaluation and research.
- Audience: Funders (CitySpan Funder) and Nonprofits (CitySpan Provider)
- Click here for more information

Success Measures Data Systems (SMDS)

- What it is: A web-based tool that allows organizations to manage their participatory evaluation process in a practical online environment.
- Purpose: SMDS facilitates the evaluation process by providing a platform for users to capture a clear picture of benefits achieved, select outcome indicators, customize data collection tools, collect and tabulate results and export data.
- Audience: Nonprofits
- Click here for more information

District Management Council Technology Solutions

- What it is: A membership-based network within public school districts.
- Purpose: Web-based dashboards facilitate communication, organization, performance tracking, and evaluation amongst key stakeholders within a district. Dashboards include functions for staffing, budgeting/resource allocation, evaluation and professional development tracking, and strategy, management and operations functions.
- Audience: Administrators, teachers, staff and other internal stakeholders within school districts
- Click here for more information

The following are consultants/think tanks that offer a range of services within the social sector (consulting services, training, thought leadership, research, external evaluations, etc.)

Monitor Institute

- What it is: A consulting firm with a focus on achieving sustainable solutions to significant social and environmental problems.
- What it does: Monitor Institute: 1) provides consulting services; 2) serves as a think tank on trends within the socials sector; and 3) incubates high-potential opportunities and overcome key barriers to impact.

Bridgespan

- What it is: A nonprofit advisor and resource for mission-driven organizations and philanthropists.
- What it does: Bridgespan collaborates with social sector leaders to help scale impact, build leadership, advance philanthropic effectiveness and accelerate learning. Services include strategy consulting, executive search, leadership development, philanthropic advising, and developing and sharing practical insights.

The Innovation Network (Innonet)

- What it is: A nonprofit organization developing planning and evaluation tools for nonprofits and funders to measure their results.
- What it does: Provides program planning and evaluation consulting, training, and web-based tools to nonprofits and funders across geographic and programmatic boundaries.

McKinsey and Company (Relevant Programs)

- Learning for Social Impact Initiative: helps funders, grantees, and other partners achieve social change by offering best practices, guidelines, tools, insights, and practical help in developing assessment plans that drive social impact.
- Social Sector Division provides expertise in the following areas: economic development, education, global public health, social innovation, and sustainability.

Foundation Strategy Group

- What it is: A nonprofit consulting firm specializing in strategy, evaluation, and research.
- What it does: Works across sectors by partnering with foundations, corporations, nonprofits, and governments. Impact areas include: philanthropy, CSR, education and youth, environment, global health and development, domestic health, learning and evaluation.

Mission Measurement, LLC

- What it is: A consulting firm focusing on social change for corporations, nonprofits, foundations, and the greater public sector.
- What it does: By blending impact evaluation with traditional market research and strategy consulting, Mission Measurement strives to identify high-value outcomes (both mission-related and market-related), and to use primary and secondary research to identify and measure leading indicators.

Compass Point

- What it is: Formerly the 'Support Center for Nonprofit Management,' Compass Point works to increase the impact of nonprofit organizations by helping them utilize management tools and concepts to help them best serve their communities.
- What it does: 1) Delivers a range of capacity-building services to community-based organizations and the individuals working and volunteering in them; 2) continuously refines these services based on client feedback and informed experience in the field; and 3) helps to shape current best practices and paradigms in nonprofit capacity building.

The Keystone Center

- What it is: An independent nonprofit organization that brings together public, private, and civic sector leaders.
- What it does: Provides mediation and facilitation services that incorporate innovative decision-making methods. Works in the areas of energy, environment, health, education policy and youth policy.

New Philanthropy Capital

- What it is: A think tank and consultancy dedicated to helping funders and charities make the greatest possible difference.
- What it does: Offers advice based on in-depth research of social issues and tried and tested methods of analyzing social impact. Provides independent research and tools, advice, and consulting services for charities and funders to better understand and increase their impact in the UK and internationally.

Hunter Consulting, LLC

- What it is: Consulting services for both nonprofit (specific focus on human services) organizations and funders to improve, strengthen, and introduce accountability into the nonprofit and public sectors.
- What it does: Provides a range of services for funders and grantees including: refining grantmaking strategies and criteria; integrating performance management methods into operations; providing evaluation services, strategic planning, etc.

Annotated Bibliography

Benedict-Nelson, A. (Interviewer) and Saul, J. (Interviewee). (n.d.) Measure with meaning. Retrieved from http://www.theinsightlabs.org/research/measure-with-meaning/.

In this interview between Andrew Benedict-Nelson and Jason Saul, of Mission Measurement, they discuss the challenges in the field of measuring social impact. Saul identifies a number of key issues with the field as it currently stands, including: 1) an organization's desire and capacity to measure is limited, in large part, due to nonprofits' perception that measurement is for compliance and fundraising purposes rather than a tool to be imbued into the culture of the organization; 2) the focus on activities measurement as well as outcomes measurement; 3) the focus on quantity of metrics measured, rather than quality ("higher-value outcomes" measurement); and 4) the lack of coordination and orchestration amongst organizations focused on tracking bits of a larger impact, and the need to identify who the other players in the space are, what they are measuring, and how that can lead to a clearer understanding of the ultimate impact.

Berger, K. & Penna, R. (2011, March 2). Points of contention: Ken Berger defends impact measurement. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://www.nonprofitquarterly.org/policysocial-context/10011-points-of-contention-ken-berger-defends-impact-measurement.html.

This blog post is a response to Steven Lawry's article, "When Too Much Rigor Leads to Rigor Mortis: Valuing Experience, Judgment and Intuition in Nonprofit Management," which questions the usefulness of nonprofit impact data. The authors argue that nonprofits and specifically charities have an obligation to prove their impact to funders and the communities they serve. Arguments against impact measurement that cite inadequate measurement tools should be used as an impetus to improve the field rather than stymie measurement. Well-informed donors are the future of philanthropy, and the nonprofit sector has a plethora of tools they can use to collect, measure and show results.

Berkman, J. Donors are settling for a "bronze standard" for measuring charities. (2011, June 14). [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://philanthropy.com/blogs/the-giveaway/donors-are-settling-for-a-bronze-standard-for-measuring-charities/270.

This blog post reports on takeaways from a meeting for nonprofit officials sponsored by the Hewlett Foundation, New York University's Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, Charity Navigator, and Liquidnet for Good. Participants argued that donors, even those who are results-oriented, tend to make gifts based on overhead cost rather than performance. Nonprofits also tend to assess themselves based on overhead costs instead of impact data. In order to close the gap between donors who care about results and donors who give based on results, participants suggested that nonprofits should both implement rigorous evaluation systems and also educate donors on which data to examine when considering a donation.

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2008). *Measuring and/or estimating social value creation: Insights into eight integrated cost approaches*. Tuan, M. Retrieved from http://www.gatesfoundation.org/learning/documents/wwl-report-measuring-estimating-social-value-creation.pdf.

This report outlines eight different integrated cost approaches that have been developed by various funding organizations to measure the impact of philanthropic investments: (1) Cost Effective Analysis; (2) Cost Benefit Analysis; (3) REDF Social Return on Investment Analysis; (4) Robin Hood Foundation Cost Benefit Ratio; (5) Acumen Fund BACO Ratio; (6) William and Flora Hewlett Expected Return; (7) Center for High Impact Philanthropy Cost-per-Impact; and (8) Foundation Investment Bubble Chart.

The eight approaches represent a variety of purposes for blending costs and social outputs, outcomes, or impacts – from internal decision-making cross portfolio and within portfolios, to general promotion and field building, to practical purposes such as making prospective investment decisions, informing ongoing practice, and/or retrospectively evaluating philanthropic investment decisions.

In this report, Tuan concludes that, due to the relative lack of maturity across the field of social program evaluation, as well as a number of technical issues and limitations of these eight approaches, it is impossible to name one methodology as 'perfect' or preferable to another. Furthermore, the lack of a common language, common measures, quality data, and incentives for transparency represent key limitations for the utilization of any efforts to integrate cost into measuring and/or estimating social value. She contends that each method has its strengths and weaknesses, and that due to the aforementioned strategies no single method has been widely adopted throughout the social sector.

Clark, C., et al. (2004). *Double bottom line project report: Assessing social impact in double bottom line ventures (methods catalogue)*. Retrieved from Columbia University Business School, RISE (Research Initiative on Social Entrepreneurship) website: http://www.riseproject.org/DBL_Methods_Catalog.pdf.

This report provides a catalog of methods that for-profit and nonprofit social ventures and enterprises can use to assess the social impact of their activities. It analyzes feasibility and credibility of nine methods and provides examples of them in use. The report contends that, as the lines between investing and grantmaking blurs (with the introduction of venture philanthropy and impact investing), the movement toward social accountability has grown. While finance and accounting are utilized in the private sector, the authors posit that no such "comparable standard social impact accounting" exists. This report explores nine examples of mission-related, non-financial reporting including: 1) theory of change; 2) balanced scorecard; 3) acumen scorecard; 4) social return assessment; 5) atkisson compass assessment for investors; 6) ongoing assessment of social impact (OASIS); 7) social return on investment (SROI); 8) benefit-cost analysis; and 9) poverty and social impact assessment (PISA).

The report includes snapshots of each method, evaluation and analysis. The report also contains examples of each highlighted methodology as well as a glossary of social impact terms (in an attempt to formulate a common vocabulary within the field).

Ebrahim, A. and Rangan, V.K. (2010). *The limits of nonprofit impact: A contingency framework for measuring social performance*. (Working Paper No. 10-099). Retrieved from Harvard Business School, Working Knowledge website: http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/6439.html.

Harvard Business School professors Ebrahim and Rangan begin by noting that over the past 20 years, there has been a proliferation in methodologies and tools for assessing social performance and impact; however, there has lacked a systematic analysis and comparison across these approaches. The authors strive to synthesize a number of the current methodologies, ultimately developing a "contingency framework" for measuring results, which suggests that some organizations should measure long-term impacts, while others should focus on shorter-term outputs and outcomes, "given the varied work, aims, and capacities of social sector organizations." The researchers provide a rationale for determining which kinds of measures are appropriate, as driven by the organization's theory of change and operational strategy.

This framework aligns squarely with one of our emerging implications: that if donors and nonprofits could find consensus around their respective theories of change - and where in that theory of change the nonprofit/intervention sits - it would help both parties clarify where and how different players can and should add value. Ebrahim and Rangan's working paper, though academic in nature, appears to have the potential for field application, given their hypotheses and framework, which could be tested amongst nonprofits and funders.

Forti, M. & Powell, A. (2012, June 18). Four ways donors support their grantees in measurement. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://www.bridgespan.org/four-ways-donors-support-grantees-with-measurement.aspx.

This blog post contends that donors ask their grantees for the wrong metrics when measuring impact. Results-oriented donors often ask their grantees for metrics that are not aligned with the grantee's own performance targets, and the result is that donors receive inaccurate information about impact while grantees are tasked with extra work. Forti and Powell share four ways nonprofits think donors can help address this disjuncture. The recommendations are: 1) let the grantee determine which metrics best measure their performance; 2) identify opportunities for better measurement, based on donor experience working with other nonprofits; 3) invest in building a grantee's capacity to measure performance; and 4) provide non-financial support, such as linking a grantee with an evaluation adviser.

Forti, M. & Yazbak, K. (2012, April 1). Data's not just for donors – It can improve a nonprofit's work. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://philanthropy.com/article/How-Data-Can-Improve-a/131342/.

This article discusses the interplay between nonprofit performance management and compliance reporting to external stakeholders such as funders and board members. The article suggests that nonprofits need tools to assess their own progress and performance, yet concedes that few nonprofits (13% total) have a dedicated staff member devoted to measurement. The article then provides a number of pieces of advice and best practices from nonprofits that have successfully implemented cultures of measurement and performance management. One key takeaway includes the notion that the role and function of measurement should evolve as the organization does, and that funders would be wise to allow nonprofits to decide what to measure, so that the organization can focus on data that will improve its work.

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations. (n.d.) Four essentials for evaluation. Retrieved from http://www.geofunders.org/geo-publications/567-four-essentials.

This guide focuses on using evaluations to improve performance as well as demonstrate program fidelity. It is aimed at grantmakers who want to expand their grantees' use of evaluations to include what the authors call "evaluation for learning." Grantmakers for Effective Organizations identifies four essential components for success. These components are: 1) leading, which means changing the culture of the organization to embrace evaluation practices; 2) planning, which means creating a framework for evaluation that includes identifying what the organization wants to know and strategies to get that information; 3) organizing, which includes identifying indicators and working within grantees' existing capacity; and 4) sharing, which includes engaging grantees and sharing findings publicly.

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations. (n.d.) Evaluation in philanthropy: Perspectives from the field. Retrieved from http://www.geofunders.org/storage/documents/Evaluation_in_Philanthropy_--_GEO_COF.pdf.

This guide brands evaluation as a "core learning practice" as grantmakers and their grantees seek to achieve impact on any number of issues. It is aimed at grantmakers who have an interest in making sure that their grantee organizations use evaluation to drive learning and improvement. Grantmakers for Effective Organizations identifies three levels across which grantmakers can and should integrate evaluation into their learning: 1) within grantmaking organizations; 2) across grantmaking organizations; and 3) in partnership with grantees. Furthermore, this guide discusses trends that indicate that funders' use of evaluation is changing in the following ways: 1) a focus on improvement of services (not just proof of services); 2) contribution of a range of factors that affect progress on an issue – and where a specific intervention fits into this change; 3) collaborative learning – amongst staff, grantees, and community members; 4) engaging in foundation-level evaluation in order to improve operations and overall strategies of the grantmaking organization; and 5) embracing failure – and learning from it to achieve better results in the future. Illustrative examples of these trends (in practice) are provided in the guide.

Hatry, H. (2007) *Performance measurement: Getting results* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

This book is a guide to evaluation methods for measuring government and human service agency performance. It covers each component of the evaluation process, including identifying indicators and outcomes, collecting data, and analyzing and using data. The second edition addresses new developments in the field, such as widespread computer technology used for collecting and presenting data, using data to improve performance, and quality control issues that have emerged with increased data collection.

Hunter, D.E.K., "Using a theory of change approach to helping nonprofits measure to outcomes." *Leap of reason: Managing to outcomes in an age of scarcity* (pp. 99-104). Weiss, L. and Collins, C. (Ed). Washington, DC: Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2011.

This essay describes how nonprofits can use theories of change to serve as blueprints for actualizing their strategic visions. Theories of change, Hunter contends, can help nonprofits navigate between over-measurement (too much data collection) and "unsupported optimism" (claiming effectiveness of a strategy without evidence). The theory of change must be tailored to serve a clear purpose, and must fit the organization's stage of development and operational goals. Ideally, a well-crafted theory of change will help an organization achieve a new level of clarity around its mission; transparency around operations; alignment amongst operational units; a better and more realistic understanding of resources needed to succeed; and a streamlined approach to gather and use performance data to achieve impact.

Kramer, M., Parkhurst, M., & Vaidyanathan, L. (2009). Breakthroughs in shared measurement and social impact. Retrieved from http://www.fsg.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/PDF/Breakthroughs_in_Shared_Measurement_complete.pdf.

This paper identifies 20 web-based shared measurement platforms that enable ongoing learning and collaboration among organizations working in the same field. These evaluation tools go beyond performance measurement, and the authors suggest they foreshadow the collaborative future of the measurement field. The 20 platforms are organized into three categories: 1) shared measurement platforms, which allow users to collect, analyze, and report on a set of pre-established indicators; 2) comparative performance systems, which allow users to compare performance across multiple organizations in the same field by requiring participants to report on pre-established indicators using the same definitions and methodologies; and 3) adaptive learning systems, which allow users to participate in a facilitated process that compares the performance, coordinates efforts, and promotes learning among organizations working on different aspects of the same problem.

Lawry, Stephen. *When too much rigor leads to rigor mortis: Valuing experience, judgment and intuition in nonprofit managemen*t. Nonprofit Quarterly (2011).

This article explores the shortcomings of nonprofit data collection and impact measurements when based upon donor-specified standards. The author eschews measurement as a rigorous, scientific exercise, divorced from the context, judgment and interpretation of on-the-ground practitioners. The article calls for greater integration of nonprofit managers' judgments as to which the feedback, measurements and indicators are appropriate to demonstrate true impact within a given field and for a specific intervention. Lawry contends that since nonprofit practitioners are much more in tune with the complex social dynamics of the problem they serve (more so than the funders or external stakeholders), they are better suited to identify, collect and interpret meaningful data. The article cautions against relying too heavily upon the rigor of mathematical reasoning, which is not capable of being applied to all social problems.

Mason, J. (2010). Is 2010 the year we will see ineffective nonprofits go away? *Philadelphia Social Innovations Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.philasocialinnovations.org/site/index.php?option=com_content&view=article &id=120:is-2010-the-year-we-will-see-ineffective-nonprofits-go-away&catid=19:disruptive-innovations&Itemid=30.

This article questions why the nonprofit sector is not held to the same standard of innovation as business leaders. In an appraisal of the state of the nonprofit sector and its private funders, Mason argues that a lack of accountability has spawned an environment where "many donors make investment decisions based on pure emotion." He further critiques how "ineffective organizations have succeeded in being great storytellers, and have charismatic leaders who have all the right connections — allowing them to do a great job of 'selling' donors on why their organization should receive funding."

Moore, K.A., Ph.D., et al. "Performance management: The neglected step in becoming an evidence-based program." *Leap of reason: Managing to outcomes in an age of scarcity* (pp. 111-116). Weiss, L. and Collins, C. (Ed). Washington, DC: Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2011.

This essay presents a case for nonprofits to focus on performance management at appropriate stages of organizations' development despite increasing pressure to focus on outcome and impact evaluation. The author contends that "as critical as good evaluations are, they need to be preceded by and built upon the knowledge provided by a performance-management system." Investing in and strengthening internal capacity, as well as developing a strong foundation upon which to implement and track programs over time, is an important step in any organizations' maturity, especially before engaging others in the expensive and time-intensive task of random assignment and/or quasi-experimental studies.

Morino, M. (2011). Leap of reason: Managing to outcomes in an age of scarcity. Washington, DC: Venture Philanthropy Partners.

This book presents the benefit of better outcomes measurement and management to funders, social sector leaders, and the communities they serve. Morino's monograph contends that in these particularly challenging economic times, assessing outcomes and being able to provide measurable results are becoming more valuable – despite the cost and time challenges associated with implementing the culture, infrastructure, and mechanisms necessary to support those sorts of efforts. Morino suggests that many organizations fall short of strong outcomes management due to a combination of lack of resolve and resources. In response, he lays out an actionable framework for social sector leaders to use to evolve the practice of managing to outcomes from within their organizations, including a detailed list of questions to ask throughout the impact assessment process. This book also includes a compendium of top reading for mission effectiveness, as well as essays by experts on related topics.

Mulgan, G. (2010). Measuring social impact: Measuring social value. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved from http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/measuring_social_value.

This article discusses the lack of consensus amongst nonprofits, funders, policymakers, and academics regarding how to define and measure social value. According to Mulgan, there are hundreds of competing tools, of which each stakeholder utilizes different ones. Furthermore, the author contends that despite widespread "use" of these metrics, very few organizations use them to guide decisions (i.e., allocate resources). Mulgan posits that the field of social impact measurement, as it currently stands, fails for two reasons: 1) most metrics assume that value is objective and discoverable through analysis – a contention that Mulgan rejects; rather, he contends that value is subject to the laws of supply and demand (which influences how individuals define "value", and is therefore both subjective in nature as well as malleable by changing circumstances); and 2) the use of metrics conflates three distinct roles – accounting to external stakeholders, managing internal operations, and assessing societal impact. Mulgan contends that no one metric can play all three roles. Mulgan further suggests, "People involved in funding social value, whether at the stage of promising innovations or of large-scale practice, likewise need sharper common frameworks. Greater use of these shared frameworks would be more valuable than proliferation of ever more assessment tools."

National Performance Programme. (2011). *Helping grantees focus on impact: How funders provide monitoring and evaluation*. Hedley, S., Lumley, T., & Pavey, H. Retrieved from http://www.partnershipforyounglondon.org.uk/data/files/Resource_Library/Voluntary_sector/helping_grantees_focus_on_impact.pdf.

This report is aimed primarily at informing funders on approaches to provide monitoring and evaluation support that enables their grantees to increase their focus on impact. The report provides case studies detailing four different models of support and identifies five key questions that funders can ask themselves to ensure the effectiveness of the support they provide: 1) what are your aims in providing support; 2) what are the principles behind your approach; 3) what barriers will you encounter; 4) how will you measure what your support achieves; and 5) based on your responses to these questions, what package of support will you ultimately provide?

New Philanthropy Capital. (2011). *A journey to greater impact: Six charities that learned to measure better.* Rickey, B., Lumley, T., Ogain, E.N. Retrieved from http://evpa.eu.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/NPC_A-journey-to-greater-impact_1111.pdf.

This report profiles six organizations that have demonstrated a commitment to conducting high quality impact measurement in the U.K. and the U.S. Some positive results yielded from putting the impact measurement process into practice are: 1) motivated and inspired frontline staff; 2) saved staff time; 3) improved service for benefactors; 4) influence on the debate on "what works"; 5) raised organizational profile; and 6) secured funding.

Penna, R. & Phillips, W. (2005). Eight outcome models. *The Evaluation Exchange,* 11(2). Retrieved from http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/evaluation-methodology/eight-outcome-models.

This article describes eight models/frameworks meant to facilitate outcome-based decision making. The authors, citing the Rensselaerville Institute's *book, Outcome Frameworks: An Overview for Practitioners*, set out to clarify the unique advantages of each model and how nonprofit practitioners can select the right one for the right situation. The authors group these tools into three main categories: 1) program planning and management; 2) program and resource alignment; and 3) program reporting. The tools listed are: 1) the logic model; 2) outcome funding framework; 3) results-based accountability (RBA); 4) targeting outcomes of programs; 5) balanced scorecard; 6) scales and ladders; 7) results mapping; and 8) program results story.

Project Streamline. *Drowning in paperwork, distracted from purpose: Challenges and opportunities in grant application and reporting*. Bearman, J. Retrieved from http://www.gmnetwork.org/projectstreamline.org/documents/PDF_Report_final.pdf.

This report identifies ten flaws in the system of grantmaking that are hampering the efficiency and effectiveness of nonprofit organizations. These flaws are: 1) enormous variability; 2) requirements are not "right sized"; 3) insufficient net grants; 4) outsourced burdens; 5) undermined trust; 6) reports on a shelf; 7) fundraising gymnastics; 8) due diligence redundancy; 9) double-edged swords; and 10) time drain for grantmakers. The document elaborates on the impact that each flaw plays, charts how the nonprofit sector got to this point, highlights creative approaches that have been taken to address those issues, and recommends four core principles that grantmakers can adopt into practice to relieve the burden on nonprofits.

RAND Corporation. (2006). Meeting funder compliance: A case study of challenges, time spent, and dollars invested. Santa Monica, CA: Lara-Cinisomo, S. & Steinberg, P.

This case study seeks to fill a gap in the literature on the investments that nonprofit organizations make to meet funder compliance. The RAND Corporation interviewed 41 directors, supervisors and field staff from the nonprofit Providing for Families about staffing decisions, staffing challenges, data challenges, staff experiences, and overall costs associated with meeting funding compliance. Key findings include: 1) challenges such as lack of internal protocol, impaired access to data, and poor quality of data; 2) experiences such as stress due to the short turnaround time to meet funder requests and the type of data requested; and 3) 11% of nonprofit funds are spent on compliance activities. The case study also includes staff-driven recommendations for funders. Key recommendations for nonprofits include creating an internal protocol and designing better infrastructure and training systems. Key recommendations for funders include reviewing proscribed data collection methods and requested data measures.

Robinson, T.B. "Managing to outcomes: Mission possible." *Leap of reason: Managing to outcomes in an age of scarcity* (pp. 105-109). Weiss, L. and Collins, C (Ed). Washington, DC: Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2011.

This essay illustrates three challenges (and solutions) to creating and maintaining a performance-management system: 1) creating a feedback culture – which includes the perspective of clients, management, and on-the-ground practitioners; 2) "becoming bilingual" – translating the "wonky world of data" into the "language of mission" – so that both funders and grantees can communicate and strive toward common goals; and 3) relieving the pain – once something is found to not work, delving deeper into the "why" – and then taking appropriate steps to mitigate the burden on the service providers.

Saul, J. *Nonprofit business intelligence: How to measure and improve nonprofit performance*. Chicago, Ill. Mission Measurement, 2003.

This paper promotes use of performance management as a means of systematically monitoring and reporting an organization's progress towards achieving pre-established goals. It argues that practitioners must harness performance data as a tool to improve, rather than prove, impact; it analyzes the trends and obstacles of the performance measurement movement within the nonprofit sector; and it provides recommendations to practitioners on how to improve nonprofit capacity while developing common standards to interpret and compare performance.

Wales, J. (2012). Measuring impact: Framing the issue. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved from http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/framing_the_issue_2?utm_source.

The article, written by Jane Wales, discusses how measurement and evaluation (M&E) can inform efforts, track progress, and assess the impact of foundation strategies. This sort of assessment can achieve three goals; it can: 1) strengthen grantor and grantee decision-making; 2) enable continuous learning and improvement; and 3) contribute to field-wide learning. Wales' 'framing the issue' is followed by articles from five leaders of major institutional foundations (including the Ford Foundation, the Omidyar Network, the Rockefeller Foundation, etc.). Each foundation leader reports on how they have developed and implemented best practices as well as fostered a culture of M&E within their institution and amongst their grantees.

Weinstein, M. (with Cynthia Esposito Lamy) (2009). *Measuring success: How Robin Hood estimates the impact of grants*. New York, NY: Robin Hood Foundation.

This report details the funding strategy employed by the Robin Hood Foundation, which developed its Benefit-Cost Ratio methodology to capture the best estimate of the collective benefit to poor individuals that Robin Hood grants create per dollar cost to Robin Hood. This methodology assesses the comparative "value" of any two grants – across programmatic areas – to guide how it invests its $130 million annual donation portfolio. The purpose of Robin Hood's Benefit-Cost Ratio is to translate the outcomes of diverse programs into a single, monetized value that measures poverty fighting on an ongoing basis to decide which programs to fund and how much to spend on each. The distribution of spending across portfolios follows as a passive consequence of decisions about individual grants.

Please send comments about this guide to the Center for High Impact Philanthropy at impact@sp2.upenn.edu. As the publisher of this report, we encourage the widespread circulation of our work and provide access to our content electronically without charge. You are welcome to excerpt, copy, quote, redistribute, or otherwise make our materials available to others provided that you acknowledge the Center for High Impact Philanthropy's authorship. Should you have questions about this policy, please contact us at impact@sp2.upenn.edu.

Copyright © 2013 Center for High Impact Philanthropy

Special Thanks

Jen Landres, Susli Lie, and Haywood Perry III for research and analysis. Lauren Kobylarz, Paul Marvucic, and Haisheng Yang for production assistance.
And with deep appreciation to the Leon Lowenstein Foundation.

The Center for High Impact Philanthropy

School of Social Policy & Practice | University of Pennsylvania
In collaboration with alumni from the Wharton School

3815 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104

WEBSITE	www.impact.upenn.edu
EMAIL	impact@sp2.upenn.edu
PHONE	(215) 573-7266

BLOG	blog.impact.upenn.edu
FACEBOOK	facebook.com/CenterforHighImpactPhilanthropy
TWITTER	twitter.com/ImpactSP2
LINKED IN	linkedin.com/groups?home=&gid=2015373
YOUTUBE	youtube.com/impactsp2

Wharton Social Impact Initiative

The Wharton School | University of Pennsylvania

108 Vance Hall
3733 Spruce Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104

WEBSITE	www.socialimpact.wharton.upenn.edu
EMAIL	socialimpact@wharton.upenn.edu
PHONE	(215) 746-2582

BLOG	socialimpact.wharton.upenn.edu/blog
FACEBOOK	facebook.com/WhartonSocialImpact
TWITTER	twitter.com/whartonsocial

Penn
University of Pennsylvania