Goal(s) and Theory of Change

The goal of the Organizational Effectiveness (OE) Program is to increase the effectiveness of grantee organizations and networks, to enhance their capacity to meet the Foundation’s goals. Our grants address the many organizational and capacity challenges that may affect nonprofits—from strategic planning to strengthening networks to leadership development. As a result of this work, we expect to see healthier, better connected organizations ready to bring about greater change on issues the Foundation cares about most.

Annual Progress Toward Impact

How are we doing?
Exceeding Expectations

The team is making significant, strategic contributions to the work of grantees as well as the work of our four major Programs.

What went well?

High-impact Grantmaking. New assessments from our external evaluators and the Center for Effective Philanthropy found that OE grants to individual grantee organizations—the bread and butter of our work—have positive impact on grantees that lasts a year or more after the OE grant concludes. From July 2013-July 2014, 94 percent of OE grants that closed met their objectives, and 24 percent exceeded their objectives, according to our external evaluators. Eighty percent of grantees reported at grant close that the OE grant already has had a positive impact on their programmatic work. In interviews 1-2 years after grants ended, grantees reported that the capacity built from the grants continues after the grant period and is more significant with time. Foundation grantees that receive an OE grant provide higher absolute ratings on most measures in the CEP Grantee Perception Report (GPR) than grantees who do not receive OE funds. OE grantees rate the Foundation more favorably on GPR measures including impact on the organization, impact on the field, and responsiveness of Foundation staff.

Focus on Leadership. OE launched an exploration of how we might support the development of emerging leaders in the fields we care about. The exploration resulted in five new “Partnership Projects” to develop cohorts of leaders in the Marine Fisheries, West Coast, C&S domestic, PRH-U.S., and Children’s Health subprograms. These projects will be implemented in 2015. Several of these projects aim to strengthen leadership at the field-level, improving the capacity of not only organizations, but whole sectors.

New Partnerships with Programs to Benefit Grantees. In addition to the leadership development cohorts, OE developed six other “Partnership Projects,” working with program staff and grantees to implement cohort capacity-building projects in the Children’s Health, Early Learning, Gulf of California, Local, South Asia, and Summer Enrichment subprograms. These projects deepened the collaboration between OE and the Foundation’s major grantmaking Programs and enabled us to serve a greater number of grantees.
What has been challenging?

Meeting the Needs of Diverse Grantees. With 20 different subprograms and hundreds of grantees to serve, the team sometimes struggles to meet everyone’s unique capacity needs within our time and budget constraints. This is particularly true for grantees and subprograms working in Africa and Asia.

Evaluation and Learning. We spent significant time and resources improving our evaluation and learning systems in 2014, but we still lack data for some outcome measures. We will begin evaluating our Partnership Projects and our services to grantmaking programs in 2015.

What has changed (internally and externally)?

A Larger, Stronger Team. With OE now managing six funds at the Foundation, the team grew to seven members in 2014. All of these staff members work at least part-time on OE. This has enabled us to assign a liaison to each grantmaking program, who can spend much more time helping program officers weave capacity building into their strategies and provide advisory services to Programs as needed. Increased team capacity allowed for an opportunity to provide enhanced coaching and support to grantee organizations. We also were able to deepen our work on leadership development.

Trends in the Field. Nonprofits and foundations increasingly focused on three key issues: leadership, full-cost funding, and pathways to scale. On leadership, there were growing calls for increased foundation and nonprofit investment in developing and supporting young nonprofit leaders, particularly people of color. Nonprofits are growing more assertive about the need for flexible, multi-year funding that covers their overhead expenses. And grantee Bridgespan sparked a conversation about how nonprofits can scale promising ideas beyond simply replicating programs, since replication does not take into account specific contexts and has been proven to be difficult to implement and sustain.

What have we learned? How have we adjusted?

We learned that our fundamental approach to helping grantees build capacity—individual, responsive grants—continues to deliver high impact and value for grantees. We are excited by our Partnership Projects grantmaking, but it is quite labor-intensive and we are not yet sure of its value, so we have made evaluating this work a high priority in 2015. We made adjustments to our grantmaking in 2014 as a result of what we learned from grantees and the field, such as increasing our focus on leadership and agreeing to provide overhead on some OE grants—a departure from past policy.

What are the key areas of focus for the coming year?

First, the team will continue to experiment with new models for developing emerging leaders in our issues areas, since there is clearly high demand for this among Program staff and grantees. This work will tie in with a potential joint effort of the Packard and Hewlett Foundations to develop nonprofit leaders of color in California. Second, we will evaluate our Partnership Projects to assess whether these cohort capacity-building projects are providing value for grantees and furthering the goals of Programs. Third, we will explore developing a new system for linking grantees to high-quality consultants, possibly using LinkedIn.

Comments:

All of the graphs in the "Monitoring Data" section start from 2014; data from previous years are not included. However, if available, we have included data points from previous years in the indicator notes.

Since it is a relatively new approach, we currently do not have monitoring data on "Partnership Projects". Data will be available in 2015.
Organizational Effectiveness and Philanthropy > Organizational Effectiveness > 1. Individual Grants (100% Progress)

**Outcome: 1. Grants Meet Project Objectives**

High proportion of OE grants meet or exceed project objectives at project close. Grant results are ranked as follows: 1 = No grant objectives were met; 2 = Some grant objectives were met; 3 = All grant objectives were met at a satisfactory level; 4 = All grant objectives were met at a satisfactory level and some objectives were exceeded; and 5 = All project objectives were exceeded, leading to significant organizational transformation (meaning both significant for the capacity focus of the project and with other capacities beyond the capacity focus).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. % of Grants that Meet Objectives</strong></td>
<td>0 Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94 Percent (100%)</td>
<td>90 Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of grants that meet or exceed (3 rating or higher) planned project objectives at grant close based on external evaluations. Source: Final grant report; PO feedback. 2013 indicator = 97% (Start Date: 7/1/2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. % of Grants that Exceed Objectives</strong></td>
<td>0 Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Percent (100%)</td>
<td>15 Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of grants that exceed (4 or 5 rating) project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Final grant report evaluation conducted by the Vallarta Institute. Note: Based on 71 grants closed between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. Does not include projects categorized as "Other".
Organizational Effectiveness and Philanthropy > Organizational Effectiveness > 1. Individual Grants (100% Progress)

**Outcome: 2. Increased Organizational Capacity is Sustained**

High proportion of OE grantees increase their organizational or network capacity at moderate to transformative levels. Capacity is ranked as follows: 1 = No increase in capacity; 2 = Slight increase; 3 = Moderate increase; 4 = Significant increase, in the specific capacity focus of the OE grant; and 5 = Great increase (transformative), including beyond the capacity focus of the OE grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual Grantees Report that Increased Capacity is Sustained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Organizational Effectiveness and Philanthropy > Organizational Effectiveness > 1. Individual Grants (100% Progress)

**Outcome: 3. Grants are Perceived as High Quality (based on GPR scores)**
Grantees perceive OE grants and services as high in quality, as reported by biennial GPR ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Grants' &quot;Impact on Organizations&quot; Score</strong></td>
<td>0 GPR rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6.5 GPR rating (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5 GPR rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR &quot;Impact on Grantees Organization&quot; rating. Source: GPR Evaluation. 2012 and 2010 GPR scores = 6.6 (Start Date: 1/1/2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014 GPR score = 6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Grants' &quot;Impact on Organizations&quot; Score Compared to Non-OE Grants</strong></td>
<td>0 binomial (statistically higher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 binomial (statistically higher) (100%)</td>
<td><strong>1 binomial (statistically higher)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR &quot;Impact on Grantees Organization&quot; rating compared to non-OE grant score (The aim is for OE grants to rate statistically higher than non-OE grants). Source: GPR Evaluation. OE-grant score was statistically higher than non-OE grant scores in 2010 and 2012 (Start Date: 1/1/2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014 OE-grant score was statistically higher than non-OE grants score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. OE Grant Recipients' Perception of Responsiveness of Funder Staff</strong></td>
<td>0 GPR rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6.4 GPR rating (98%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5 GPR rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR &quot;Responsiveness of Funder Staff&quot; rating. Source: GPR Evaluation. 2012 and 2010 GPR scores = 6.4 (Start Date: 1/1/2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014 GPR Score = 6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome: 1. Individual Grants Directly Impact Program Work

Increase in the proportion of OE individual grantees that report that their OE grant had a direct, positive impact on program work funded by Packard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Individual Grantees Report Direct Impact on Program Work at Grant Close</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of individual grantees that report direct, positive impact on program work because of OE grant. Source: Final Report (Start Date: 7/1/2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of individual grantees that report direct, positive impact on program work because of OE grant. Source: External evaluation conducted 1-2 years after grant close (Lasting Change) (Start Date: 7/1/2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcome: 2. Partnership Projects Directly Impact Program Work

High proportion of OE partnership project grantees that report that their participation in the partnership project had a direct, positive impact on program work funded by Packard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Partnership Project Grantees Report Direct Impact on Program Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of partnership project grantee beneficiaries that report direct, positive impacts on program work 6 months after grant close. Source: Partnership Project external evaluation. No data available for 2014.
### Organizational Effectiveness and Philanthropy > Organizational Effectiveness > 2. Strategic Integration with Programs (85% Progress)

**Outcome: 3. OE Grants Enhance Packard Program Goals**

Program staff perceive OE grants as a tool to enhance their ability to achieve program goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Staff Attest to Impact on Program Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of program officers/directors stating that OE grants and services significantly enhanced their ability to achieve program goals. Source: Program survey (needs to be developed)

No data available for 2014

### Organizational Effectiveness and Philanthropy > Organizational Effectiveness > 3. OE Thought Leadership (81% Progress)

**Outcome: 1. OE Asserts Leadership**

OE asserts its voice and leadership in the philanthropic sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of OE Team Produced External Publications &amp; Presentations</td>
<td>0 Pubs./Pres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Pubs./Pres. (80%)</td>
<td>10 Pubs./Pres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OE team publications and presentations produced for the general public each year. Source: Team reporting through Fluxx (Start Date: 1/1/2014)

2. Number of Public Speaking or Writing Invitations

<p>| | 0 Invitations | | | 10 Invitations (83%) | 12 Invitations |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invitations to OE staff to speak or write in a public forum within a year.</td>
<td>Source: Team reporting through Fluxx (Start Date: 1/1/2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Outside Foundations that Consult the OE Team</td>
<td>0 Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside foundation consults with team members for advice about OE grantmaking within a year. Source: Team reporting through Fluxx (Start Date: 1/1/2014)</td>
<td>15 Consultations (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Avg Number of Unique Wiki Visitors per Day</td>
<td>0 Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg unique visitors to wiki page per day (est.).</td>
<td>200 Visitors (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Wiki Analytics. 2013 indicator = 150 (est.) (Start Date: 1/1/2014)</td>
<td>250 Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>estimated value from Wiki Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Twitter Followers</td>
<td>0 Followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of @PackardOE Twitter followers at the end of each year. Source: Twitter Analytics (Start Date: 1/1/2014)</td>
<td>251 Followers (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800 Followers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome: 2. OE Invests in Bold, Innovative Projects**
OE invests in bold, innovative projects (as defined by OE team) designed to move the field forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of &quot;Game Changing&quot; Grants</td>
<td>0 Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Grants (100%)</td>
<td>5 Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of experimental or learning grants related to a topic identified by team as "game changing" or "forward thinking" each year. Source: Grant Tracker (Start Date: 1/1/2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High proportion of OE grants meet or exceed project objectives by project close.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. % of Grants that Meet Objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of grantees reporting that they meet or exceed (3 rating or higher) planned project objectives at grant close based on external evaluations. Source: Final grant report; PO feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No data available for 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. % of Grants that Exceed Objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of grants that exceed (4 or 5 rating) project objectives at project close based on external evaluations. Source: Final grant report; PO feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No data available for 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome: 2. Increased Organizational Capacity is Sustained**

High proportion of grantees increase capacity at moderate to transformative levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Partnership Project Grantees Report that Increased Capacity is Sustained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of partnership project grantee beneficiaries that report increased capacity at moderate to transformative levels (3 rating or higher) 6 months after close of partnership project. Source: Partnership project external evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No data available for 2014</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROGRAM SERVICE:** Organizational Effectiveness

### 1. Grants Awarded by Program/Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scott</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Dollars Awarded by Program/Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scott</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,158,791</td>
<td>$3,491,284</td>
<td>$5,244,738</td>
<td>$3,478,263</td>
<td>$3,885,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Percent of Grants Awarded by Approval Process

- **Board:**
  - 2010: 10%
  - 2011: 10%
  - 2012: 9%
  - 2013: 15%
  - 2014: 14%

- **PAG 2:**
  - 2010: 90%
  - 2011: 90%
  - 2012: 88%
  - 2013: 85%
  - 2014: 86%

- **PAG 1:**
  - 2010: 27%
  - 2011: 26%
  - 2012: 38%
  - 2013: 39%
  - 2014: 34%

### 4. Percent of Dollars Awarded by Approval Process

- **Board:**
  - 2010: 73%
  - 2011: 74%
  - 2012: 48%
  - 2013: 61%
  - 2014: 66%

- **PAG 2:**
  - 2010: 26%
  - 2011: 26%
  - 2012: 13%
  - 2013: 39%
  - 2014: 34%

- **PAG 1:**
  - 2010: 27%
  - 2011: 26%
  - 2012: 38%
  - 2013: 39%
  - 2014: 34%

**Approval Process**
- Red: Board
- Green: PAG 2
- Blue: PAG 1

**PAG =** President’s Approval Grant

**PAG 1:** $0-$50,000

**PAG 2:** $50,001-$250,000

**Board:** > $250,000

"Board" includes:
- Board
- Executive Committee
- Emergency grants
5. Median Grant Award Size by Dollar Amount

Reference #  | Grantee                        | Project Description                                                                 | Term (Months) | $ Awarded
---           | ---                           | ---                                                                                   | ---           | ---
2014-40295   | Fondo Mexicano para la Conser.. | for management and implementation of the Pescadero Program to strength..              | 12           | $200,000
2014-40261   | Context Partners, Inc.         | for a pilot of the Conservation Alliance Fellowship to strengthen the sustaina..        | 12           | $192,243
2014-39854   | Spitfire Strategies, LLC       | for Phase IV of the Friendlying the Finish Line project                                | 12           | $130,000
2014-40115   | CompassPoint Nonprofit Services| for a fund development cohort for Summer Matters participants                          | 12           | $105,000
2014-40407   | Third Plateau Social Impact Str.. | for a networked leadership program for emerging nonprofit leaders                   | 12           | $100,000
2014-40486   | Georgetown University          | for the Center for Children and Families for planning of a children's health an..    | 12           | $100,000
2014-39808   | The Vallarta Institute LLC     | for evaluation and learning for the Organizational Effectiveness Program, its ..     | 12           | $85,000
2014-40566   | Management Assistance Group    | for completion of research on complexity analysis and frameworks                      | 12           | $78,695
2014-40041   | Community Partners             | for the Talent Philanthropy Project, to promote investment in the developm..         | 12           | $75,000
2014-40191   | Bridgespan Group               | for the Bridgespan nonprofit tools and tactics survey                                 | 12           | $75,000

6. Top 10 Grant Awards in 2014 by Dollar Amount

7. Top 10 Grant Awards to Grantees New to the Foundation in 2014 by Dollar Amount
OE Grants Awarded in 2014
by Primary Project Focus

- Planning: 32% (30 grants)
- Fund Dev. / Feasibility Studies: 13% (12 grants)
- Leadership/Coaching: 10% (9 grants)
- Strategic Comm. Planning: 9% (8 grants)
- *Other/Misc.: 8% (7 grants)
- Board Dev. / Governance: 5% (5 grants)
- Operational Systems: 5% (5 grants)
- OE Exploration & Innovation: 5% (5 grants)
- Organizational Assessment: 4% (4 grants)
- Executive Search/Transition: 4% (4 grants)
- Evaluation: 2% (2 grants)
- Network: 2% (2 grants)

*Other/Misc. includes miscellaneous (3), facilities (1), strategic restructuring (1), human resources/personnel (1), and staff development (1) projects.

OE Grants Awarded in 2014
by Subprogram

- *Other includes support for OE exploration and innovation, evaluation, and philanthropy.
OE Grants Awarded in 2014
by Geographical Area Served

UNITED STATES
69 grants
$2,689,850

MEXICO
3 grants
$243,550

PAKISTAN
1 grant
$42,658

EAST AFRICA
3 grants
$132,860

INDIA
1 grant
$60,000

THAILAND
1 grant
$42,180

GLOBAL
15 grants
$674,025

TOTAL AWARDED
93 grants
$3,885,123