The Bridgespan Group

Photo: Spencer T Tucker

Philanthropy in the New Age of Government Austerity

By Daniel Stid, Alison Powell, and Susan Wolf Ditkoff

Collaborating to accelerate social impact

www.bridgespan.org

Whoever is elected this fall to govern in Washington and in state houses and city halls across the United States will confront tremendous fiscal constraints. And the situation won't improve any time soon given the long-term pressure bearing down on government budgets. For philanthropists pursuing social change, the imperative is to revisit their strategies because yesterday's successful approaches may well be less effective tomorrow.

The challenge is most obvious in the case of strategies that target government directly. Consider the funding of advocacy. It's "the most direct route to supporting enduring social change for the poor, the disenfranchised and the most vulnerable among us," Gara LaMarche, former president of the Atlantic Philanthropies, recently wrote in the introduction of a foundation report entitled "Why Supporting Advocacy Makes Sense for Foundations." And he's not alone; many see advocacy as a time-tested way for philanthropy to get more bang for its buck.

Our fiscal problems are putting roadblocks across that route, however, because we are now in a period in which advocating to increase spending in one area entails decreasing it in others or raising taxes to pay for more government. So advocacy to expand the role of government and government spending is becoming a zero-sum game, especially in a climate hostile to tax increases.

This zero-sum dynamic in turn is exacerbating an ongoing trend in American politics—the polarization of political debate between the Democratic and Republican parties. Since the moderate wings of both political parties have practically vanished, there is almost no common ground for the bipartisan consensus that has historically been a rich seedbed for the advocacy work underwritten by philanthropy. Not only is there not enough money to pay for new initiatives suggested by foundation-funded research or blue-ribbon commissions, but our political parties are much less able and inclined to work together in crafting them.

Of course, many philanthropists make a point of avoiding advocacy—along with other forms of engaging in and around government—because they believe philanthropy should work independently, or because they abhor the partisan wrangling and mind-numbing red tape. They much prefer to give instead to a deserving nonprofit serving their city's homeless, say, or to underwrite a new dormitory at their alma mater, old State U.

But philanthropists in this camp can't escape the ramifications of government's new age of austerity so easily. Chances are the homeless shelters they are funding draw most of their revenue from government and are seeing that revenue steadily decline, putting more pressure on their already unsteady finances. Even if their nonprofit has abstained from government funding, as some may do, it will now be seeking private funding in a much more competitive philanthropic market as peer organizations seek to backfill shrinking public funds.

As for the gift to old State U, the finances of public higher education in this country are taking a beating as state governments continue to shift more of the financial burden onto students, their families, and corporate or alumni donors. Whether they like it or not, philanthropists who have historically sought to avoid giving in and around government are thus going to be left holding an increasingly heavier bag.

The Million Dollar List and Government

Just how many donors are we talking about here? And if we accept that traditional philanthropic approaches to working with government—or avoiding doing so—are being stretched and strained by our fiscal straits, what alternatives do they have?

To begin answering these questions, a team from The Bridgespan Group analyzed a random sample of more than 400 $1 million-plus gifts over the past decade from the "Million Dollar List" database recently released by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.[1] We used an inclusive definition of working with government that encompassed philanthropic gifts attempting to shape what government does via policy advocacy, gifts to bolster government's capacity and the institutional infrastructure through which it does its work, and gifts to support the nonprofits that are integrally involved in implementing government policy.

We discovered that a whopping 40 percent of the philanthropic gifts in our random sample were connected in some way with government. The biggest single chunk (17 percent) went to publicly governed and funded universities, reflecting the large amount of giving by high-net-worth individuals to public colleges and universities to which they or their families have a personal connection. Setting aside this category of giving to public institutions, we found 23 percent of the $1 million-plus gifts sought in other ways to shape what government does, improve its ability to function, or increase the effectiveness of the nonprofits that government agencies rely on to implement policy.

1 Data accessed on November 21, 2011. Analysis involved a random sample of 439 grants from 2000-2009, out of a total of over 50,000 publicly announced, $1 million-plus grants (refining the database to exclude, for example, grants to foundations that have a potential to be double counted). The team analyzed grants individually to determine whether they met our criteria of investing in and around government.

At first we were surprised by this finding. We had not hypothesized that the proportion of philanthropy related to government would be so high. But the more we reflected on the data, the more it made sense. Philanthropists seek to address unmet needs in our society. So does government. There is bound to be considerable overlap between the two domains, especially for ambitious donors seeking to tackle our most vexing problems like global climate change or the achievement gap. As one foundation officer who has worked for years to coordinate the philanthropic giving of several hedge fund managers told us, "the bulk of the work that everybody is trying to do still lies in the hands of the government."

How might donors best do this work given our fiscal challenges and the continued political polarization? We've identified three promising approaches that enable philanthropists to work around these obstacles and in some instances to reduce them. They include investing in government's capacity to govern, giving to nonprofits in ways that effectively leverage government funding, and underwriting advocacy work to mend our broken political and budgetary processes. We share several examples of this work below to illustrate ways it can be undertaken, then draw out some general tips for philanthropists seeking to do this work.

Investing in Government's Capacity to Govern

Despite its vast resources, government is woefully constrained when attempting to invest in its own ability to get things done.

This comes as an unwelcome surprise to many philanthropists. Business leaders, for example, have long realized the importance of investing in leadership development, innovation, and other capacity-building efforts in their own enterprises, but the resources and will to do this have typically been lacking in the government. Why? First, government agencies are under even more pressure than nonprofits to avoid spending on so-called overhead,(e.g., recruiting and training budgets). Moreover, given the short tenure of many elected officials and political appointees, political leaders rarely have the time or the inclination to develop the teams of civil servants who anchor programs for the long run, or to identify and develop promising leaders who can step into the top slots of the organization from within its ranks.

Eli Broad noticed just such a leadership development gap in America's public education system—state and local governments' single most expensive undertaking. As the entrepreneur behind KB Homes and SunAmerica, Broad knew from experience that building strong companies requires effective leadership and a focus on results. A product of the Detroit Public Schools, he believed that these same principles—investing in people—might have the power to transform public education.

The Broad Foundation is focused on improving student outcomes at the approximately 100 large urban school districts that serve high proportions of low-income and minority students. "In determining how best to leverage our investment in improving America's public schools," explained Broad in *The Art of Being Unreasonable*, "we relied on the essential ingredient in any successful organization: smart people. I realized that if we could help identify or train effective school district leaders, they could give teachers the necessary resources and support."[2]

The Broad Residency in Urban Education and the Broad Superintendents Academy have innovated on existing leadership development processes in a number of important ways. First, they attract previously excluded leaders from new talent pools—including top business schools, corporations, and the military. Cohorts of Broad Residents and participants in the Superintendents Academy then go through training and development programs during their residencies that equip them to navigate and drive change in urban school districts in ways that boost academic achievement for disadvantaged students. And finally, these programs established and underwrote a national network to keep the participants knit together over time, sharing experiences and supporting each other long after completing their formal leadership training.

In just over a decade, the Broad Foundation's leadership programs have led to promising results. In 2011, *Education Week* reported that "21 of the nation's 75 largest districts now have superintendents or other highly placed central-office executives who have undergone Broad training," including the three largest (New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago). The Broad Foundation reports that 75 percent of academy graduates who have served as superintendents for at least three years are outperforming comparison groups, based on a variety of student achievement data. Four have been named superintendent of the year in their states, and one has been named national superintendent of the year. This impact in turn greatly strengthens the talent pool of leaders coming into the programs. The Broad Foundation currently receives upwards of 3,000 applications for the 50 residencies it underwrites each year—a powerful indicator of "market demand" for its services.[3]

Another example in philanthropic bolstering of government's capacity to govern comes from New York City Mayor and philanthropist Michael Bloomberg. Mayor

2 Broad, Eli with Swati Pandey. *The Art of Being Unreasonable: Lessons in Unconventional Thinking* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2012).

3 Christina Samuels, "Critics Target Growing Army of Broad Leaders," *Education Week*, June 7, 2011; impact data retrieved from http://www.broadcenter.org/about/impact-of-broad-graduates; Broad with Pandey, *The Art of Being Unreasonable*; interview with Gregory McGinity, Managing Director of Policy, The Broad Foundation.

Bloomberg's success in engineering innovations in his own city's departments has spilled over into his philanthropic activities. In the spring of 2011, Bloomberg hosted a small gathering of mayors. Among other topics, they discussed why innovation in the public sector is so hard—and how philanthropy could help. "It was notable that across that table, the barriers were very much the same," recalls James Anderson, who oversees government innovation programs for Bloomberg Philanthropies. "They increasingly want to deal with these issues that cut across agencies, across levels of government, but they are not organized in their offices to deal with those issues in a surefire way."

Thus was born Bloomberg Philanthropies' Mayors Project, which, among other activities, committed $24 million in 2011 to fund "Innovation Delivery Teams" in five US cities (Atlanta, Chicago, Louisville, Memphis, and New Orleans). These small teams, whose leaders report directly to their mayors, are looking across agencies and functions of government to address critical priorities. In Chicago, for example, the focus is on growing small businesses and on dramatically scaling energy efficiency efforts. In New Orleans, the team is working to reduce homicide and to streamline permitting and licensing processes for businesses and residents.

In pursuing these innovations, the teams will borrow from successful models for developing and delivering innovation in government deployed by UK Prime Minister Tony Blair and by Mayor Bloomberg's administration. Similar models have also thrived in Malaysia and at the state level in Maryland and Louisiana.

Crucially, Bloomberg Philanthropies is not trying to dictate a specific solution. Rather, it seeks to introduce a proven process to drive innovation in government programs and practices. In picking cities, Bloomberg Philanthropies recognized that for innovations to take root, certain conditions had to exist. Thus, they sought to identify cities with a leadership commitment to innovation and reform, and whose mayors, ideally, were in the first 18 months of their first terms in office, thereby giving the teams sufficient time to drive their innovations. To support the teams' work, Bloomberg Philanthropies is providing technical assistance and has established a peer-to-peer learning network across cities to elevate best practices. To ensure that those practices spread beyond these five cities, Bloomberg Philanthropies engaged NYU's Wagner School to document the work and share the lessons they learn with a broader group of cities as well as with other grantmakers and academics.

Helping High-Performing Nonprofits Make Better Use of Public Funding

The national safety net of social services in the United States is a curious public-private hybrid. Federal, state, and local government underwrites the bulk of the cost of supporting vulnerable people in our society. But most services are delivered by nonprofits operating under government contracts or grants. In essence, government "outsources" its social work.

However, as noted above, government is increasingly putting the squeeze on its nonprofit service providers. The Urban Institute recently surveyed human service nonprofits and found that 68 percent of their respondents said they had a problem with government's failure to pay what it cost to deliver services under a contract or grant.[4]

Government is thus exacerbating what our Bridgespan colleagues Ann Goggins Gregory and Don Howard have termed the nonprofit starvation cycle, in which funders insist on paying only for program services and skimping on so-called overhead (i.e., the ability to sustain and improve those programs over time).[5]

This problem is especially acute in government funding because it tends to be highly siloed, with disparate funding streams from different agencies focused on different problems. A nonprofit agency supporting a low-income battered mother struggling with depression and caring for two young children will likely need to secure several different funding streams from different agencies, each focused on just one of the several problems bedeviling the family.

Staff at the best social service nonprofits are dedicated to weaving together separate government funding streams and providing an integrated set of supports for the people

What about Social Impact Bonds?

One of the hottest topics in the social sector right now is social impact bonds.[1] With these instruments, a third-party intermediary lines up the resources to pay nonprofits as they deliver services and takes on the financial risk of delivering results. The intermediary is later reimbursed by the government at levels that provide it and its investors a sufficient rate of return. One aspect of this approach is especially relevant now given public sector budget woes: Government pays if and only if results have been delivered. Advocates of so-called impact investing see an important role for philanthropy to play in the upfront financing via social impact bonds of the work done by nonprofits. One of our authors has confessed to being a skeptic when it comes to the potential of social impact bonds in the United States, primarily because of the challenges that federal, state, and local government agencies have experienced in implementing more basic forms of pay-for-success programs. While still nascent, social impact bonds may prove to be an important tool for philanthropists to use in helping high-performing nonprofits gain better access to scarce government funding, and their ongoing development is certainly worth tracking.

1 See, for example, McKinsey & Company, "From Potential to Action: Bringing Social Impact Bonds to the US," May 2012; and Tina Rosenberg, "The Promise of Social Impact Bonds," *The New York Times*, June 20, 2012.

4 Elizabeth T. Boris, Erwin de Leon, Katie L. Roeger, and Milena Nikolova, "Human Service Nonprofits and Government Collaboration: Findings from the 2010 National Survey of Nonprofit Government Contracting and Grants," Urban Institute, 2010, p. 13.

5 Ann Goggins Gregory and Don Howard, "The Nonprofit Starvation Cycle," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Fall 2009).

they serve over the years—not months—it takes them to address their challenges. But this requires the case management capacity, data infrastructure, and performance measurement and evaluation system (i.e., what we might term "good overhead") needed to continually improve supports for the people being served. Government won't pay for this. Philanthropy can and should.

A great example in this regard is the Career Family Opportunity initiative (CFO), an innovative pilot program offered by Boston-based Crittenton Women's Union (CWU) to help very low-income women. The goal of CFO is to help clients achieve economic independence, which CWU defines as an annual income of $45,000 to $50,000, with at least $10,000 in savings within five years. CFO services include an integrated set of supports: incentive payments linked to the achievement of pre-established goals, matched savings, and peer support. The most important of the services is Mobility Mentoring™, the CWU-developed professional practice of partnering with program participants so that over time they acquire the resources, skills, and sustained behavior changes necessary to attain and preserve economic independence.

CWU's programming is grounded on the belief that becoming economically independent requires clients to make sufficient progress in multiple areas, including housing, child care, physical and mental health, social supports, education, financial literacy, money management, and career development. With the help of a Mobility Mentor, each client produces her own customized development plan based on where she is starting from, her interests, and her personal goals, and she carries out and refines that plan over time while taking advantage of a range of different programs and funding streams that support her journey. In order to monitor program participants' progress toward achieving economic independence, CWU developed a measurement system that tracks data across these different areas.

CWU is seeing promising early results: More than two-thirds of the initial participants achieved their educational attainment goals, completed their financial literacy training, and opened savings accounts. In addition to tracking each participant's progress, staff members regularly review data showing which services are being used most and why, and assesses whether clients and services are being matched appropriately.

While CWU obtains its programmatic funding from separate government agencies, it has also been able to attract approximately a quarter of its $11 million annual budget from philanthropic funding to cover the "overlay" organizational structure, roles, and systems required for the integration of its CFO programs, including the Mobility Mentors and data infrastructure, to support the participants as they progress toward self-sufficiency. In the absence of this philanthropic support, CWU, like most agencies, would be scrambling just to make ends meet with disparate programmatic funding streams, and it would be in no position to provide the integrated services that are making the difference for its clients.

CWU's story shows how philanthropic contributions that effectively leverage larger but programmatically restricted government funding streams can make or break a nonprofit's impact in one location. The history of the Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP) sheds light on a similar story occurring at national scale. NFP, first developed by Dr. David Olds in 1977, sends nurses to visit the homes of low-income women pregnant with their first child to help them prepare for the birth, and then to assist the mother as she learns how better to care for herself and her baby, how to plan future pregnancies, stay in school, and prepare for the world of work so she can provide for her child.

Rigorously tested with randomized control trials in three sites over 30 years, the program improved the mothers' prenatal health, increased their employment, reduced children's injuries, and improved children's school readiness. A RAND research study estimated that for every $1 invested in NFP, up to $5.70 would be saved over the long term by avoiding health care, child welfare, juvenile justice, and other costs.

"The program's effectiveness has been demonstrated in randomized, controlled trials, but to reach the next step of growing the program to meet national demand was an entirely different challenge," stated NFP President and CEO Thomas R. Jenkins Jr. To do that, NFP needed to create a quality improvement measurement system to allow local agencies to know whether they were conducting the program well and achieving outcomes comparable to those achieved in the successful demonstration sites. Government, however, wasn't going to pay for developing and deploying such a system; it was "overhead" after all, not programs.

Philanthropy stepped up to fill the gap in funding. Impressed by NFP's strong results and its carefully crafted replication strategy, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and other donors joined together to fund development of the quality improvement data system and several other key components of NFP's capacity-building strategy.

"This foundation group of co-investors was a gift in that it allowed us to focus on the quality replication of the NFP model and not have to worry about operating capital to take the model to scale," said Jenkins.

With a quality monitoring system in hand and infrastructure ready to scale, NFP was poised to take off. More and more state and local governments began funding NFP's work. Today, NFP operates in 41 states and serves over 22,500 low-income families a year. And the 2010 Affordable Care Act included $1.5 billion for evidence-based home visiting programs like NFP that are designed to serve high-risk families and communities. So the foundations' relatively modest investment in NFP's capacity to deliver high quality results at scale—a system that government would not fund—laid the groundwork for Congress to make a major investment in similar programs, helping both donors and taxpayers get much more bang for their buck.

Philanthropy can't fill the gap created by constrained government budgets, but it can pay for things that government funding won't—and in the process, strengthen the case for more effective public investment.

Mending Broken Political and Budget Processes

The approaches discussed above will enable philanthropists to work around and to some extent alleviate the fiscal constraints and political polarization described at the outset. But is there anything that philanthropy could do to resolve them?

One California-based initiative borne of philanthropy is seeking to answer this question. When five big California foundations[6] came together in 2007, their target was not to advance a particular policy nor to drive a particular decision, but rather to address the whole process by which California state government made—or increasingly failed to make—major policy and budget decisions. The foundations ultimately pooled over $30 million to form and sustain California Forward, a bipartisan organization focused on reforming state government to promote pragmatic, fiscally sound public policy that would be responsive to Californians. The organization sought a radically different kind of politics that was much more inclined to compromise and problem solving.

"We all have our different policy priorities,"

Do Political Contributions Count as Philanthropy?

It's no secret that the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision has altered today's political giving landscape. The resulting opportunity for donors to remain anonymous and give big dollars to candidates is reshaping campaign strategies before our eyes. In fact, the percent of campaign donations from undisclosed donors rose from 1 percent to nearly 50 percent of spending outside political parties between the 2006 midterm elections and 2010; and almost three-quarters of political advertising budgets funded by outside groups came from sources prohibited in 2006.[1]

We discussed including political contributions explicitly in our research, because campaign financing is in some ways the ultimate advocacy opportunity: shaping who serves in government and who will make major policy decisions and appointments. Any donor seeking results should certainly think hard about whether funding political candidates is a lever he

1 MacColl, Spencer. "Citizens United Decision Profoundly Affects Political Landscape." Center for Responsive Politics. May 5, 2011.

6 James Irvine Foundation, The California Endowment, Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr. Fund, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

Zabrae Valentine, former deputy director of California Forward told us. "But whether your priority is economic development, climate change, youth, education, or health care, at some point you begin hitting a brick wall.... It is not possible unless we address these fundamental [governance] issues."

or she should pull. We ultimately decided to exclude political contributions from our work. Why? Because while clearly a tool for change, there is little evidence (yet) that donors are shifting dollars from traditional, tax-exempt philanthropy to fund political campaigns instead. We therefore felt that our analysis and findings could stand on their own. In addition, the laws and court decisions on this topic have changed so frequently that we preferred to focus our work on philanthropy with a longer track record.

One early victory came from a redistricting initiative on the 2008 ballot. Historically, legislative district boundaries were redrawn after each census by legislators themselves, with their own political interests foremost. More impartial district boundaries could lead to more competitive elections and potentially promote more moderate representatives to the state legislature. In 2008, California voters passed a ballot proposition to turn redistricting over to an independent citizens' commission. California Forward was a strong supporter of the measure and has worked hard to facilitate its successful implementation.

Two years later, California Forward's Action Fund played an active role in the passage of Proposition 14, which created a top-two "open-primary" that puts the first- and second-place winners, regardless of party, on the general election ballot. The idea is to help elect more moderate and pragmatically minded people to state offices to break through the state's notorious political gridlock. Now California Forward has set out an even more ambitious new target—a package of governance and fiscal measures that would stabilize the state's revenue base and budget process, and increase accountability for results in government spending.

One donor has been in the vanguard to bring about similar fiscal sanity at the federal level. Pete Peterson credits his astronomical rise from son of hardworking Greek immigrants to self-made billionaire to the opportunities afforded by the American Dream. The former Secretary of Commerce and cofounder of private equity and investment management firm The Blackstone Group is troubled by what he sees as the potential for the rapidly mounting national debt to crowd out opportunities to invest in America's future.

Peterson has been working on this issue for decades. In 1992, he cofounded the bipartisan Concord Coalition to advocate for deficit reduction. When he faced retirement in 2008, Peterson saw the opportunity to devote more time to his passion. He launched the Peter G. Peterson Foundation with a pledge of $1 billion to increase awareness about the key fiscal challenges he saw facing the United States and accelerate action on solutions.

Peterson set a course for long-term success. First, he surveyed top political leaders from both sides of the aisle and found that they unanimously felt the United States was on an unsustainable path. Despite the consensus, there was little talk—much less action—in Washington about the debt. Peterson decided to rely on his advertising background and raise broad public awareness through a movie (I.O.U.S.A.), an innovative advertising campaign, and partnerships with media and nonprofit organizations.

Unwilling to wed himself to either party in service of his goal, Peterson followed his awareness building with a search for solutions. He commissioned research from six think tanks spanning the political spectrum, and hosted a "Solutions Summit" to share their recommendations, inviting key political leaders on both sides of the aisle. While the issue continues to plague the country (as evidenced by the failure of the Simpson-Bowles plan among other breakdowns), Peterson perseveres. His foundation has held three annual summits to convince politicians from both parties to work together to solve this issue of critical importance.

The vignettes described above are by no means an exhaustive list of possibilities, only an illustration of different types of philanthropic work in and around government that we believe hold promise in a new age of austerity. And this is not easy work. Democracy in America, by dint of its separated powers, checks and balances, and federal system, is effectively designed to withstand outside pressures. It takes patience and sustained effort to make change happen.

For the benefit of donors interested in exploring possibilities like these, we close with observations based on our research and conversations about how to make the philanthropy-government connection work.

Six Suggestions for Donors Working in and around Government

1. **Garden in your backyard:** While the media seem fixated on the federal government, state and local government is often where the action is. Some 80 percent of the government-related grants in our Million Dollar List sample were made at the state and local level. You can get your arms around problems at this level, and your personal relationships and networks will have much more effect.
2. **Play the angles and levels:** At the same time, recognize that the local, state, and federal levels of government can be highly interdependent. For example, if you choose a local problem such as fixing nearby schools, you will still need to recognize and join forces with others working at the state level to set higher standards for student learning. And there may be opportunities to secure federal funds to drive work in your district.

3. **Learn from others, and share what you learn:** There are 50 states and thousands of local governments. So if you are trying to accomplish something in your city or state, odds are that others have already tested solutions to the same problem in another "laboratory of democracy" to use Justice Brandeis's term for these sub-units of government in the United States. Take the time to learn what's out there, so that you're not reinventing the wheel—or worse, trying a failed strategy. And if you help invent something promising, publicize it so that others can apply and adapt it.
4. **Accept the constraints; government can't—and shouldn't—turn on a dime:** Government leaders are accountable to active constituencies and zealous taxpayers (i.e., all of us) who are just waiting to pounce on them when they bend the rules for expediency's sake. Don't get impatient at the time it will inevitably take for the flywheel of government to start to turn. Once it is rolling in a certain direction, it can accomplish great things given its resources.
5. **Look for the change makers:** If leadership is critical to get things done in the private sector or philanthropy, it is even more crucial within government. Almost every entrepreneur in the philanthropic or social sector has had his or her work enabled by someone who was just as entrepreneurial working for change from within the halls of government.
6. **Complement, don't backfill:** Philanthropic resources can't begin to match government resources dollar for dollar, nor can they make up for them as funds are cut back. The key is to identify high-impact opportunities to provide dollars that government is not in a position to supply or make investments that will leverage or increase the effectiveness of much larger sums of public funding.

About the Authors

Daniel Stid

Daniel Stid is a partner in The Bridgespan Group's San Francisco Office. He coleads Bridgespan's performance measurement practice and advises clients working in social services, youth development, education, and philanthropy. Daniel also helps coordinate Bridgespan's engagement with government at the federal, state, and local levels.

Daniel has coauthored several articles and white papers, including, "A View from the Cliff: Government-Funded Nonprofits Are Looking Out on Steep Cuts and an Uncertain Future" (Bridgespan white paper, January 2012); "Five Ways to Navigate the Fiscal Crisis," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Winter 2012), "Strongly-led, Under-managed," included in the book, *Getting Results in Nonprofits and Philanthropy* (2010). Daniel is currently leading a Bridgespan initiative to improve government funding of and support for nonprofits and blogs regularly on this topic at www.bridgespan.org.

Daniel joined Bridgespan from The Boston Consulting Group. Earlier in his career, Daniel was an American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow, served on the staff of the Majority Leader in the US House of Representatives, and taught political science at Wabash College.

Susan Wolf Ditkoff

Susan Wolf Ditkoff is a partner in the Boston office and has been with The Bridgespan Group since 2001. Her work has focused on three primary areas: effective philanthropy, public education, and infrastructure issues such as leadership, capacity building, and governance. Most recently, Susan coauthored "When You've Made Enough to Make a Difference" (*Harvard Business Review*, January 2011) and before that, "Galvanizing Philanthropy" (*Harvard Business Review*, November 2009), which explored how philanthropists can increase their impact by getting clear about defining success, getting real about what it takes to create change, and getting better over time. She has coauthored two related op-eds: "It Takes More than Money" (*Chronicle of Philanthropy*, June 18, 2010) and "The Hard Truth" (*Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October, 29, 2009), as well as two case studies on high-impact philanthropy (Tiger Foundation) and education strategy (Expeditionary Learning Schools / Outward Bound: Staying True to Mission). She has been cited as an expert by *The New York Times* and Reuters, and her writings have been reprinted in national and international publications. She also recently launched Bridgespan's first philanthropy blog.

Outside of Bridgespan, Susan serves on the Harvard Business School (HBS) Alumni Board of Directors and is the past president of the HBS Social Enterprise Alumni Association, a global alumni group with over 1,000 members.

Alison Powell

Alison Powell joined Bridgespan in 2006. She currently serves as the firm's Philanthropy Knowledge Manager and blogs on philanthropy at www.givesmart.org. Alison previously spent four years in Bridgespan's strategy consulting practice working with direct-service clients, including a charter management organization and a nonprofit focused on transitional support for those aging out of foster care. Prior to joining Bridgespan, Alison worked for Mattel as an Associate Marketing Manager. She started her career at The Parthenon Group.