

## PART I - FACE SHEET

<b>APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE</b>		1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION: Application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Construction														
Modified Standard Form 424 (Rev.02/07 to conform to the Corporation's eGrants System)																
2a. DATE SUBMITTED TO CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE (CNCS): 03/27/12	3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE:	STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER:														
2b. APPLICATION ID: 12SI138953	4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY: 03/27/12	FEDERAL IDENTIFIER: 12SIHMA001														
<b>5. APPLICATION INFORMATION</b>																
LEGAL NAME: GreenLight Fund Inc.  DUNS NUMBER: 623890311  ADDRESS (give street address, city, state, zip code and county): 2 Canal Park Cambridge MA 02141 County: Middlesex	NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR OR OTHER PERSON TO BE CONTACTED ON MATTERS INVOLVING THIS APPLICATION (give area codes): NAME: Margaret Hall TELEPHONE NUMBER: (617) 252-3235 FAX NUMBER: (617) 252-2100 INTERNET E-MAIL ADDRESS: mhall@greenlightfund.org															
6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN): 200407083	7. TYPE OF APPLICANT: 7a. Non-Profit 7b.															
8. TYPE OF APPLICATION (Check appropriate box). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEW <input type="checkbox"/> NEW/PREVIOUS GRANTEE <input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUATION <input type="checkbox"/> AMENDMENT If Amendment, enter appropriate letter(s) in box(es): <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>  A. AUGMENTATION            B. BUDGET REVISION  C. NO COST EXTENSION    D. OTHER (specify below):		9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY: <b>Corporation for National and Community Service</b>														
10a. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE NUMBER: 94.019	11.a. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT: GreenLight Fund															
10b. TITLE: Social Innovation Fund	11.b. CNCS PROGRAM INITIATIVE (IF ANY): SIF - Issue Area Youth															
12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT (List Cities, Counties, States, etc): Boston, MA; Philadelphia, PA; Alameda, San Francisco counties, CA	14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF:    a.Applicant <input type="text"/> b.Program <input type="text" value="MA 008"/>															
13. PROPOSED PROJECT:    START DATE: 08/15/12    END DATE: 08/15/13	16. IS A APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS? <input type="checkbox"/> YES. THIS PREAPPLICATION/APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON: DATE: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO. PROGRAM IS NOT COVERED BY E.O. 12372															
15. ESTIMATED FUNDING:    Year #: <input type="text" value="1"/>	17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT? <input type="checkbox"/> YES if "Yes," attach an explanation. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO															
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; font-size: x-small;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">a. FEDERAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 2,000,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. APPLICANT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 5,008,205.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. STATE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. LOCAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e. OTHER</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f. PROGRAM INCOME</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>g. TOTAL</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>\$ 7,008,205.00</b></td> </tr> </table>	a. FEDERAL	\$ 2,000,000.00	b. APPLICANT	\$ 5,008,205.00	c. STATE	\$ 0.00	d. LOCAL	\$ 0.00	e. OTHER	\$ 0.00	f. PROGRAM INCOME	\$ 0.00	<b>g. TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 7,008,205.00</b>	18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS AWARDED.	
a. FEDERAL	\$ 2,000,000.00															
b. APPLICANT	\$ 5,008,205.00															
c. STATE	\$ 0.00															
d. LOCAL	\$ 0.00															
e. OTHER	\$ 0.00															
f. PROGRAM INCOME	\$ 0.00															
<b>g. TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 7,008,205.00</b>															
a. TYPED NAME OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Margaret Hall	b. TITLE:	c. TELEPHONE NUMBER: (617) 252-3235														
d. SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:		e. DATE SIGNED: 08/30/12														

## Narratives

### Executive Summary

#### BASIC INFORMATION

The GreenLight Fund (GLF) is a nonprofit grantmaking institution working in Boston, Philadelphia, and the Bay Area.

GLF is applying as an issue-based SIF focused on closing the achievement and opportunity gap for 20,000 low-income children and youth.

GLF's priorities are driven by local needs related to closing this gap in 3 cities and our primary outcomes include:

1. Improved school persistence and academic achievement
2. Increased high school graduation and GED attainment
3. Increased college access, credit accumulation and degree completion

Our model is concentrated on importing and sustaining innovative, high-performing nonprofits serving low-income children and youth in the cities where we operate. So while our portfolio organizations may be headquartered in cities across the country, GLF is focused on launching and growing their local sites in the three GLF cities.

GLF is applying to the SIF with Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) as our evaluation partner. P/PV will support our request for proposals and selection, providing technical assistance to subgrantees in evaluation planning and performance management.

GLF is requesting \$1 million over 1 year from CNCS, \$800K of which will be awarded in subgrants.

## Narratives

We have secured a \$500K contribution toward our matching funds from John Simon. In addition, Mr. Simon has expressed willingness to fully fund the first year match requirement of \$1 million as necessary.

Our proposal is focused on children and youth ages 0-24. Depending on local needs, some of our subgrantees may work explicitly on improving economic well-being, while others will address this through improving educational achievement or degree completion.

### PROJECT OVERVIEW

The GLF Fund proposes a SIF that works toward closing the achievement and opportunity gap for 20,000 low-income children and youth in Boston, Philadelphia, and the Bay Area.

To do this, GLF will identify local needs in areas research has demonstrated are critical to closing this gap: kindergarten readiness; school engagement, success, and persistence; college access, credit accumulation and completion; and alternative pathways for high-risk youth. GLF will select organizations based on evidence of their ability to achieve the above-stated outcomes for low-income children and youth:

In addition, GLF will support subgrantees to accomplish the following results:

- Increase levels of evidence and respond and adapt to evaluation
- Build capacity to be self-sustaining beyond SIF funding
- Achieve as strong or stronger outcomes at the local site than nationally

GLF's experience over the last eight years has demonstrated that replication and scale of high-

## Narratives

performing national nonprofits is most effectively accomplished with strong participation and support at the local level. By including key local stakeholders in the diligence, selection, and support processes, GLF ensures that our portfolio organizations enter the community with strong local buy-in and the technical assistance and network of relationships needed to ensure long-term sustainability and growth.

In each of our three cities, GLF has a local executive director (ED) who works with a Selection Advisory Council (SAC) to identify critical community needs and select and support organizations with proven potential to meet these needs with significant, measurable impact. Based on this model, GLF and P/PV will manage a selection process with input from the local SACs that attracts programs from around the country with a track record of success in each city's areas of greatest need.

GLF provides grant funding of \$150,000 to \$300,000 according to evidence of success and organizational capacity. Additionally, local GLF EDs will support talent recruitment, board and donor development, and targeted technical assistance to help subgrantees successfully integrate locally. P/PV will provide intensive evaluation assistance including planning, selection and oversight of a qualified local evaluator, and performance management training.

Since 2004, GLF has supported 6 national organizations to expand to Boston, investing nearly \$4 million and leveraging almost four times that in additional local and national funding for the Boston sites. Our evaluation partner, P/PV, has 35 years of experience conducting research that leads to better services and outcomes, evaluating programs, and providing high quality technical assistance.

### Program Design

#### GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

## Narratives

Building on its eight-year track record, the GreenLight Fund Youth Development issue-based SIF will run a competitive process to select six social innovations, help them expand into the three cities where GreenLight Fund (GLF) currently operates, and support them to evaluate their results in those cities and reach a higher level of evidence of effectiveness while growing. We will work with our evaluation partner, Public/Private Ventures (P/PV), to address the significant achievement and opportunity gap for low-income children and youth in these three cities: Boston, Philadelphia and the San Francisco Bay Area. Drawing on our existing footprint, GLF will run a local selection process in each city to identify areas of greatest local need and the ripest opportunities for closing the achievement and opportunity gap. GLF will select two organizations in each city (six total), that have proven or promising potential demonstrated by evidence of meaningful and measurable impact in other locations. Once selected, local GLF staff will deeply engage with each subgrantee to develop a strong local staff team and Board of Directors, build local relationships they will need to establish themselves, create a strong organizational foundation to facilitate growth, and build their evidence of success in the new community.

As noted, we plan to select two subgrantees per city. This volume is informed by lessons learned from our experiences in Boston, recognizing that organizations new to a city need intensive local capacity building support to succeed and grow.

GLF's SIF proposal is based on its work in Boston over the past eight years. Since 2004, GLF has worked in the Boston community to support the replication and growth of high-performing, evidence-based nonprofits creating impact for low-income children, youth and families. GLF has created a locally-centered, demand-driven process designed to identify specific gaps in service in the cities we serve, conduct intensive diligence on organizations throughout the country addressing these needs,

## Narratives

and select organizations with compelling evidence of success and strong organizational capacity to expand their models to GLF cities. Because GLF operates on the demand side of the nonprofit scale -- that is, working with the local community to proactively attract and support relevant national models -- we create an environment where effective organizations enter our cities with strong buy-in from local stakeholders and funders, and the support and technical assistance to help them quickly and effectively implement their models and grow their impact at the local level.

Since its founding in Boston, GLF has worked to improve the lives of children and youth by bringing six innovative organizations to the city: Raising a Reader, Friends of the Children, Peer Health Exchange, Youth Villages' Transitional Living Program, the Family Independence Initiative, and Single Stop USA. Over the last year, GLF launched sites in Philadelphia and the San Francisco Bay Area and brought on executive directors, advisors, and a growing base of donors to select and support portfolio organizations there. The three cities are guided and overseen by GLF's national board and staff leadership, and network through shared learning opportunities. All GLF cities share a common diligence process, a common approach to building high impact, sustainable organizations, and routine collaboration both remotely and in-person.

### SOCIAL INNOVATIONS FUND STRUCTURE

GLF will be an issue-based SIF focused on Youth Development, with a specific objective of closing the achievement and opportunity gap for 20,000 low-income children and youth ages 0-24 in Boston, Philadelphia and the San Francisco Bay Area.

To do this, GLF will identify local needs in areas research has demonstrated are critical to closing this gap: kindergarten readiness; school engagement, success, and persistence; college access, credit

## Narratives

accumulation and completion; and alternative pathways for high-risk youth. GLF will select organizations based on evidence of their ability to achieve the following outcomes for low-income children and youth:

1. Improved school persistence and academic achievement
2. Increased high school graduation and GED attainment
3. Increased college access, credit accumulation and degree completion

In addition, GLF will support subgrantees to accomplish the following results:

- Increase their levels of evidence and develop the tools to respond and adapt to evaluation
- Build the capacity to be self-sustaining beyond SIF funding and GLF support
- Achieve as strong or stronger outcomes at the local site than the national organizational outcomes

### SUBSTANTIATED NEED

The three target cities have a significantly greater achievement and opportunity gap for low-income children and youth than the nation as a whole.

Nationally, 44% of children live below 200% of poverty, 75% of students graduate from high school on time, and 48% of youth 18-24 are enrolled in or have completed college. [Sources include Annie E. Casey Foundation's Kids Count Data Center 2010 and the National Center for Education Statistics 2011]. According to the 2011 National Assessment of Education Progress scores, nationally the achievement gap between low-income students and their higher incomes peers is 10.4%.

- In Philadelphia, 61% of children live below 200% of poverty; only 61% of students graduate high school within four years of enrollment; just 24% of youth 18-24 are enrolled in or have completed

## Narratives

college; and statewide there is an average of a 13% gap in student achievement between low-income students and their peers (based on National Assessment of Educational Progress scores 2011).

- In Oakland, one of the Bay Area's most challenged cities where GLF San Francisco Bay Area works, 53% of children live below 200% of poverty; 60% of students graduate high school in four years; 32% of youth 18-24 are enrolled in or have completed college and the achievement gap for low-income students is 12%.

- In Boston, 44% of children live below 200% of poverty, on par with the national average, but only 64.4% of students graduate high school within four years of enrollment; 45% of young adults are enrolled in or have completed college. Boston area community college graduation rates for first-time, full-time students are substantially lower than the national average -- 14% as compared with 22% nationally. [The Case for Community Colleges: Aligning Higher Education and Workforce Needs in Massachusetts, The Boston Foundation, November 2011]. Statewide, there is an average of an 11% gap in student achievement between low-income students and their peers.

### THEORY OF CHANGE: GLF'S MODEL OF DEMAND-DRIVEN REPLICATION

In the growing focus on scale and replication in the nonprofit sector, too little attention has been paid to ensuring that quality implementation accompanies program replication, and sustainability is often not adequately attended to, either. Diminished results and diminished programs have slowed scale and replication efforts. In a 2008 article on replication, the Bridgespan Group explains that in replication organizations, "Local stakeholder enthusiasm often proves hard to come by [and] nonprofits' leaders end up compromising their program in order to convince a new geography to take it on." The same article goes on to explain, "Organizations rarely replicate successfully without struggling with quality

## Narratives

somewhere along the way. Fully 70 percent of our survey respondents indicated that maintaining quality at existing sites while opening new ones was a challenge." [Getting Replication Right: The Decisions That Matter Most for Nonprofit Organizations Looking to Expand, K. Campbell, M. Taft-Pearman, The BridgespanGroup, June 3, 2008, <http://www.bridgespan.org/LearningCenter/ResourceDetail.aspx?id=398>]

GLF was created to address these problems, by building the ability of replicating organizations to be as or more effective in the new community and increasing the efficiency of their replication. GLF does this first by ensuring that replication responds to urgent community needs. GLF then runs a locally-driven process to find social innovations that have proven potential to make a significant impact against that need. When GLF selects an organization, GLF focuses support not only on funding the replicating organization, but also on finding and supporting exceptional local leadership, helping the organization navigate the local environment, introducing the organization to individuals and institutions that can support it in a variety of ways, and providing resources to implement strong local data management and evaluation. GLF proposes to follow this same approach with our SIF subgrantees.

### GLF'S ABILITY TO SUPPORT PROGRAM GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

GLF's ability to successfully implement its SIF program is based on eight years of experience replicating social innovations into Boston and supporting them to meet or exceed results in other cities, achieve measurable local impact and build the foundation for sustainability.

The success of our approach is illustrated by GLF's portfolio organizations in Boston:

- Friends of the Children in Boston is the second largest chapter in terms of funds raised and the

## Narratives

number of children served, the largest being the original chapter. Its data collection and analysis system has been replicated throughout the national Friends of the Children network.

- Raising A Reader-Massachusetts is the only RAR affiliate to have expanded statewide and is reaching more children and families annually than any other affiliate. It has developed parent training videos that are now distributed to other affiliates by the national headquarters, and is leading the network with its evaluation on RAR's results with children in family child care.

- Peer Health Exchange is the second largest local chapter in terms of numbers of youth served annually. It is reaching 65% of all Boston Public School ninth graders with its year-long comprehensive health education program, a penetration rate that far exceeds that of other cities. Its local Board of Overseers is creating the policies and procedures, board structures and board leadership that will be emulated by the boards of other local sites.

Collectively, GLF's six portfolio organizations are reaching 15,000 children and families with their proven, life-changing programs (all have at least preliminary evidence of effectiveness, 3 have moderate or strong evidence, and one is participating in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and Health-funded randomized longitudinal control study). GLF's portfolio organizations employ 50 staff members and engage 52 board members. They are all progressing on pace to build the organizational foundation to sustain themselves in Boston. GLF no longer provides funding to the first three portfolio organizations, Friends of the Children, Raising A Reader and Peer Health Exchange. All continue to thrive, attract new resources, and grow their services, some far beyond their original plans.

This experience, GLF's tested and codified selection process, its strategic approach to supporting organizations locally, and its strong staff and volunteer leadership in the three cities, create a strong

## Narratives

foundation for effectively implementing its SIF program.

In each of the three cities where GLF operates, it employs an executive director and has developed volunteer Selection Advisory Councils (SAC) made up of leaders from the nonprofit, academic, philanthropic, public, and private sectors. Boston's SAC has more than 25 active members including heads and trustees of major local foundations (e.g. Amy Berylson, trustee of the Smith Family Foundation), local executive directors of national organizations (e.g., Casey Recupero, ED of Year Up Boston), leaders of major local initiatives (e.g., Kristin McSwain, ED of Boston Opportunity Agenda), relevant academics (e.g., Andy Hahn, professor at the Heller School of Social Policy at Brandeis University and director of the Sillerman Center for the Advancement of Philanthropy at Brandeis), private sector entrepreneurs and investors (e.g., Chuck Brizius, managing director of Thomas H. Lee Partners) and local government officials (e.g., Judith Kurland, the city's Director of Community Partnerships).

The SAC is key to helping GLF identify urgent, critical community needs and selecting organizations to support. For example, the SAC in Boston has helped GLF uncover and understand the unique challenges and nuances of early education in the city, the population of young people aging out of foster care, and community college completion rates that are significantly lower than national averages. The SAC's knowledge of these issues as they exist on-the-ground in Boston, and their review of organizations under GLF consideration, led to the selection of Raising A Reader, Youth Villages' Transitional Living program and Single Stop USA.

The SAC meets three-to-four times during the selection process to consider and provide input on organizations. For GLF's SIF process, the SACs will review current local data and share expertise on

## Narratives

the achievement and opportunity gap in cities, review applications and help GLF vet and select subgrantees.

Once GLF selects a portfolio organization, it supports them in the following ways:

- Funding at a significant level (\$600,000-\$800,000) over the first four-to-five years in the new city
- Recruiting strong staff and board leadership
- Connecting the organization to people and partners they will need to be successful
- Taking a seat on local boards of directors to support organizational development, effective governance, ongoing fund development, strategic planning and fiscal management
- Showcasing portfolio organizations to a large network of prospective donors through multiple events each year
- Monitoring the organization's progress toward impact and sustainability using GLF's scorecard tool and identifying areas to improve

GLF will support its SIF subgrantees in the same way, with the significant addition of providing subgrantees more funding for evaluation and intensive evaluation assistance provided by P/PV.

### DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

GLF's subgrantee selection processes will happen concurrently in each city where we operate, led by the local GLF ED and supported by the local SACs, P/PV, and GLF's national staff. While each city will have its own local advisors supporting and informing its process, the fundamental criteria for selection will be consistent across cities. In evaluating subgrantees, GLF will rely on the following criteria:

- Innovation: the organization meets a critical community need with an innovative approach

## Narratives

- Evidence: the organization has preliminary or moderate evidence of addressing this need in similar urban environments
- Organizational Capacity: the organization has the internal capacity to expand into new markets, reach significant scale there, and maintain a high level of quality
- TA and Evaluation Readiness and Commitment: the organization is willing and able to participate in intensive technical assistance and evaluation during the course of the grant period

### SUBGRANTEE SELECTION

GLF's timeline for selection will happen within a six month period, selecting two portfolio organizations in each of Boston, Philadelphia, and the Bay Area. The process will proceed in the following sequence:

September -- October 2012: Issue identification in each city (local SAC, GLF staff)

October -- November 2012: Open RFP (Public/Private Ventures, GLF Staff)

December 2012 -- February 2013: Diligence and selection of six portfolio organizations (P/PV, local SAC, GLF staff)

March 2013: Support with local launch, executive hire, board and donor development, and relationship building (local SAC and GLF staff, GLF supporters)

Each of these stages is explained in greater detail below.

### STAGES OF SUBGRANTEE SELECTION

1. Issue Identification: Within the GLF SIF's objective of closing the achievement and opportunity gap, GLF plans to address specific issues most relevant to the cities where it operates. In all three

## Narratives

cities, the local SAC will help GLF staff find and assess local data on child and youth outcomes and provide insight into critical externalities including the policy environment, local leadership, and the funding environment, which affect the probability of success of a national model. Each local SAC will help GLF select one-to-two specific areas of focus, within GLF SIF's overall goal and overarching outcomes.

2. Open RFP: GLF will work with our evaluation partner, Public/Private Ventures, to design an RFP that asks organizations to demonstrate how they address identified local needs and explain their base of evidence showing results against these needs. GLF will post and promote the RFP widely using its Web site, Facebook page, e-newsletter, and communications with a large network locally and nationally. In addition, GLF will reach out to local and national issue experts, as well as local stakeholders to source applicants. Past GLF processes have attracted organizations of diverse sizes and from diverse geographies. GLF has successfully sourced hundreds of candidate organizations in the past using local and national networks and organizations like Ashoka, Echoing Green, New Profit, Draper Richards Foundation and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

3. Diligence and selection: GLF staff and P/PV will perform intensive diligence on prospective subgrantees. GLF will use various tools it has developed to aid in the diligence and selection process of SIF subgrantees (e.g. GLF due diligence/selection guide which includes: intake document and document review tools, site visit overview and checklist, and management team interview outline/questions). P/PV will play the lead role in reviewing evaluation data to ensure preliminary or moderate evidence and organizational capacity to implement additional evaluation. GLF staff will review all applications and bring forward all those that meet GLF SIF eligibility criteria. GLF and P/PV staff will then do preliminary diligence based on all GLF SIF criteria and present 8 applicants to the SACs in each city. Local SACs will review and rate these applications for expansion to their cities

## Narratives

and advise the local GLF executive director on the three-to-four to move on to the full diligence phase.

GLF EDs in each city will then conduct site visits with the finalist organizations that have proposed expansion to their cities and will undertake community landscape analysis to determine whether the organizations fit local circumstances and can garner the early partners and supporters they will need to be successful. Local EDs will present findings and recommendations to the local SACs at a final selection meeting. GLF will select two organizations in each city and award grants in the range of \$150,000-\$300,000/year each over five years. The size of these grants will be determined by the level of evidence of success in other cities, providing greater funding to organizations that have stronger levels of evidence. We will weight criteria in selecting organizations and determining grant sizes in the following way:

- Level of evidence and internal capacity to support local performance management -- 40%
- Potential for scale in the new community -- 35%
- Innovation of the model locally and in its field nationally -- 25%

4. Implementation support and technical assistance: As research has shown and GLF has learned over the past eight years, perhaps the most complex aspects of scale are achieving high quality implementation and sustainability at the local level. GLF and the local SACs will address this with subgrantees by bringing local knowledge and relationships to attract excellent local staff and board leadership, funders and critical partners. The local GLF ED will sit on subgrantees' local Boards of Directors, work with the national organization to recruit a strong local ED, introduce the ED to key local actors, help develop local launch plans and monitor and review progress toward local impact and sustainability. Additionally, P/PV will work closely with subgrantees to implement sound local performance management systems and build their evaluation plans with a goal of building their level evidence. To ensure the appropriate level of subject area expertise, subgrantees will select their own

## Narratives

local evaluators with significant support from P/PV.

### EVALUATION PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The GLF Fund is applying in collaboration with Public/Private Ventures (P/PV), a nationally-recognized research and evaluation firm with expertise in youth development, including mentoring, out-of-school time services and workforce, and a 35-year history of directly managing or guiding the piloting and scaling of publicly- and privately-funded programs.

P/PV will consult with GLF on overall SIF evaluation strategy. The purpose of the GLF SIF evaluation is to strengthen the overall initiative by:

1. Ensuring that well-qualified subgrantees with research-based program models and at least preliminary evidence of effectiveness are selected;
2. Improving the capacity of subgrantees to use data and evaluation for performance improvement, and ready them for participation in a rigorous evaluation that moves them to a higher level of evidence;
3. Helping subgrantees select local evaluators to conduct rigorous evaluations that yield either moderate or strong evidence of effectiveness and supporting them throughout the process;
4. Developing cross-site metrics and a reporting structure that enhances implementation, TA provision and accountability; and
5. Documenting the process and lessons through formative evaluation in order to expand the knowledge base about growth and replication, including the efficacy of the GLF approach.

Evaluation of the GLF SIF will be coordinated and conducted by three evaluation entities: a GLF director of programs and evaluation; P/PV (the "national" evaluator); "local" evaluators for each of

## Narratives

the subgrantees. P/PV's past experience suggests that this is a robust evaluation approach for a multi-site, multi-agency model. The role descriptions follow:

- GLF Director of Programs and Evaluation -- The GLF director will be responsible for the day-to-day monitoring of the initiative's progress through the collection and distillation of high quality program monitoring data, determining if programs are achieving benchmarks, identifying areas where programmatic mid-course corrections are needed, and assuring that TA efforts are being guided by data and evaluation activities.

- P/PV -- P/PV, as the "national" evaluator, will focus on three main tasks: 1) providing evaluation technical assistance to GLF and subgrantees; 2) charting the progress of the initiative by analyzing information on subgrantee progress through both common and project-specific measures and interviews with GLF SIF staff--all designed to document implementation lessons, identify areas ripe for mid-course correction and inform TA provision; 3) help subgrantees to select and contract with an appropriate evaluation partner and research design that moves them to a higher level of evidence.

- "Local" Evaluators -- Local evaluators will be responsible for conducting the studies that move subgrantees to a higher level of evidence. With P/PV's support, the local evaluators will develop and implement approaches to evaluation that are tailored to meet the needs and objectives of the specific community and intervention, but which have a common framework for assessment grounded in a meaningful set of cross-intervention indicators of performance and outcomes. Local evaluators, who do not have to be locally-based in GLF cities, will work closely with subgrantees to create a local evaluation plan that is responsive to the structure, intent and expected outcomes of that subgrantee's work and provides useful and timely information to support decision-making throughout the life of the project. Subgrantees will pay for these evaluations through their subgrant budgets.

### 1. Supporting the selection process

## Narratives

As referenced in the selection process outlined previously, P/PV will assist GLF to develop a competitive selection process RFP that reflects the importance of robust evaluation as a condition of selection and that clearly describes the expectations surrounding evaluation and assessment to which subgrantees must agree. Drawing on their youth and young adult expertise, they will ensure the focus on closing the achievement and opportunity gap is well articulated and representative examples of promising interventions and outcomes are described. P/PV will also work with GLF to build off of existing GLF diligence and selection tools to develop a protocol and rubrics--including document review, site visits, and interviews--for assessing the suitability of applicants for participation in the initiative. The elements of these protocols and rubrics will include:

- Types, quality of available evidence of effectiveness in implementation and desired outcomes;
  - Capacity to grow while sustaining programmatic quality;
  - Organizational infrastructure to support growth and greater demands for evidence of effectiveness;
- and
- Responsiveness to the expectations and goals of the GLF SIF initiative.

As part of the due diligence process, P/PV will help GLF conduct an informal audit of the existing performance management and evaluation activities/experience of each subgrantee finalist to reveal their ability to provide accurate, timely data needed for the proposed evaluation of the intervention.

As noted, we expect that some of the organizations applying as potential SIF subgrantees --by virtue of their age and size--will require support in strengthening an effective performance management system (both the technical software and the internal processes and learning platforms necessary).

However, we also expect to find variation across organizations, requiring that support be tailored to their individualized needs. The audits will focus on understanding the subgrantees' current knowledge, use of, and concerns about: evidence-based practices, performance management, and

## Narratives

evaluation. This information will be utilized by GLF to develop technical assistance plans, as well as to inform evaluation efforts. P/PV will also support the subgrantee selection process by providing an assessment of the current level of evidence achieved by potential subgrantees (in relationship to the evidence framework outlined in the SIF NOFA). In addition to aiding in the selection process, this information will inform the local evaluation plans and methodologies, with the goal of moving each subgrantee toward a higher level of evidence during the course of their SIF subgrant.

### 2. Building the capacity of subgrantees to use evaluation and data

P/PV will provide evaluation technical assistance to both GLF and the subgrantees during the early years of the initiative. P/PV has extensive experience in providing effective evaluation TA to organizations at all developmental levels (see Organizational Capacity section). The evaluation will comprise a combination of both GLF SIF-wide TA and customized TA.

#### GLF SIF-Wide TA

P/PV will provide a series of four workshops for GLF SIF subgrantees. Two confirmed topics are: 1) selecting and working with a local evaluator and, 2) performance management. The other two topics will be determined by GLF and P/PV together, and will be jointly delivered by P/PV and GLF to highlight the close relationship between the ongoing evaluation and the objectives of the overall initiative. Potential topics could include: program logic models, working with databases, or evaluation for sustainability.

#### Customized TA

As subgrantees select local evaluators, GLF and P/PV will provide individualized assistance to both the subgrantees and local evaluators. First, P/PV will be available to assist subgrantees in the

## Narratives

development of their local evaluator RFP and scoring process. P/PV will also review local evaluator finalists for each subgrantee organization, and will review, if needed, the local evaluator contracts. Second, P/PV will serve as the GLF SIF evaluation coordinating entity. They will hold bi-monthly evaluator conference calls to share information and to, where possible, identify resource-sharing opportunities, common metrics and evaluation challenges.

Finally, P/PV, together with GLF, the subgrantees and the local evaluators themselves, will generate a reporting protocol, which will include both common and subgrantee specific information.

Periodically, P/PV will support GLF in their review of local evaluator reports to identify common themes in programmatic successes and challenges (which can potentially illuminate the need for mid-course corrections at the intermediary level). Some common areas upon which P/PV plans to focus evaluation attention are programmatic outcomes, sustainability, growth metrics and performance management.

### 3. Help subgrantees select local evaluators and support them during rigorous evaluations

As noted in the Customized TA section above, P/PV will support subgrantees with the selection of a local evaluator and contracting for that evaluation and, work across subgrantees and local evaluators to provide support during the planning and execution of rigorous evaluations. Subgrantees will be responsible for funding evaluations that yield moderate or strong evidence of effectiveness.

### 4. Cross-site metrics and reporting

During the early stages of the initiative, P/PV will develop--based on the array of likely subgrantee applicants' goals and objectives and those of the overall initiative--an initial measurement framework for assessing the overall project. This preliminary measurement framework will be assessed for

## Narratives

completeness and 'fit' using the proposals submitted by applicant organizations and GLF's goals and objectives. The goal is to develop a common set of metrics that can be readily obtained from all subgrantees to document progress towards GLF SIF goals. GLF, with P/PV's support, will use these metrics in the initiative's dashboards and reports. P/PV anticipates that the metrics will include a combination of indicators of implementation achievements, positive benefits for targeted children and youth, and community-wide indicators reflecting the experiences of young people served. Once subgrantees are selected, P/PV will help GLF finalize a measurement framework for both the subgrantees and the initiative as a whole. This framework will guide the initiative, both in terms of identifying needs for technical assistance and local evaluation. The measurement framework will be reviewed annually and revised, as needed, to reflect emergent issues and challenges.

### 5. Formative evaluation

As the national evaluator for the GLF SIF, P/PV will document the story of the GLF SIF initiative. The goal of the formative evaluation is two-fold: 1) to strengthen the initiative itself, and 2) to provide an analysis of the efficacy and scalability of the GLF SIF approach for the field. Specifically, the evaluation will seek to answer the following types of questions:

- How does GLF respond to emergent site-based challenges?
- How does the GLF approach benefit target children, youth and the communities in which they live?
- What were the successes and challenges in GLF's subgrantee selection process?
- How does GLF support the expansion of the selected subgrantees to new locations or to an expanded population?

The bulk of the data for this analysis will come from reviews of local evaluator reports and subgrantee and GLF performance data. However, P/PV will also conduct annual interviews of GLF staff and

## Narratives

partners. The information gleaned from these interviews will illuminate strengths and weaknesses in GLF SIF implementation--which P/PV will distill and present to GLF in annual evaluation memos. In addition to summarizing the findings from the site visit, annual evaluation memos will provide an informal analysis of subgrantee progress (based on data from monthly performance data), as well as other information from the local evaluators (as per their evaluation timeline). The purpose of the memos will be to identify successes and challenges of the initiative, and identify areas that need to be addressed in order to improve performance at the intermediary level. Finally, P/PV plans to develop a final published report on the initiative in year five that will present the story of GLF's SIF initiative and summarize the findings across the GLF evaluation to inform future scaling efforts.

### Evaluation Cost Narrative

P/PV's evaluation costs for the full five-year period are estimated to total \$940,599 covering 694 full staff days. Costs are highest in year two, when evaluation TA peaks, and years four and five, when wrap-up activities necessitate extensive data analysis and a final publication (year five).

Personnel and Other Direct Costs by Year: Year 1 (\$108,945); Year 2 (\$177,046); Year 3 (\$151,875); Year 4 (\$190,003); Year 5 (\$227,221). Subtotal: \$855,090. Overhead (10%): \$85,509. Total: \$940,599.

The \$855,090 in personnel and direct costs break down as follows: project management, alignment, and coordination (\$234,022); competitive selection process support and participation (\$16,547); building the capacity of subgrantees to use data and evaluation (\$236,588); cross-site metrics and reporting (\$136,563); formative evaluation (\$231,370).

## Narratives

Major Year 1 Activities: help to develop RFP with GLF; participate in selection process; confirm level of evidence of subgrantees; perform initial audit of performance management and evaluation capacities of subgrantees; provide guidance to sites on local evaluations, including RFP development and evaluator selection; conduct first evaluation workshop; develop initial cross-site metrics and data dashboard for GLF. Total Year 1 costs (personnel and other direct, plus overhead) as reflected in GLF SIF budget: \$119,840.

Major Year 2 Activities: host second evaluation workshop; provide additional guidance to sites on local evaluations; review performance management and evaluation capacities of subgrantees; convene evaluation partners; revise data dashboard and metrics, as appropriate; support data collection and analysis with GLF and subgrantees; qualitative interviews and analysis.

Major Years 3 and 4 Activities: host remaining workshops and re-present workshops as needed; provide guidance to sites on local evaluations; convene evaluation partners; revise data dashboard and metrics, as appropriate; support data collection efforts; initiative-level mid-course review and adjustments with GLF; ongoing data collection, analysis and interviews.

Major Year 5 Activities: provide guidance to sites on local evaluations; convene evaluation partners; revise data dashboard and metrics, as appropriate; support data collection efforts; ongoing data collection, analysis and interviews; extensive data analysis for entire initiative; write final, published report.

### GROWING SUBGRANTEE IMPACT

GLF has based its approach to helping organizations expand into Boston, in large part, on extensive

## Narratives

interviews with Boston community leaders and social entrepreneurs who had experience replicating or planned to replicate their organizations to new geographies.

From social entrepreneurs, GLF heard that the biggest challenges to replication were finding a dynamic, capable ED, developing the right relationships in the new city, raising funds to launch and sustain the organization locally, and finding the right local board chair and board members. Time and again, GLF heard stories of resources wasted as national staff worked to build relationships locally and cultivate local funders. GLF also heard multiple stories of a local ED or board chair that was not effective and connected in the ways the national organization expected them to be. This affected the organization's local brand, often leading to a re-launch of the organization locally, and requiring significant expense for damage control in the community and finding new leadership. These social entrepreneurs were clear and consistent in saying the three key ways GLF could significantly accelerate replication were to 1) help organizations develop the necessary relationships in a community; 2) provide local start-up and early stage funding; and 3) help find and support local leadership.

At the same time, our interviews with community leaders emphasized the need for objective and thorough landscape analysis to ensure replicating organizations: 1) meet local needs; 2) do not duplicate existing services; 3) partner with local organizations and build on current community assets; and 4) are able to attract local financial support.

GLF's approach to growing organizational impact is predicated on the proven ability of the organization to address priority needs in the community with significant impact, is designed to address the barriers and inefficiencies of replicating into a new community, and is centered on building

## Narratives

leadership and support of the organization locally. The SIF will allow GLF to significantly strengthen its ability to support subgrantees to substantiate their results locally and build evidence of improved outcomes for low-income children and youth.

### OTHER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT GROWTH

In addition to intensive evaluation support, GLF will support subgrantees in the areas of local organizational development, leadership development and board development in three ways:

1. Local GLF EDs will engage actively with local subgrantee leadership and take a seat on subgrantees' local Boards of Directors/Advisors;
2. GLF national staff and TA providers will host in-person meetings and webinars for subgrantee staff on topics in these areas; and
3. GLF will hold events for subgrantees to connect them to people and organizations in the community that could serve as board members and implementation partners.

Organizational Development: Based on its approach with its existing portfolio organizations, GLF will support subgrantees to recruit local staff in the first year. Depending on the national organization's role, this will range from directly engaging and managing a search firm to hire the local ED, to participating in interviews with final candidates found by the national organization's recruitment efforts. The local GLF ED will sit on the local boards of subgrantees over the five-year grant period in order to play an active role in business planning, board development, organizational development and fund development. Through these board roles and regular meetings with local subgrantee EDs, GLF will monitor progress, help identify areas of capacity-building need, and help subgrantees connect to TA providers.

## Narratives

Fund and Friend Development: In each of our cities, GLF engages a community of private sector entrepreneurs and investors who can actively engage with portfolio organizations as board members, donors and local champions. As GLF has done with its other portfolio organizations, GLF will introduce subgrantees' national and local leadership to people and companies at events it holds to launch and showcase the subgrantees locally. In Boston, these events attract several hundred attendees annually. Raising A Reader's first board chair, Steve Smith, came from one of these events. He had just sold his company and because of his experience growing companies and interest in early literacy, he signed on to help Raising A Reader grow in Boston and Massachusetts. Friends of the Children recruited more than a dozen Family Friends at their first GLF event. This core of supporters went on to produce fundraisers for the organization, join the local board, and became major donors of the organization. There are stories like this for every one of our portfolio organizations in Boston. In Philadelphia and the Bay Area, the SACs will be the core group from which we will both recruit early local leaders and supporters for replicating organizations and build a GLF community of friends to introduce to subgrantees.

Community of practice: As we have with current portfolio organizations, GLF will convene our SIF subgrantees for shared learning opportunities in person twice each year, and facilitate webinars on key and common organizational growth issues including board development, fund development, leadership development, and financial management.

### VALUE OF SIF TO GLF'S WORK

GLF's proposal to the SIF comes at an exciting moment in the growth of GLF. Over the past year and a half, GLF has laid the groundwork and launched its model in Philadelphia and the Bay Area. GLF has hired local EDs, garnered significant local funding support, and developed strong founding SACs

## Narratives

in both cities. Support from SIF would catalyze growth and investment in these two cities by helping to fund early portfolios and providing the profile necessary to quickly build our funding base to maturity. Additionally, GLF continues to strengthen its capacity and model of portfolio evaluation, and the partnership with P/PV made possible through SIF would dramatically increase GLF's evaluation expertise across every site. The SIF partnership would bring GLF a step closer to realizing our vision of building a strong network of local efforts committed to finding and spreading the highest performing and most locally relevant child- and youth-serving innovations among cities.

### Organizational Capability

#### HISTORY OF COMPETITIVE GRANTMAKING

Since its launch in 2003, the GreenLight Fund (GLF) has run six competitive selection processes to select its six portfolio organizations, including Friends of the Children, Peer Health Exchange, Raising A Reader, Youth Villages Transitional Living Program, Family Independence Initiative, and Single Stop USA. Each selection process takes approximately six months over several diligence phases: 1) identification of urgent local social issues that the selection process will focus on (e.g. college persistence, credit accumulation and degree completion for low-income students); 2) national sourcing of social innovations with potential to help meet these issues; 3) an initial screen of organizations; 4) preliminary diligence, including in-depth management team calls and review of organizations' financial information, evaluation studies and outcomes and growth plans; 5) full diligence, including two-day site visits to see the model in action and interview senior staff, front-line staff, board members, funders, partners and clients; 6) extensive assessment of the fit between finalist organizations and local needs, considering local data and interviewing experts, practitioners, funders, policy-makers and academics. The selection process has resulted in GLF choosing one organization per cycle to support with \$600,000 to \$800,000 over four years and help expand into the Boston area.

## Narratives

GLF's selection criteria include the following: that the organization address needs of low-income urban children and families and the specific needs identified at the local level; that the organization is a ground-breaking, proven model delivering measurable social impact; that it is replicable; that it does not duplicate existing local services and will garner the local support and partnership it needs to be successful; that GLF can add significant value to enabling its successful growth to the new city; that the national leadership supports expansion to the new city and has the operational and financial strength to support the expansion site.

A cross-sector, local Selection Advisory Council (SAC) meets with the GLF executive director throughout the selection process. The SAC has between 20 and 40 community leaders from foundations, nonprofits, local government, academia and the business sector. In Boston, SAC meetings generally have 30 people in attendance. This group meets three to four times during a selection process, beginning with a launch meeting where the group advises GLF on urgent or emerging local issues that need innovative solutions. At subsequent SAC meetings, GLF presents candidate organizations for their review and input. National CEOs of the finalist organizations present at the last SAC meeting of the process, and the SAC helps GLF select the organization it will support to expand to the local community.

GLF has codified its selection process into a Selection Process Guide it uses to train new city executive directors and selection consultants. This 55-page guide covers GLF's selection criteria, the purpose and methods of each diligence phase, talking points for conversations with candidate organizations, and questions to use in the various interviews. It also includes the following tools: the intake and screening form to capture initial information on organizations, a site visit overview and checklist, the

## Narratives

framework for a community landscape assessment, a decision-making matrix, sample SAC agendas, and sample SAC presentations.

The local executive director manages the diligence process, doing the research, interviews, site visits and presentations to the SAC. Two GLF staff members participate in all site visits. Going forward, the executive directors in each city will support each other on site visits ensuring that there are always two GLF staff to ask questions and hear answers in stakeholder meetings and reflect to one another what they are learning on the ground. In addition, weekly calls will allow local executive directors across all of GLF's sites to support each other in the due diligence work and internal decision-making on candidate organizations.

To conduct the SIF competitive process, GLF will include the step of circulating and publicizing a request for proposals (RFP) as part of its national sourcing of organizations. The RFP will be targeted to organizations that address the achievement and opportunity gaps with innovative approaches and at least preliminary evidence of results. GLF's evaluation partner, P/PV, will help design the RFP to ensure that applicants include the appropriate information to substantiate their levels of evidence. P/PV will also be a reviewer of the applications to determine if they meet preliminary to moderate levels of evidence. P/PV has extensive experience designing competitive RFP processes. Most recently in 2011, they worked with the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office and the Lenfest Foundation to develop an RFP to select a local social service provider to implement an alternative-to-incarceration program with high-risk youth. More than 30 organizations attended a bidders conference and 9 organizations applied. P/PV formed an independent review committee comprised of a diverse group of 8 local and national experts on criminal justice and created a scoring rubric designed to measure each organization's strengths, weaknesses and competencies. The rubric assessed applicants' ability to

## Narratives

implement a preliminary evidence model that included mentoring, community service opportunities and assistance with housing, child support, public benefits and other key services. Site visits with three finalists were conducted, and a final round of due diligence was completed on the prospective winner. As another example, in preparation for an impact study of sectoral employment programs, P/PV developed criteria for potential programs to study, garnered 25 nominations from experts, and assessed 7 finalists through multi-day site visits, including verification of program data and operational assessments. Four organizations submitted final proposals and three were selected.

A group of expert reviewers from within the SACs in each of the GLF sites will review all applications and present the strongest candidates to the full SAC. SAC members will advise on landscape analysis and organizational fit in the cities, as well as attend presentations of the final candidates. In Boston, the SAC represents a highly qualified and diverse cross-section of the community. In Philadelphia and the Bay Area, SACs are currently being developed by GLF's local executive directors. GLF has held 50-100 meetings in each city, and engaged SAC members include foundation presidents, nonprofit executives, and CEOs of well-respected local businesses.

### EXPERIENCE GROWING PROGRAM IMPACT

GLF's primary activities are focused on growing the impact of its portfolio organizations and helping them become sustainable in the new location. It has supported six organizations to expand into Boston over the past eight years. These organizations started with no presence in Boston and are now collectively reaching more than 15,000 children and families. At the same time, their results are meeting or exceeding those of sites in other cities.

GLF currently supports organizations by providing \$600,000-\$800,000 over their first four years in

## Narratives

the new city. The local GLF executive director takes a seat on the local Board of Directors/Advisors for each organization, and works closely with the organization's executive director to recruit board members (primarily from the business community) to the board. At the outset of the funding relationship, GLF and the new portfolio organization sign an engagement letter laying out the terms of the relationship. The letter includes expectations and commitments between the two organizations during the four years of engagement, including: the amount of funding the portfolio organization must raise in addition to GLF funds committed; the growth in number of clients served over the four years; the budget growth over the four years; the results indicators the organization expects to show each year; and the evaluation the organization will undertake at key points.

In addition to regular board level monitoring, every year the local GLF executive director meets with each portfolio organization to review their progress toward the goals laid out in the engagement letter. In addition, at the annual check-in the executive director uses a scorecard tool to gauge the organizations' progress toward impact and sustainability. This tool is organized around five areas: Leadership/Governance, Fundraising/Revenue, Impact, Operating and Internal Capacity, and Community Awareness/Engagement. There are a total of 20 high level indicators in these areas that GLF reviews with organizations. Targets in these areas are very specific and include having a strong baseline in place to measure results against, having systems to track and analyze data, and having target metrics in place to measure intermediate and long-term outcomes.

GLF uses this tool to assess organizational health and progress and identify specific areas to focus support on in the upcoming year. Where needed, GLF provides resources and referrals to consultants to organizations and their senior leadership. Based on previous experience, however, the focus of support is generally on the staff and board at this early stage of local organizational development.

## Narratives

With its SIF subgrantees, GLF will provide more intense technical assistance and evaluation through P/PV to build the capacity of subgrantees to collect and use data, participate in formative and implementation evaluation in the early stages of their new site's operations and impact evaluation in later years when the organization has generated positive outcomes and is ready to undertake a rigorous evaluation that will expand their level of evidence (e.g from moderate to strong).

Raising A Reader (RAR) is a prime example of GLF's success in supporting a grantee's growth. GLF selected RAR in 2006 to expand this early literacy program into the Boston area. During the diligence and landscape analysis process, GLF identified the communities of greatest need for early literacy programming, including Chelsea, MA, and after selecting RAR, developed partnerships with the Chelsea public library to host the organization, the superintendent of schools to support the program in Chelsea schools, and the city manager to champion RAR. GLF engaged the search firm Egmont and Associates to hire the local ED, and then GLF introduced the ED to these community partners. Through GLF's events, RAR also connected with its eventual board chair, entrepreneur Steve Smith. Additionally, the GLF ED introduced RAR's ED to local funders such as Strategic Grant Partners and the Smith Family Foundation and helped facilitate early fundraising success. In addition to providing \$600,000 of GLF funding, the GLF ED has served on RAR's board and chaired the strategic planning and program committees. Annually, the GLF ED has had a formal review with the RAR ED, identifying areas to strengthen including board development, internal financial policies and procedures and evaluation. Through GLF introductions, RAR has connected with local evaluators from Harvard University and strategic planners from Ascendant Strategy Management Group. Since its founding in 2006, RAR has grown to reach more than 7,000 pre-K children and their families in four of the lowest income and lowest literacy communities in Massachusetts -- Chelsea, Lawrence, Lowell and New Bedford. The state commissioner of early care and education included RAR in the federal Race to

## Narratives

the Top Early Learning Challenge grant application, citing RAR as the only evidence-based organization in Massachusetts working on early literacy and parent engagement. Raising A Reader is now poised to expand statewide.

To ensure GLF has the capacity to deliver high quality support to organizations in Philadelphia and the Bay Area, GLF national staff is training local GLF executive directors on the use of the annual scorecard tool, as well as appropriate and effective board support. There are two national GLF executive director meetings planned to focus on building their knowledge and skills in key areas such as board development, financial management and fund development to build internal capacity to support subgrantees in these areas. In addition, local GLF executive directors and subgrantee staff leadership will meet together twice annually for training on these topics. One of these meetings will be focused on data collection, performance improvement, and evaluation which will be developed and led by P/PV. These national meetings will also give local GLF EDs and subgrantees an opportunity to share best practices in key organizational development areas (financial management, board development, data management, human resource management and communications).

### EVALUATION EXPERIENCE

GLF's evaluation partner, P/PV, has a 35-year history of designing, conducting and monitoring a wide variety of rigorous evaluations, including randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and quasi-experimental designs designed to yield strong or moderate evidence of effectiveness, and formative implementation evaluations, that offer practical lessons for nonprofits working to build on preliminary evidence, improve their programming and prepare for more rigorous studies of their impact. P/PV specializes in integrating qualitative and quantitative methods to illuminate not just whether programs work, but also how they work. P/PV works closely with programs to ensure that: research is of the highest

## Narratives

quality; evaluation methods minimize disruptions to day-to-day programming; and, evaluations produce information that is of direct value to program staff, as well as funders, policymakers and the field at large.

Evidence from P/PV evaluations that produce strong or moderate evidence has helped to catalyze and guide the growth of organizations like Big Brothers Big Sisters--their Making A Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers Big Sisters report highlighted RCT findings showing that weekly meetings with a mentor reduced first time drug use by almost half, cut school absenteeism by half and gave youth confidence in doing their school work--and fields such as sectoral employment--their Tuning Into Local Labor Markets: Findings from the Sectoral Employment Impact Study report highlighted RCT findings showing that program participants earned \$4,500 more than the control group and were more likely to find employment and work consistently, and has contributed to the growth of sector strategies nationally. Their random assignment studies of the Summer Training and Employment Project, which attracted more than 3,000 youth, ages 14 and 15, who were economically and academically disadvantaged and at high risk of dropping out of school, and the Summer Career Exploration Project (SCEP), a 28-site initiative serving more than 1,500 youth in Philadelphia, led to important findings about the needs and behaviors of high-risk youth, which informed public policies designed to better serve this population.

P/PV also has significant experience expanding the evidence-base of SIF-funded nonprofits. They are currently serving as independent evaluators for two SIF-funded nonprofits:

1. The Latin American Youth Center, who, with the support of the Venture Philanthropy Partners SIF, are testing and expanding the Promotores Pathway Model, an innovative youth mentoring program

## Narratives

operated in and around Washington D.C.; P/PV is conducting both an implementation study and an RCT;

2. iMentor, who, with the support of the New Profit SIF, are significantly expanding their technology-based mentoring program; P/PV is conducting both an implementation study and a quasi-experimental impact study of the program.

P/PV has also conducted numerous formative studies of implementation, in which they have worked closely with programs to examine fidelity to the established program model and the strengths and weaknesses of implementation. For example, they worked with the Youth Advocates Program (YAP), to assess the validity of their logic model and theory of change based on program operations on the ground and used that information to develop a system for YAP to assess the fidelity of its implementation. P/PV also conducted a formative feedback study of a new program component for College Summit, which led to further development and refinement of the program model. Recently, P/PV partnered with local workforce subgrantees funded through the Jobs for the Future-National Fund for Workforce Solutions SIF to examine their efforts to expand sectoral employment strategies for job seekers and incumbent workers in sectors such as healthcare and manufacturing. And, they are currently conducting a formative evaluation of the First Place for Youth program, My First Place. The study incorporates interviews with program staff, stakeholders and participants as well as participant intake, tracking and outcomes assessment data, information from the study is fed back to program leaders to inform program improvement efforts.

Additionally, GLF has extensive experience using evidence to: (1) select grantees during the diligence process and (2) assess the impact of individual grantees:

1. Selection: GLF reviews the evaluation studies of candidate organizations and rates them on quality,

## Narratives

level of evidence and results demonstrated. With evaluation partner P/PV, GLF will greatly strengthen its ability to gauge the quality and level of evidence, as well as an organization's substantiated impact.

2. Ongoing Assessment: GLF stays actively involved in local assessment and performance management. When RAR shifted its program in the Boston area to focus most of its work on family care providers, GLF included funding for an evaluation of this adaptation. After a year of planning, in 2009 Nonie Lesaux, Ph.D., an expert in early education at the Harvard School of Education, undertook a study of RAR's work with children served by family care providers in the community of Lowell. The study design included a treatment group and a control group at family-based child care providers, and its outcomes have helped shape RAR's next steps.

In addition, GLF's scorecard tool helps it monitor whether organizations have effective data collection tools and systems, as well as appropriate evaluation.

### ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM SUPPORT AND OVERSIGHT

Providing long-term support to its portfolio organizations is core to GLF's theory of change. GLF funds organizations for four years and stays on the local Board of Directors for six years. The engagement letter GLF signs with each organization outlines annual and long-term goals for fundraising, program growth and impact. This engagement letter is negotiated at the outset of the relationship to have goals articulated from the beginning, and continued GLF funding is conditional upon reaching stated annual benchmarks. Using the scorecard tool, the local GLF executive director reviews on an annual basis with each grantee executive director progress toward meeting these goals and building a strong organizational foundation for sustainability.

Key positions to support subgrantees are the national executive director (based in Boston), the GLF

## Narratives

Philadelphia executive director, and the GLF Bay Area executive director. Relevant experience of these staff members follows:

Margaret Hall, national executive director: co-founder of GLF and Boston executive director since 2003; has served on and chaired multiple nonprofit boards of directors; was associate director of the Georgia Center for Nonprofits, which provided management consulting, professional development and advocacy services to nonprofits; Masters in Public Administration from the Harvard Kennedy School.

Matt Joyce, GLF Philadelphia executive director: co-founder of Philly Fellows, an AmeriCorps funded program to place recent college graduates in key capacity building efforts in Philadelphia nonprofits; associate in the Children, Youth and Families division of the William Penn Foundation; board chair of Philadelphia Young Nonprofit Leaders; member of the Broad Street Ministries Board of Directors; Reynolds Social Entrepreneurship Fellow; Masters in Public Policy from the Harvard Kennedy School.

Casey Johnson, GLF Bay Area executive director: Room to Read international professional development fellow; Raising A Reader program and evaluation director in California and Massachusetts; Girl Scout Council of Wyoming director of statewide programs and evaluation; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future program manager; Masters in Teaching from the University of San Francisco; Masters in English from Brooklyn College.

GLF has also begun a search for two new hires that will expand its capacity to provide program and evaluation assistance and oversight, as well as manage a federal grant. GLF will hire an experienced

## Narratives

national director of program and evaluation to serve as the primary point of contact with P/PV and local evaluators, as well as CNCS. In addition, this position will support the national and local GLF executive directors in implementing GLF's selection process and subgrantee support through the development of tools and training. This position will also support subgrantees with centralized training opportunities (in-person and via webinar) and best practice sharing in key organizational development areas (financial management, board development, data management, human resource management and communications). S/he will work with P/PV to assess subgrantee data and evaluation capacity and needs to deliver effective and appropriate training, support and oversight.

GLF will also hire a manager of finance and administration with significant experience managing federal grants to coordinate compliance and reporting to CNCS with support from Insource Services, our accountant.

GLF's Director of External Affairs (not funded through the SIF budget) will handle external communications to key stakeholders among the media, funders, and community and will support the national and local GLF executive directors in highlighting the work and impact of subgrantees in Boston, Philadelphia and the Bay Area.

GLF has extensive experience investing in and growing organizations that work toward closing the achievement and opportunity gap for low-income children and youth. GLF has supported program models with extensive reach such as Raising A Reader and Single Stop USA, as well as groups that work more intensely with a small number of high-risk youth such as Friends of the Children and Youth Villages.

## Narratives

Youth Villages offers an excellent example of GLF's ability to replicate and grow a proven model to address a significant local need. In 2008, GLF committed \$800,000 to Youth Villages to bring its Transitional Living program to Boston and Massachusetts. This program works with young people who are aging out of the foster care system. While 90.6% of Boston area adults have a high school diploma or GED (State of Metropolitan America, [brookings.edu](http://brookings.edu)), nationally only around 46% of former foster youth earn a high school diploma or GED (Closing The Education Achievement Gap For Foster Youth -- Education Information Sharing Challenges and Legal Provision, Children's Law Center of Los Angeles, <http://www.sp2.upenn.edu>). Based on Youth Villages' outcomes with this population in other states -- and a robust, long-term history of data collection and evaluation -- GLF supported Youth Villages to expand its Transitional Living (TL) program to Boston. With funding from GLF and help connecting to policymakers such as the Commissioner of the Department of Children and Families and Chair of the State Legislature's Foster Care Caucus, government affairs consulting from The Strategy Group, Inc, board members and donors, Youth Villages Massachusetts is serving 93 high-risk young people (over 10% of the annual aging out population in Massachusetts) with state funds supporting 27% of services at GLF's last annual review. Massachusetts is, now the only state government providing funding directly to Youth Villages' TL services. Youth Villages expects to serve 115 aging out youth this year.

As of September 2011, at one year post-discharge from the Youth Villages program in Massachusetts, 89% of youth were in school, had graduated from high school, or were in GED classes. Additionally, 74% of youth were living at home with family and 79% of youth reported no trouble with the law -- a substantial improvement from average regional outcomes.

Our evaluation partner, P/PV also has extensive experience working directly with nonprofits to ensure

## Narratives

their programming is research-based, building their capacity to collect and use data, and to improving their performance. The activities they regularly deploy and would marshal for this project include:

1. Theory of Change and Logic Model Development: P/PV is composed of experts who specialize in education, out-of-school time, mentoring, employment, prisoner reentry, juvenile justice, and more. As youth experts, P/PV often works with organizations to improve theories of change and logic models. For example, through a comprehensive implementation and outcomes evaluation of the San Francisco Beacons Initiative, P/PV helped to shape and test a theory of change designed to affect more than 50 youth, school, family and community-level outcomes. Working closely with the initiative's leadership over the course of the three-year evaluation, they sought to identify key model components and align them with the early, intermediate and long-term outcomes that were integral to the theory of change. Currently, P/PV is engaged with Year Up, a SIF subgrantee serving disconnected youth with a year-long program of skills training and a paid internship, to clarify the student success outcomes they can reasonably expect to achieve. This iterative process has involved a literature review, stakeholder interviews with management and front-line staff, and facilitated group dialogue.
2. Staff and Leadership Trainings: P/PV works with organizations to understand the research base in their field and develop data-driven practices and cultures through on-line and in-person trainings. P/PV created several year-long programs (Workforce Leaders Academy, Sector Strategies Practicum, and, in cooperation with the Aspen Institute, the Sector Skills Academy) and has led workshops around the country (in New York, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Ft. Worth, Cleveland, Minneapolis, Seattle and Philadelphia)--all focused on using data to improve performance. Since 2003, over 1,000 participants have participated in these workshops.
3. Tool Development and Deployment: P/PV has developed data dashboards and scorecards, survey

## Narratives

instruments, customized performance management data systems and data collection manuals to help organizations collect and analyze their own data. Recently, P/PV guided the development of scorecards providing real-time data for sites participating in the Atlantic Philanthropies-funded Elev8 initiative--which provides middle-school age youth and their families with a coordinated array of support services across 19 schools in four states. The scorecards collect and visually display aggregate and individual level information such as, number and type of school-based health visits and family engagement metrics. P/PV staff worked with Elev8 sites to customize an Efforts-to-Outcomes performance management database for data collection and reporting. Data is analyzed through regular site calls and supplemented by site visits from P/PV staff.

4. Benchmarking Performance and Learning Community Engagement: Over the last 7 years, P/PV has led a learning community of over 330 national workforce providers funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Each organization in this Benchmarking Project has submitted extensive organizational, operational and outcome data. P/PV stratified participating organizations into statistically-significant peer groups and provided each organization with comparative data on how well they perform compared to their peers. This analysis has driven both independent and P/PV-coordinated data management and practice improvement opportunities. The online learning community for participating organizations provides access to webinars, discussion forums, downloadable resources, and interactive customized reports. In two related projects, P/PV has worked with 45 workforce providers in New York City and Chicago to build cultures of continuous improvement. The New York City Benchmarking Project and The Chicago Workforce Project offer interactive workshops for program managers in both cities, as well as bi-monthly learning group forums.

P/PV also played an integral role in the replication of the well-regarded Nurse-Family Partnership

## Narratives

(NFP), which pairs trained nurses with low-income first-time mothers for one-on-one home visits. P/PV has worked with the NFP for more than a decade, managing the selection of new sites and providing extensive technical assistance, including developing ongoing quality improvement initiatives as well as creating numerous peer-to-peer learning opportunities. The lessons from the NFP experience were distilled in a publication--Growing What Works: Lessons Learned from Pennsylvania's Nurse-Family Partnership Initiative. P/PV also conducted a three-year study of the growth of Experience Corps to five new cities resulting in the publication--Growing Bigger Better: Lessons from Experience Corps' Expansion in Five Cities.

P/PV's GLF evaluation will be led by Wendy McClanahan, Senior Vice President. With P/PV since 1995, Ms. McClanahan has overseen a variety of complex, multisite evaluation projects. She has extensive experience collaborating with programs to develop relevant and manageable evaluations and data collection systems. She was the principal investigator of P/PV's random assignment impact evaluation of America Works' reentry program for the formerly incarcerated and she directed the evaluation of P/PV's Ready4Work prisoner reentry initiative. Much of Ms. McClanahan's work has focused on high-risk youth, including juvenile and young adult violence, reentry and disconnected youth. In the realm of youth violence reduction, Ms. McClanahan is currently the principal investigator of P/PV's evaluation of the Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP), a multi-agency effort to reduce youth homicides in Philadelphia. Ms. McClanahan holds an M.S. in human development and family studies from The Pennsylvania State University and an A.B.D at the University of Pennsylvania (expected completion date: December, 2012).

### ABILITY TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND OVERSIGHT

GLF has managed an annual grants budget of \$500,000 - \$1,000,000 in Boston for the past eight

## Narratives

years. Under SIF, the Boston site will manage a slightly increased budget. Margaret Hall has managed all aspects of fiscal oversight, reporting, and grant compliance during that time. Margaret has had extensive experience as a nonprofit executive, board chair, and grantmaker managing substantial budgets.

GLF has recently built capacity in Philadelphia and the Bay Area to manage grantmaking budgets of the same size. In the Bay Area, executive director Casey Johnson brings extensive experience overseeing annual budgets greater than \$600,000 at Raising A Reader Massachusetts, and managed federal grants from CNCS, the Office of Housing and Urban Development, and the Early Learning Opportunity Act. In Philadelphia, executive director Matt Joyce has previously managed a \$900,000 budget, supported in part by CNCS AmeriCorps\*VISTA funding, while the co-executive director of Philly Fellows. He was responsible for reporting and compliance on CNCS grant funds as well as private funding. Matt also oversaw an annual grant budget of approximately \$4 million while with the William Penn Foundation, and worked closely with grantees on strategy and financial management.

GLF's outside financial services firm, Insource Services, specializes in nonprofit accounting and has significant experience managing and reporting on the financial aspects of Federal grants. Insource is the financial services firm for the Massachusetts Service Alliance, the Commonwealth's Commission on Community Service and Volunteerism, a CNCS partner and grant recipient.

In addition to GLF's current staff experience with federal reporting and compliance, we will hire a manager of finance and administration with expertise in federal grants management to work with GLF, P/PV, and our subgrantees to ensure ongoing compliance with federal regulations.

## Narratives

### STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Subgrantee Sustainability: GLF's work with subgrantees is centered on transitioning portfolio organizations to local sustainability and continued growth. As we have highlighted in previous sections, GLF is focused on building support and capacity for subgrantees as financial support steps down. GLF's strategy has been to decrease funding incrementally in the later years of grantmaking -- both in actual terms and as a percentage of subgrantees' overall budgets. GLF will continue this strategy with SIF funding by shifting a percentage of subgrantee funds from operating support to evaluation in years three through five.

GLF's sustainability and growth: GLF's success in Boston has been driven in part by a unique fundraising strategy focused on engaging the entrepreneurial and venture capital communities. We have found that our model is particularly resonant with these donors, as our rigorous market analysis and intensive diligence mirrors the process of private sector investing. This community of donors has grown from a few dozen to several hundred people in Boston, as the GLF portfolio has increased in size and impact. As we enter new markets in Philadelphia and the Bay Area, GLF has begun to build a similar community of donors to support our portfolio organizations. In the same way our initial seed fund served as the foundation for donor development and growth in Boston, the Social Innovation Fund, with GLF's match, will catalyze the expansion of our donor base in new cities by enabling us to demonstrate impact in the first several years. During the SIF grant period, GLF will continue to build its donor base in all three cities, and through this community will facilitate board and donor relationships for our subgrantees, supporting their long-term sustainability in the communities we serve. Additionally, GLF has demonstrated the ability to raise both local and national foundation support, including funders such as Bank of America, the Boston Foundation, and the William Penn

## Narratives

Foundation, and funds from SIF will help us deepen and expand these relationships. After our relationship with SIF comes to an end, GLF will emerge with a strengthened version of our model, an expanded donor base that includes a committed group of entrepreneurial donors in each city, and an impressive portfolio of past and current nonprofit organizations operating at significant scale and poised for greater growth.

Evaluation: Among the greatest assets of the SIF for GLF's long-term success will be the partnership SIF will enable with Public/Private Ventures (P/PV). Bringing the assets and experience of P/PV to our selection process, subgrantee technical assistance and evaluation planning will improve our process and outcomes in every city. The partnership will boost GLF's internal knowledge and capacity to assess prospective grantees, and will use evidence to determine fit and likelihood of success within the local community. In addition, it will provide us with the tools to more comprehensively work with portfolio organizations on local evaluation planning. As a learning organization, we hope to continually adapt and improve the set of technical assistance resources that GLF provides our grantees, and P/PV's evaluation will help inform both the strategy of the portfolio organizations and the areas of support that we provide them with during their local implementation and growth.

GLF will exit the SIF with a strong community of donors in each of our three cities, and a strengthened process to bring evidenced-based nonprofits to Boston, Philadelphia, and the Bay Area, ensuring organizations' outstanding performance management, adaptability, and growth at the local level.

### **Budget/Cost Effectiveness**

#### BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

The GreenLight Fund (GLF) has proposed a \$2.06 million overall annual budget for its Social

## Narratives

Innovation Fund work, \$1 million of which is requested from CNCS, \$1.06 million of which will be matched by GLF. We propose to allocate funds in the following categories:

Personnel (\$402,970): Five staff will support GLF's selection and support of subgrantees -- executive directors in Boston (50% time), Philadelphia (85%), and the Bay Area (85%) (our national ED will manage the Boston site) to lead our SIF activity in each city; a director of programs and evaluation (80%) who will work closely with P/PV, CNCS, and across all subgrantees to ensure consistent, quality evaluation, needed GLF and subgrantee training, and appropriate program compliance; and our manager of finance and administration (80%) who will be responsible for financial reporting and compliance with CNCS requirements and support local GLF EDs with the added fiscal and operational requirements of managing a federal program. We have proposed for GLF to assume 60% of these salary and benefit costs and CNCS to assume 40%.

Travel (\$77,500): Travel costs include the costs to GLF associated with convenings of subgrantee leaders twice annually for capacity building and evaluation trainings, meetings and trainings for GLF executive directors, and travel costs to support the subgrantee diligence, selection, and monitoring processes. GLF's matching funds will support these costs.

Supplies (\$1,450): These costs include materials for capacity building sessions and trainings. GLF's matching funds will support these costs.

Training (\$18,000): These costs include facilitation for subgrantee capacity building and technical assistance sessions as well as consulting and facilitation for ongoing training for GLF EDs. GLF's matching funds will support these costs.

## Narratives

Evaluation (\$100,000): These costs represent the majority of our total year one evaluation contract with P/PV. Costs include support to develop GLF's RFP, participate in the selection process, and provide support to subgrantees with evaluation planning, data collection, and performance management. Approximately \$20,000 of the total contract will be collectively supported through our six subgrants.

Other costs (\$1,443,944): A total of \$1,400,000 will be paid as subgrants to our six portfolio organizations. Of this, \$800,000 will be from the CNCS share and \$600,000 will come from GLF's matching funds. In addition, basic administrative costs to ensure compliance with federal guidelines and maintain GLF operations will come from GLF's matching funds.

### BUDGET ADEQUACY

Competitive Selection: The primary cost centers of our competition include local executive director salaries and benefits, support with RFP development and analysis of applicants' evidence base by P/PV, and travel expenses. The selection processes will be managed locally by our executive directors in each city. The EDs, along with our volunteer SACs will identify local needs and with support from P/PV manage a national RFP to attract effective and relevant organizations. P/PV also will support the assessment of past evaluation by applicants and the GLF EDs will perform intensive diligence on finalist organizations, including site visits, covered in our travel budget. Final selection in each city will be performed in partnership with our SACs. Due to the rigorous nature of GLF's diligence process and our multiple geographies, our selection cycle is fairly resource intensive, but our staff and travel budget and partnership with P/PV provide appropriate funding to ensure a high-quality process.

## Narratives

Program Evaluation: P/PV will manage an evaluation process that includes local and national evaluation. Major year one activities will include performing initial audits of performance management and evaluation capacities of subgrantees; providing guidance to subgrantees on local evaluations, including evaluator RFP development and evaluator selection; conducting first evaluation workshops; developing initial cross-site metrics and a data dashboard for GLF. GLF's SIF application includes a year one budget for evaluation of \$100,000. In addition, we expect subgrantees will allocate approximately \$4,000 (2-3%) of their grants toward evaluation costs in year one. We expect that amount to increase somewhat in years two through five to support additional costs associated with local evaluation.

Technical Assistance: The majority of GLF's technical assistance, including staff leadership development, board development, local growth strategy, and fund development will be provided by the GLF EDs in each city. Additionally, GLF has budgeted funds for two large, facilitated national convenings of subgrantee leaders each year, one dedicated to evaluation and another to capacity building based on identified needs within the portfolio, as well as regular webinars and conference calls.

Subgrants: GLF's SIF budget is designed to support subgrantees with both the financial resources needed to expand into new cities and the support they need to ensure a smooth transition, comprehensive evaluation and performance management, and the partnerships and resources to sustain locally over the long term. Our subgranting budget is designed to reflect GLF's eight-year track record of supporting organizations with thoughtful and efficient local implementation. As we have in the past, GLF will provide grants in the range \$150,000 to \$300,000 to each organization in the first year, depending on the strength of their evidence and their organizational capacity to match

## Narratives

and effectively spend grant funding. We have found this amount over a four to five years period provides an appropriate runway for organizations to hire core staff, integrate locally, build a strong local organizational foundation, launch their programs, and build the necessary base of evidence and support to sustain.

Attracting Diverse Funding: GLF has developed a unique model of funding over the past eight years which braids support from local and national foundations with a strong network of individual and corporate donors from entrepreneurial and investment communities. GLF's co-founder and board chair has committed \$500,000 (50% of our match) to the SIF relationship, and GLF has a track record of raising significant 6- and 7-figure commitments from leading local and national funders including the Bank of America Charitable Foundation, the Tudor Foundation, The Boston Foundation, the Paul and Phyllis Fireman Charitable Foundation, the Frank Reed & Margaret Jane Peters Memorial Fund, Barra Foundation, and the William Penn Foundation. In addition, we have a long track record of raising funds approaching the level of the SIF match through our events in Boston. We will begin hosting similar events in Philadelphia and the Bay Area in the coming year.

### DESCRIPTION OF MATCH SOURCES AND CAPACITY

Matching Funds: GLF has secured a \$500,000 commitment from co-founder and board chair John Simon. In addition, we anticipate working with existing foundation partners such as those mentioned above to support match funding. We will also draw from individual support from our three annual events -- which net over \$500,000 each year -- and additional events being planned in Philadelphia and the Bay Area. GLF's matching funds will be roughly \$44,000 higher than the CNCS share to support adequate operating costs. John Simon has also made clear in his commitment letter that he will consider providing additional funds toward the match beyond his \$500,000 commitment if

## Narratives

needed.

Supporting Subgrantee Match: As is our model, GLF local executive directors will actively assist subgrantees with local fundraising, board development, and donor development to meet and surpass their matching fund obligations. The \$3.5 million GLF invested in our first five portfolio organizations in Boston leveraged an additional \$13.8 million from other local and national sources. We expect these results to continue over the next five years.

### Clarification Summary

1. Your application states that you are currently building Selection Advisory Councils in Philadelphia and the Bay Area and have yet to complete the local needs assessment. Please explain further how you intend to complete these in time to execute your subgrantee selection processes on the schedule outlined in your proposal? Also, please describe any other capabilities or activities required to make GLF operational in these expansion cities.

The GreenLight Fund has made significant progress in building Selection Advisory Councils in Philadelphia and the San Francisco Bay area and assessing local needs since we submitted our SIF application in March. SACs are currently in place in both locations, and are each made up of a diverse group of 20+ members from the for-profit and nonprofit communities, including venture capitalists and private equity investors, foundation leaders, nonprofit leaders, leaders from government and academia, individual philanthropists and business leaders. Examples of SAC members include in the Bay Area Jenny Shilling Stein (executive director (ED) and co-founder of the Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation), Arun Ramanathan (ED of The Education Trust -- West) and Neil Sequiera (managing partner of General Catalyst Partners), and in Philadelphia, Josh Kopelman (managing partner of First Round Capital), Debbie Kahn (ED of Delaware Valley Grantmakers) and Kat Rosqueta (ED of the

## Narratives

Center for High Impact Philanthropy) . The Philadelphia and Bay Area SACs held their first Council meetings in May (with 15 Bay Area members and 19 Philadelphia members in attendance), where broad issue areas were selected to focus on for GreenLight's first selection cycle and that are in sync with the opportunity and achievement gap issue area discussed in GreenLight's SIF proposal. In addition, the local EDs for GreenLight Philadelphia and Bay Area have been using the last few months to meet with a variety of community leaders, issue experts and funders, as well as to research local data points, reports and policy briefs, to develop the community needs assessment.

The local EDs for Philadelphia and Bay Area have also been building operational infrastructure in each of their communities, including securing office space, as well as on-boarding three interns and two fellows to assist with refining operational systems across all GreenLight sites, developing community needs profiles and beginning to scan for innovative organizations in target issue areas. Using technology solutions including Central Desktop and Salesforce, GreenLight has centralized day-to-day operations, communications, file-sharing, and systems to collect diligence on potential pipeline organizations. The full GreenLight team has also come together for two in-person national meetings in the first and second quarters of this year for professional development, training and team building.

2. Are you open to considering current GLF grantees for expansion to Philadelphia and the Bay Area? Would organizations be able to apply to multiple cities under the SIF program? If so, please explain your plan for preventing any conflicts of interest or biases during the selection processes.

The GreenLight Fund's selection process is driven by locally identified needs, so while we are open to current GLF grantees in Boston receiving SIF funding to expand to Philadelphia or the Bay Area, we do not expect our local EDs or SACs in these locations to give any preference to our current portfolio

## Narratives

in Boston.

Our staff and advisors in each of the three cities have already begun the landscape analysis process to understand the specific, community-identified areas of need in each city within our broader effort to help close the opportunity and achievement gap. In Philadelphia, the Bay Area and Boston the SACs have met as a group and participated in comprehensive surveying to surface urgent needs in their communities -- each independently of one another. While organizations may apply to and be considered by multiple cities, the local ED and SAC would have the autonomy to select organizations based on the needs identified by their community.

GreenLight maintains a transparent relationship with its SACs in each community to ensure there is no conflict of interest, or perception of conflict, as we recruit and assess organizations. We are in regular touch with local advisors -- and would continue to be as applicants respond to our RFP. We have developed tools such as an online portal to regularly report to SAC members as we hone in on local issue areas and begin to consider organizations for support. The local SACs would meet as a large group at least twice more during the diligence process -- once to consider several prospective subgrantees in the context of local needs and capacity to succeed, and again to provide feedback on the finalists. In addition, should we become a SIF grantee, a small group of SAC members would be more actively involved in the reading and vetting of proposals. Maintaining a transparent, locally-driven process helps GLF ensure that we remain agnostic about specific organizations during the process and tailor our selection to community needs.

3. You propose that the Greenlight Fund would sit on the local Board of Directors for selected subgrantees. Please provide additional information regarding your role and the use of the board to

## Narratives

provide oversight.

As we do with our existing portfolio organizations, GreenLight EDs would serve on the local boards of our subgrantees. This would allow them to use board meetings and board documents on fund development, program and evaluation activities and financials as real-time, ongoing monitoring tools to determine the health and progress of subgrantee organizations. As have most funders in the venture philanthropy world, GreenLight has learned to balance various roles with its grantees: as funder; as advisor, coach and mentor to portfolio EDs and as active member of the local board. As a partner to the local ED, we are able to develop a trusting, supportive and friendly relationship that allows us to work together easily and smoothly to identify and pursue opportunity as well as to discuss and address areas of challenge. In addition to providing GreenLight an opportunity to monitor organizations' progress, board roles allow us to build relationships with board members, shape good governance structure and policies from within, and take a lead on key governance responsibilities that need focused attention (e.g. board development, strategic planning, fund raising). We are careful to be one of many on the board rather than a voice that has disproportionate weight because of our funding role. Our success with this approach was affirmed in an evaluation we did in 2009 to learn from our portfolio organizations what they felt were GreenLight's major contributions in supporting them and adding significant value to their work. Our roles as partner and sounding board to the ED and active, experienced board member were ranked highest after funding in interviews and surveys among our portfolio organizations' EDs and board members.

4. Given that the proposed research partner, P/PV, would no longer be in business, who would be conducting the activities for which P/PV had a lead role and what assurance can you provide that the key components would be executed as described in the application? Please address all critical

## Narratives

processes for which P/PV was specifically mentioned in the proposal, including the following:

development of the RFP for subgrantee selection, conducting of due diligence in assessing preliminary evidence and evaluation TA needs prior to subgrantee selection, provision of customized technical assistance to subgrantees, provision of assistance in developing subgrantee evaluation plans, general oversight of the GLF evaluation program for the SIF and assistance in selecting local evaluators.

Since we learned that P/PV has decided to go out of business, the GreenLight Fund has taken several steps to ensure we would be able to implement all evaluation activities described in our application. It is important to note that the GreenLight Fund worked in close partnership with P/PV to develop the evaluation plan. We are clear about the requirements of the SIF, the details of the evaluation plan, and the expectations of any firm that we would select as our new evaluation partner.

Wendy McClanahan, P/PV's senior vice president of research and evaluation, who partnered with GreenLight to develop and write the SIF evaluation plan, has worked closely with us to identify and vet potential evaluation firms to engage as our evaluation partner. In addition, McClanahan has offered to stay on as the principal investigator of the evaluation work if we choose. We are exploring this option as we talk with evaluation firms but have not yet made a decision.

GreenLight Fund has shared our SIF application with several evaluation firms and asked for and received their statements of capacity to undertake the work, as well as their credentials. We explained to all that we are looking for an evaluation partner to undertake all the roles and responsibilities that P/PV would have performed: development of evidence requirements in the RFP, technical assistance to applicants during the application process, due diligence to assess levels of evidence, technical assistance to subgrantees and GreenLight to build evaluation and performance management capacity,

## Narratives

assistance to subgrantees in developing their evaluation plans and selecting and managing an evaluation firm, and evaluating GreenLight's support to subgrantees.

We have narrowed our search to three firms: Abt Associate in Cambridge, MA, the Center for Youth and Communities at the Heller School for Social Policy at Brandeis University in Waltham, MA, and the Urban Institute in Washington DC. All three have assured GreenLight that they can implement all activities that would have been undertaken by P/PV and can do the work within the budget parameters laid out in the application. Based on their statements of capacity and interviews with them, we are confident all have the credentials, experience and staff to carry out the work with high quality. They have each identified highly qualified lead staff who would manage the project. These lead investigators and project directors are JoAnn Jastrzab and Dr. Catherine Darrow at Abt Associates, Alan Melchior and Cathy Burack at the Center for Youth and Communities, and Mary K.Winkler at the Urban Institute.

Once we learned GreenLight is among the SIF grant finalists, we asked each firm for a detailed budget based on a quarter-by-quarter task plan developed by McClanahan and GreenLight. We also have set up in-person meetings with all three. We plan to select the firm to be our evaluation partner by the end of July. If GreenLight receives a SIF grant, we would have our evaluation partner in place to begin working immediately on the subgrantee selection process as outlined in our application.

5. Please explain the governance/management structure between the legal applicant and the regional Greenlight Fund offices.

All three GreenLight Fund offices, Boston, Philadelphia and the San Francisco Bay Area, operate

## Narratives

under one 501(c)(3). GreenLight has one governing board and each of the three sites has a local Selection Advisory Council that helps identify critical local issues and vet potential portfolio organizations for expansion into the local community. Margaret Hall, the national ED, reports to the GreenLight Fund Board of Directors and board chair. Matt Joyce, ED of GreenLight Philadelphia, and Casey Johnson, ED of GreenLight Bay Area, report to Hall. The national office provides back office support including payroll, financial management, state and federal compliance and reporting and benefits administration. In addition, GreenLight Fund nationally convenes, trains and supports the site EDs and other staff to run local selection processes, support local portfolio organizations, connect with the private sector investor and entrepreneurial worlds, and raise funds.

6. Please describe the criteria you would use to determine when a program model is ready for replication.

Although GreenLight has extensive criteria for selecting portfolio organizations, we look particularly hard at the ability of an organization to replicate its program model to the new city and maintain or improve results there. Our criteria for subgrantee applicants' readiness to replicate would be built on our experience doing diligence on and supporting replicating organizations over the past eight years. Specifically we would look at the following:

- Strength of the program model's theory of change (TOC), the extent to which the TOC has been tested and refined, and an understanding based on the TOC of program elements that must be implemented in order to achieve results demonstrated in other sites;
- Capacity of the national/original organization to support replication, ongoing operations, and consistently high quality at the new site;
- Well-thought-out relationship between local sites and the national/original organization including

## Narratives

the role of local board (whether Board of Directors or Advisory Board) vis-a-vis the national/original organization;

- Justified and appropriate funding flow between the local site and national/original organization;
- Community fit, showing readiness of the community to accept and support the replicating organization; and
- Demonstrated previous replication that shows proven success at a new site, lessons learned from working in a new community and the national/original organization's ability to tolerate local innovation and adaptation where necessary (although GreenLight wouldn't require that an organization had already replicated to another site, it would be weighted heavily).

7. In the past, your organization has onboarded one organization per grant cycle. Please explain how you would adjust this process to accommodate the increase in organizations and geographic scope.

In past annual selection cycles, the GreenLight Fund has selected one portfolio organization to support over multiple years. We have done this for a couple of reasons. One, we always want to be sure we have the internal capacity to fully support organizations in a highly engaged way over several years. Second, we believe it is important to showcase one organization at a time to our community of private sector investors and entrepreneurs. This way the one organization receives full attention, is better able to get its message across, and thus better able to recruit board members, ongoing donors and volunteers.

With our SIF proposal to select two subgrantees in each of our three cities in one selection process, we would address these two issues in the following ways:

## Narratives

First, because SIF subgrantees would be the first portfolio organizations selected in Philadelphia and the San Francisco Bay Area, the local GreenLight EDs have more than enough capacity to engage intensively with them over time. They have no other boards to serve on or organizations to support. Their entire focus would be on the SIF subgrantees. In addition, because GreenLight sites would each select two organizations in one year, they would not select portfolio organizations in the year following the SIF selection process. Again, this would leave EDs in all sites the time and capacity to engage intensively with the SIF subgrantees.

In Boston, as ED Hall has served on up to six boards of portfolio organizations at a time. She is now actively serving on four boards and is exiting one of them in the next year. In addition, the new GreenLight director of programs and evaluation would take on some of Hall's programmatic responsibilities supporting Boston portfolio organizations and the Philadelphia and San Francisco Bay Area sites. The director would also add capacity to support subgrantees, particularly around performance management and evaluation, which would give the GreenLight city EDs more time and ability to support subgrantees in other key ways.

Second, though we would select two subgrantees and begin working with them immediately to expand their work into the new city, we would stagger their launches to GreenLight's network of potential private sector donors and supporters. In each of the three locations, GreenLight would support both organizations on the same timeline to lay groundwork, begin their programs, and prepare for and implement performance management systems and evaluation. One of the organizations would be featured at the launch event most immediately following the selection and the other organization would be featured at the following year's launch event.

## Narratives

In deciding on which organization to feature in year one vs. year two, we would consider which organization can more quickly show local progress and results. At the time of our annual events, portfolio organizations are more or less ready to present their work and progress, depending on what kind of groundwork needs to be laid and how the program is implemented in the new community. This would give us more flexibility in showcasing organizations when they are ready to highlight their work.

8. To what extent would the SIF-funded organizations be managed separately or otherwise segmented from GLF's existing grantees?

GLF would provide many of the same key resources for SIF subgrantees that have helped our previous portfolio organizations succeed in the past, including:

- Multi-year funding
- Local relationship building
- Local board development
- Local donor development
- Support in hiring the local ED
- Active board membership and strategy support

In addition, we would manage our SIF portfolio with specific supports related to the expectations and requirement of CNCS subgrantees. These include:

- Technical assistance on data collection and performance management
- Support in selecting and working with a local evaluator
- Technical assistance on reporting and compliance with federal regulations

## Narratives

- Shared learning opportunities with other SIF subgrantees
- Significant funding for evaluation

Along with these supports, GLF's system for measuring the success of the SIF portfolio would vary somewhat from past grantees, as we would monitor and assess the SIF portfolio along the specific metrics we have laid out in our application. While considering SIF subgrantees as part of GreenLight's overall portfolio of funded organizations, GreenLight would work with SIF subgrantees as a distinct cohort that had additional requirements and technical assistance needs, with intensive support to implement major evaluation efforts.

9. Your application indicates that you would hire a Director of Programs and Research. What is the timetable for this? Who would fulfill this role until it is filled?

GLF has already begun informal explorations for the role of director of programs and research and would be ready to begin a full search process upon learning the outcome of our SIF application. We have strong relationships with nonprofit search firms, who we expect would assist in this process. CommonGood Careers has been an excellent partner to GLF, and recently supported GreenLight's local ED hiring process in Philadelphia. We expect to have the director of programs and research on board in fall 2012.

In the meantime, GLF has contracted with Daniel Michaud Weinstock to support our initial preparations for the public RFP and diligence processes. Michaud Weinstock has consulted with GLF on our past three selection cycles in Boston, in addition to supporting our SIF application process. He is closely acquainted with both GLF and SIF and would help enable GLF to bridge the gap until we

## Narratives

bring on a full-time director.

Additionally, our Hall, Johnson and Joyce, would continue their primary roles with program management, recruitment, diligence, and evaluation structuring in each city. They have led the planning for the SIF program, developed and written the SIF application and would spend a large percentage of their time implementing SIF-related activities.

10. The application refers to subgrantees contributing 3-4% of their budgets to pay for evaluation support or TA they would be receiving, but there are no references to what GLF's expectations of its subgrantees would be for the cost of local evaluations positioned to achieve evidence at the moderate or strong level. Please clarify the subgrantee budgets around these aspects.

Our budget narrative for year one evaluation costs states that the GreenLight Fund would allocate \$119,000 for the first phase of the evaluation process, including providing technical assistance to subgrantees on developing a local evaluation RFP, selecting an evaluator, and implementing performance management and data collection efforts. These costs would be primarily supported through GLF's budget, rather than re-grants to subgrantees.

The \$4,000-\$5,000 we anticipate each subgrantee would allocate to evaluation in year one would support the very early costs associated with local evaluation. We expect most of the local evaluation budget to be concentrated in years two through five. Looking ahead, we anticipate that the total cost of local evaluation for each subgrantee would be in the range of \$100,000-\$500,000 over the five years SIF period depending on the existing levels of evidence.

## Narratives

We arrived at these estimates by soliciting feedback from a variety of organizations with SIF experience, including evaluators, current SIF grantees and current SIF subgrantees..

11. Your application indicates that John Simon would provide \$500,000 towards matching funds and more if needed. Please provide information on any other bases of financial support.

GreenLight Fund has a strong track record of raising significant funds from institutional funders as well as individuals. Major grants in the past include \$1,000,000 from the Bank of America Charitable Foundation, \$750,000 from The Tudor Foundation, \$400,000 from The Boston Foundation, \$250,000 from the Paul and Phyllis Fireman Foundation, and \$250,000 from the Frank Reed & Margaret Jane Peters Memorial Fund, Bank of America Trustee.

In the past two years, GreenLight has received major gifts from both national and local sources to support its expansion. At the national level, Bank of America has provided lead support. Locally, the William Penn Foundation committed \$500,000 for expansion to Philadelphia, along with The Barra Foundation (\$160,000) and the Brook Lenfest Foundation (\$50,000).

In our first application to the SIF in 2010, we lined up the Ford Foundation at \$650,000 and Bank of America at \$1,000,000 as match funders in addition to John Simon. We also spoke with several interested funders including the Open Society Institute, Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. We have continued to cultivate these relationships and would return to them and others to request match funding.

In addition, we are in the process of hiring an external affairs director who would start in early

## Narratives

August. She has had extensive experience and relationships with national foundations as the senior foundation director of a widely-known, well-respected national organization. She would increase our capacity to raise funds on the national landscape and for a SIF match requirement.

### Continuation Changes

N/A

## Required Documents

Document Name

Status

Match Verification

Sent