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INTRODUCTION

Philanthropic organizations make a significant impact on the lives of Americans on a daily basis. These organizations play a major role in providing health care, educational programs, cultural enrichment, and basic human services to millions of people every year, all across the country. They provide citizens with the opportunity to take direct action to impact the issues of concern in their communities, across the nation, or in other parts of the world. In short, they make an important contribution to the quality of life in our society.

Increasing the level of effectiveness of these organizations has attracted more attention in recent years, as the role they play in the life of our society has continued to grow. Scholars and practitioners have noted that increasing the level of effectiveness of these organizations increases the quality of life in our communities. In fact, Peter F. Drucker recently suggested that "America needs a new social priority: to triple the productivity of the nonprofits and to double the share of gross personal income--now just below 3%--they collect as donations. Otherwise the country faces, only a few years out, social polarization."
This study is intended to be a contribution to the development of theory for designing philanthropic organizations for producing increased levels of effectiveness. Various models which define organization effectiveness are used by practitioners and scholars. These models differ in how they assess an organization's effectiveness. As such, a review of key models which define organization effectiveness is included herein.

One "defining model" of organization effectiveness holds that an organization is effective to the extent that it accomplishes its mission. This "mission accomplishment" model has been used in this research project to study the ways in which philanthropic organizations are designed. The "mission" of an organization is a frequently cited issue of importance in organization theory, including writings on management, marketing, strategic planning, and excellence. The importance of "mission" is even more frequently discussed in the literature on philanthropic organizations, citing its role in board effectiveness and fund-raising, as well as management, marketing, strategic planning, and excellence. A review of the "mission" literature has been made in order to determine how a philanthropic organization committed to accomplishing its mission would be designed.

Despite the agreement among scholars and practitioners that "mission" is an important issue in the operation of philanthropic organizations, there has been little empirical
research done which examines how these organizations currently design themselves for accomplishing their missions. This project has begun to fill that gap by adding to our understandings of how philanthropic organizations are currently designed.

The initial design feature of interest is the organization's mission. Philanthropic organizations may express their commitments in their missions—in pursuit of mission accomplishment—which provides a basis for the development of relationships with their internal and external environments. This project has examined the existing relationships between these organizations and their internal and external environments, and the structures they have for mission accomplishment. These structures are revealed and reported on, and the implications for theory development on designing philanthropic organizations for mission accomplishment are represented. Specifically, the questions engaged for the organizations studied in this inquiry have been:

1. Is the mission expressed as an intention to impact the world outside itself, or itself, or both?

2. Is the mission communicated outside and inside the organization, and if so, how?

3. Do performance measures assess mission accomplishment? In what other ways is mission accomplishment assessed?
4. What performance measures exist which link the performance of members of the organization to the accomplishment of the organization mission? How else do members of the organization know if what they are doing supports the accomplishment of the mission?

5. What are the attitudes which members of the organization report having toward the mission?

6. In what other ways does the organization use its mission in its operations?

A blend of quantitative and qualitative data were collected during this project in order to produce new understandings of the operations of philanthropic organizations from a variety of perspectives. Findings were collected by utilizing questionnaires, interviews, and organization case studies. Through this process, a rich body of new data regarding the missions of philanthropic organizations and their effectiveness has been made available for study and discussion.

The finding of greatest significance in this research project is that the vast majority of organizations studied do not use "reliable impact measures" to determine whether they are or are not accomplishing their missions. While an analysis of the mission statements of these organizations clearly indicates their intention to make an "impact" on the outside world, they have no reliable measures which provide evidence of whether or not this impact is being made. In sum, they do not know whether or not they are accomplishing their missions.
This finding has important implications for increasing the effectiveness of philanthropic organizations. Without reliable impact measures they do not know their current level of "effectiveness." And further, they have difficulty in designing coordinated action within and outside the organization for the accomplishment of the mission. Once they create reliable impact measures, philanthropic organizations can utilize them in their strategic planning and for the overall management and growth of the organization. They can design coordinated action for higher levels of effectiveness.

Another important finding in this research project is that the levels of commitment toward the organization mission reported by the staff and volunteers involved in the study were very high. Therefore, by creating and utilizing reliable impact measures, along with the organization mission, as the foundation for designing the organization, philanthropic organizations can more fully harness and focus these levels of commitment for exceptional improvements in organization effectiveness. These increases in organization performance and effectiveness will further increase the important impact philanthropic organizations have on the quality of life in our society.
CHAPTER I. PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATIONS IN AMERICA

A. General Definition

Philanthropic organizations serve a wide range of purposes including human services, cultural enrichment, educational advancement, health services, religious expression, and more. Generally speaking the aim of these philanthropic or "charitable" organizations is, as philanthropy historical expert Robert H. Bremner says, to assist in the "improvement in the quality of human life."²

These organizations are unique from business and government organizations in many ways. One way of viewing these differences is to review the extent to which each is influenced by the economy, the market, and by political authority. In extending this view, Bozeman notes that business organizations are heavily influenced by the market, and much less so by political authority. Government agencies are much less influenced by the economy, but very subject to political authority.³ Philanthropic organizations fall between these two. Funding, for example, which is significantly dependent upon charitable contributions, is a
very market-driven aspect of the organizations. And since the goods and services produced by philanthropic organizations are somewhat "public" in nature, they are often affected by political actions. This may include government regulation, funding, or the extent to which the government provides similar services to the community.

For the purposes of this project, a "philanthropic organization" is defined by being recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as a non-profit organization to which charitable, tax-deductible contributions can be made (i.e. they have been designated as 501(c)(3) organizations in the IRS code), but which is not primarily a "grant making" organization. These organizations are legally governed by a volunteer board of directors which employs a paid chief staff officer—the CSO. The "charitable contribution" element in the definition distinguishes these "philanthropic" organizations from other non-profit, tax-exempt organizations, such as trade associations.

While churches, colleges and universities, and hospitals broadly fit this definition—and while those familiar with these organizations may find applications of theory discussed herein to them—they are excluded from study in this project. These three "classes" of organizations each have characteristics which distinguish them from other 501(c)(3) organizations. In the case of churches, the uniqueness of their "spiritual" purpose is the key distinction.
Colleges/Universities and hospitals have numerous contextual differences between themselves and these other organizations. These differences include size, professional credentials of staff, and organization complexity. In terms of size, these organizations represent the extremes in terms of their annual budgets. For example, in 1989 over 70% of all 501(c)(3) organizations (excluding religious organizations and grant-making foundations) had annual budgets of under $25,000 and were, therefore, not required to report to the IRS. The remaining 30%, which do file annually with the IRS, reported median budgets of $157,000. The smallest colleges/universities and hospitals far exceed these budget sizes and in some extreme cases, such as Ohio State's annual budget of over $1 billion, dwarfs them. This size factor reflects the larger scope of these organizations and the higher levels of complexity, as organizations, they have compared to others. Adding to this complexity, and further distinguishing them, is the professional credentials of the professors and medical doctors who are key staff in these organizations. All of these factors make these organizations very interesting for study, but not as part of the rest of the 501(c)(3) group. Their differences would make them much more interesting to study as separate classes and then compare them to these other groups.
B. Scope and Impact

Frederick S. Lane, in his "Managing Not-For-Profit Organizations" article in Public Administration Review, cleverly describes the scope of the "third sector." He writes "Where else might you have:

*been born,
*been baptized,
*been sent for day care,
*learned basketball or camping,
*been bar mitzvahed,
*attended social events,
*kicked the drug habit,
*gone to college,
*been married,
*recovered from a heart attack,
*learned how to draw or be assertive,
*spent one night a week as a volunteer,
*participated in a protest over civil or women's rights,
*promoted your occupational interests,
*attended a symphony or exhibition,
*worked to fight neighborhood decay,
*contributed money,
*grown old, and
*held your funeral?"

Of course the answer to his question is that the setting for this wide range of important lifetime activities is—or at least could be—a philanthropic organization. Indeed, the breadth of this third sector is staggering. Philanthropic organizations touch us in many ways throughout our entire lives.

The scope of these contacts is not only wide but the impact is significant as well. During 1992, contributions to all organizations qualified to receive tax-deductible gifts was estimated at $124.31 billion. The economic value of the
time Americans volunteer in support of these organizations was
estimated at $100 billion in 1985. Even with modest
adjustments for inflation that figure would exceed $130
billion in 1992, bringing the total to over $250 billion worth
of dollars and services donated to philanthropic
organizations. The scope of philanthropic organizations is
broad and their impact on our society is significant.

The impact of philanthropic organizations has expanded in
recent years. The number of organizations granted tax exempt
status by the IRS has nearly tripled between 1967 and 1985. According to a recent study by Ben-Ner and Van Hoomissen,
"Growth of the Non-Profit Sector in the 1980s," this impact
may continue to grow: "It is possible that future changes in
the economy will further increase reliance on the nonprofit
sector. Future rapid growth in the size of the nonprofit
sector may make it more difficult for it to fulfill its
special role."  

The sector does have limitations. Sector leaders say
that government officials must remember the lessons of Herbert
Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the depression years.
Philanthropic organizations cannot be called upon to provide
basic services and relief. This must remain the government's
responsibility. Brian O'Connell, President of INDEPENDENT
SECTOR, has frequently written about the danger of government
officials attempting to repeat Hoover's error. "Voluntary
organizations provide wonderful elements of spirit,
participation, service, influence, and the freedom to do one's 'own thing,' but if government overloads them with the basic responsibility for public services, undercuts their income, and limits their roles for advocacy and criticism, they will fail society, and America will be at another point of national breakdown when people demand the government do it all."10
CHAPTER II. MISSION STRUCTURES AND ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVENESS

A. Organization Effectiveness Literature Review

The wide range of organization effectiveness models, which have evolved over the years, can be divided into two categories. First, there are models which define effectiveness, and then models which explain what causes an organization to be more or less effective. Kahn calls this the difference between "definition" and "prediction." A "defining model" is like the dependent variable in a study, and a "causal model" would include the independent variables. All "causal models" are, implicitly or explicitly, based upon a certain "defining model," for one cannot adequately argue for the "cause" of an effect without first "defining" the effect. Therefore, it is important to understand the various "defining models" of organization effectiveness and to make them explicit at the outset of one's research and theoretical work.

The large number and variety of "defining models" of organization effectiveness have appeared to create great confusion for many organization theorists, as pointed out by Goodman & Pennings; Dalton, Todor, Spendolini, Fielding,
& Porter\textsuperscript{13}; Cameron & Whetten\textsuperscript{14}; and Knauf, Berger, & Gray\textsuperscript{15}. Rather than allow confusion to reign, these multiple models can be embraced. Their evolution simply reflects the broad range of normative perspectives various researchers bring to the study of organizations. These various perspectives provide researchers with a rich "menu" of organization effectiveness models from which they can choose in conducting empirical studies and developing organization theory. By understanding the evolution, strengths, and weaknesses of these various models, researchers can more wisely choose and explicitly state the approach upon which their theory or studies are based.

A frequently mentioned concern in the literature is the lack of a definition of organization effectiveness (Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum\textsuperscript{16}; Kanter & Brinkerhoff\textsuperscript{17}; INDEPENDENT SECTOR\textsuperscript{18}; Rainey\textsuperscript{19}). While there are those who have found the level of confusion in the organization effectiveness literature to be so great that they have advocated discontinuing its study (Hannan & Freeman\textsuperscript{20}; Goodman\textsuperscript{21}; Bluedorn\textsuperscript{22}), Cameron & Whetten and others have pointed out that his would be undesirable and impossible. Implicit or explicit assumptions regarding a definition of organization effectiveness underlay all approaches to organization theory. Furthermore, as Cameron & Whetten point out, "it is the ultimate dependent variable in organization research."\textsuperscript{23} Therefore, it is important to have an
understanding of the general models which have evolved and the tradeoffs involved with their usage.

The Early Years

Organization effectiveness has long been an implicit concern of organization theorists and practitioners. Some of the early "classical" theorists emphasized an "efficiency" model of effectiveness. Taylor's concern was that "the greatest prosperity can only exist when (an) individual has reached the highest state of efficiency" which would lead to "turning out his largest daily output." Likewise, Weber stated that the advancement of bureaucracy was due to its "precision" and "technical superiority." The "efficiency model" values conservation, technical control, and stability.

Barnard was one of the earliest writers to specifically define effectiveness, about which he wrote "an action is effective if it accomplishes its specific objective aim." While this definition is very basic, it introduces the idea that effectiveness has to do with a comparison between aims--intentions or goals--and accomplishments, or results. This "goal" model, wherein an organization is considered effective to the extent that it achieves its outcome goals, would continue to significantly influence the literature through the current day (Price; Strasser, Eveland, Cummins, Deniston, & Romani). In fact, by 1960, Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum, Etzioni, and others would make statements such as "the
literature is rich in studies in which the criterion for the assessment of effectiveness is derived from organizational goals.\textsuperscript{30}

The "goal" model is logical and makes the analysis of effectiveness a purely objective task--one compares results to goals and measures effectiveness. And it is a model closely related to the basic dictionary definition of effectiveness. Webster's defines "effective" as "producing a desired effect; producing or capable of producing a desired result" and states that "effectiveness emphasizes the actual production of or the power to produce an effect." An "effect" is a "result" or "accomplishment." So, then, an organization which becomes more "effective," increases the amount of "desired effects" or "results" it produces.

However basic and logical, researchers discovered problems with this approach. First, there is the question raised by Perrow of whether to study "official" goals, publicly stated by organization representatives, or "operative" goals, reflected through the operating policies of the organization.\textsuperscript{31} Goals also have different time frames, they may be short or longer term. As Steers points out, these two properties of goals create subjectivity; someone must decide which goals to study, and this can result in a set of multiple goals which conflict with one another.\textsuperscript{32} And according to Etzioni, because even like organizations would not share exact goals, this approach does not allow for
comparative organization effectiveness studies.\textsuperscript{33}

Despite these shortcomings, "goal" and "efficiency" approaches to effectiveness continue in use today, and so are other approaches which are similarly one dimensional and thus trace their lineage back to these criteria. A "reputational" or "high performance systems" model, which relies on expert opinion of effectiveness ("How well do you think these organizations are accomplishing their mission/goals?"), has been used widely (Lawrence & Lorsch\textsuperscript{34}; Peters & Waterman\textsuperscript{35}; Cameron\textsuperscript{36}; Kauft, Berger, & Gray). These judgements are sometimes supported by traditional "profitability" models (Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum; Lawrence & Lorsch) or other financial measures (Peters & Waterman). Other approaches related to the "goal" and "efficiency" models include cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis (Strasser et al.).

\textbf{System Approach: The Next Generation}

Dissatisfaction with the weaknesses of the "goal" model of organization effectiveness, particularly the inability to compare organizations, led Etzioni to propose a "system" model of analysis.\textsuperscript{37} This model focuses attention on the most "highly effective allocation of means" possible in an organization.\textsuperscript{38} Therefore, the "system" approach is "a working model of a social unit which is capable of achieving a goal."\textsuperscript{39} This "system" approach is utilized even outside organization theory, as "general system theory," first put
forth by von Bertalanffy in 1950.\textsuperscript{40}

Etzioni describes two sub-types of the "system" model, the first being the "survival" model, which sets forth the requirements for the organization to continue to exist. The second is the "effectiveness" model, which "defines a pattern of interrelations among the elements of the system which would make it most effective in the service of a given goal, as compared to other combinations of the same or similar elements."\textsuperscript{41} It "tells us the relative effectiveness of several alternatives" and "evaluates changes that have occurred in the organization, and how they affect the ability of the organization to serve its goals, as compared to its earlier state or other organizations of its kind."\textsuperscript{42}

Etzioni certainly wasn't the first to study the organization "system"--"elements" and "patterns of relationships" (Weber; Fayol\textsuperscript{43}; March & Simon\textsuperscript{44}). The significance of his approach is that he specified the "system" as the dependent variable, the definition of effectiveness. Prior to this time, the "system" was a collection of independent variables, a "causal model," which produced the dependent variable of goal outcomes. During the 1960s the "system" approach blossomed, and has been used by researchers with three different emphases: open systems, internal process systems, and human resource systems.
The "open system" approach is, perhaps, best exemplified by the work of Seashore & Yuchtman in the development of their "System-Resource" model. They examined the annual performances of seventy-five insurance sales agencies over an eleven-year period by factorial analysis methods. The ten factors which described most of the variance of their performance indicators are generally described as "resource-getting capabilities." They therefore "define the effectiveness of an organization as its ability to exploit its environments in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources to sustain its functioning." This is a particularly useful approach when outputs are very difficult to quantify, such as in the case of many non-profit organizations. However, the approach does overlook the importance of how well the organization utilizes the resources it already has. It has also been pointed out that the most appropriate time frame for considering the indicators is not discussed and that most of the performance indicators in their study were economic in nature, leaving out a host of other possible criteria. The redefinition of the "causal" independent variables (the ten factors which described the variance of the performance indicators) from the factorial analysis into the dependent variable—the effectiveness definition—is notably clear in this example.

The "internal process" approach is similar to the "efficiency" model of Weber and Taylor. It emphasizes
systematic decision-making, information management, and control. In one example of this work, Evan suggests that three organization variables be measured: inputs, transformation of inputs, and outputs. By assigning costs to each variable, a ratio of inputs to outputs can indicate the organization’s financial efficiency. In another example, March & Simon have done considerable work in the area of decision-making, emphasizing search behavior and the bounded rationality with which decisions are made. While this approach is very helpful in analyzing the workings of the organization, it de-emphasizes the importance of the external environment, acquiring resources, and overall outputs.

The "human resources" approach is similar to the "internal process" approach in that the focus is on the internal workings of the organization. However, in this case it highlights the importance of the development, satisfaction, and psychological health of the employees. Writers emphasizing the importance of human resources to organizational effectiveness have included Argyris, Bennis, Katz & Kahn, Likert, and Cunningham. The "human resources" approach highlights the importance of the people in the organization working as a happy, cohesive team, and bases the effectiveness level on these factors. However, like the "internal process" model, this approach de-emphasizes the external environment and the importance of acquiring new resources. It also tends to shun the controls which are
promoted in the "internal process" model, thus leaving open the possibility of inefficiencies.

The various "system" models take differing, sometimes diametrically opposed, approaches to the question of organization effectiveness. However, they have in common the fact that each utilizes an explanation of the interrelationships of various organizational elements as a definition for effectiveness. This means that their effectiveness criteria become very difficult to operationalize, as compared to the simple "goal" model, and involve a great deal of interpretation. Each of the "system" approaches reviewed here are widely used by researchers and theorists today. But other writers have taken a step further, into a modern theoretical era.

Integration: The Modern Era

The compelling, yet differing strengths of the models reviewed thus far have led a number of theorists to "integrate" some of the various approaches in an effort to build a more complete model. These "integrated" models are the type being promoted most frequently in current times.

The "constituency" or "participant satisfaction" model is an integrated approach which has been promoted by a number of theorists. Seashore explains that organization effectiveness must "be evaluated from the perspectives of different interested parties" which are referred to as "constituents."
These "constituents" include employees, customers, suppliers, and the general public. Every different "constituent" will have his or her own idea of how effective the organization is, based on their orientation, interest, and experience. They each influence the operation of the organization in their own way, according to their values and judgements. According to Seashore, this framework links together the goal model, natural system model (called open system here), and decision-process model (called internal process and human resources models here) in a practical way, since organizations really do base their operations in each of these areas on constituent influence.

Many others have put forward their own versions of the "constituent" approach, including Goodman & Pennings, Friedlander & Pickle, and Connolly, Conlon, & Deutsch. Keeley has added an additional dimension to the approach by suggesting that social justice concerns, regarding the harm that can come to participants or constituents, should be considered. While the various "constituency" approaches add another insight to the study of organization effectiveness, they have their weaknesses. The judgements of constituents are, by definition, highly subjective and subject to swift and significant change. Organizations may have difficulty tracking these shifts. Further, inconsistencies are bound to arise and no indications as to how to balance the differing influences is given. Finally, as an integration of a set of
"system" models, the "constituency" model is a "system" model on a grander scale that is even further removed from actual organizational operations or outcomes. This may present difficulties in developing prescriptive theory.

A second integrated approach developed by Quinn & Rohrbaugh, the "competing values" model, combines four other models: rational goal, open systems, internal process, and human relations. These component-models are differentiated according to the perspective each "values" regarding organizational focus: internal or external, and organizational structure: flexibility or control. The rational goal model is external/control, and values productivity, efficiency, and profit. The open systems model is external/flexible, and values growth and resource acquisition. The internal process model is internal/control, and values stability and equilibrium. And, the human resources model is internal/flexibility, and values human resource development. As such, every model has another which is its opposite along the dimensions, and two others which are similar along one dimension.

The "competition" among the "values" perspectives of each component-model within the total "competing values" model means that effective organizations must balance their operations between each. Organizations must maintain internal controls, yet be open for external growth. They must be efficient and productive, and maintain high morale. Balancing
these seemingly contradictory "values" is the key challenge organizations face. Organizations will balance in their own ways, depending on management emphasis or life cycle, for example. An instrument which measures the performance of an organization in each of the component-model areas has been developed by Quinn.61

The "competing values" model recognizes that each of the four different sets of "values" emphasized in its component-models are required for the effective operation of organizations. By taking this integrated approach, Quinn & Rohrbaugh are able to show how conflicting values truly do exist simultaneously in an organization. However, the model exists at a highly generalized level and does not provide specific guidance for achieving the appropriate balance. Without this guidance it is almost as if the model suggests that effective organizations must be able to do everything well, and to know when to do it. At this level of abstraction the model would have limited prescriptive value.

Both examples of "integrated" approaches are very complex and abstract. This is understandable, given the task of combining multiple models. While they successfully include strengths from various other approaches, the tradeoffs include difficulties in developing prescriptive theory and complications with the interactions of the numerous variables which would need to be included in empirical studies. The comprehensive nature of these models would make them useful in
measuring effectiveness in organizations in cases where the broadest definitions are important.

The Mission Accomplishment Approach

A new approach, "Mission Accomplishment as Effectiveness" developed by Ford & Ford, gives organizations the opportunity to create their own, individual defining models of effectiveness. The "mission" of an organization is considered to be its commitment to make a difference in the world in which it operates, to produce results for others beyond its own borders. The results it produces which correspond to the mission are its "accomplishments." Ford & Ford suggest that organizations design "Mission Performance Measures" for themselves which serve as "registers" to indicate the level of mission accomplishment attained. They are therefore "reliable impact measures" of the difference the organization is making out in the world.

This approach is similar to the goal approach in that it is concerned with "producing intended results" and "accomplishing aims." But it is much more specific and broader than the goal approach. Depending on one's use of the term "goal," a goal may or may not be specific and measurable and if it is measurable it may or may not represent an "impact" or difference made. For example, an organization could have a "goal" to mail out 10,000 fund-raising letters by a certain date. Attainment of this goal would not represent
an "impact" made on a person, place, or thing outside of the organization. Further, Mission Performance Measures are broader than a "goal" might be in that they are measures of the entire organization's performance according to the intention it states in its mission, rather than being a measure of just a small segment of the organization's activities or performance as could be the case with a "goal."

One of the unique aspects of the Mission Accomplishment approach is that the perspective of the organization is most highly valued, rather than observers or outside evaluators; it creates its own defining model of effectiveness rather than having one imposed upon it. This does not mean that outsiders would be ignored. In fact, views of outsiders could be considered by the organization as it creates its defining model. This approach has great promise for organizations interested in designing themselves to produce results, as the organization can design coordinated structures for mission accomplishment. However, like the goal approach, comparative evaluation between organizations becomes challenging since no two organizations will likely have the same Mission Performance Measures.

**Utilizing "Defining Models"**

Defining models of organization effectiveness first evolved from simple "goal" and "efficiency" models, and their variates, to "system" approaches, which were widely developed
through the 1960s and sought deeper analysis of outcomes. These approaches define effectiveness according to the arrangement and operation of the organization elements their proponents assert are best for achieving organizational goals. The desire to capture the strengths of a combination of "system" approaches led to the "integration" of those models by theorists in the 1970s.

Organization effectiveness models reflecting each of these approaches are still being used by theorists and researchers today. New models will certainly continue to be developed, as our selection of effectiveness definitions grows far beyond the thirty criteria Campbell identified in 1977. This "menu" of effectiveness models is a vast resource for researchers and theorists to utilize. Since the defining model of effectiveness provides the dependent variable for empirical studies, it is important that theorists and researchers make their choice of the defining model used in their work explicit. Without an explicit dependent variable, any explanatory study runs a tautological risk.

In an effort to support those making the choice of a model, Cameron & Whetten present the following set of seven "guiding questions" which can be asked prior to the implementation of an effectiveness study. "The value of these questions is that they force investigators to explicitly make decisions about the key sources of controversy regarding the evaluation of quality and effectiveness."
1. "From whose perspective is effectiveness being judged?" The viewpoint from which effectiveness is being assessed must be made explicit. Interpretations of effectiveness will vary according to the perspective which is chosen. Researchers should consider the best perspective for their study and make it clear why this view was chosen.

2. "On what domain of activity is the judgement focused?" This question provides more focus to the definition. Some definitions of effectiveness are focused on internal activities and some are external. This must be clarified or research results can be confusing or contradictory.

3. "What level of analysis is being used?" The level of analysis may be the individual, group or subunit, organization, population of organizations, or society in general. The type of outputs or outcomes to be judged will vary widely depending on level of analysis.

4. "What is the purpose for judging effectiveness?" The purpose will affect the judgement, and the focus. The study must be designed so that the purpose can be achieved.

5. "What time frame is being employed?" Long term and short term effectiveness may be incompatible. Some organizations emphasize one time frame over another, and may make sacrifices in operation according to the frame they more highly value.
6. "What type of data are being used for judgements of effectiveness?" The data may be more objective--information collected from the organization's own official documents on its performance, or more subjective--perceptions of members of the organization or other constituencies. Mixing these data may produce contradictory results, therefore selecting analyzing the data must be done with great care.

7. "What is the referent against which effectiveness is being judged?" The results of the study may be compared to an ideal model, or compared with a set of other organizations, or compared to the goals the organization had set for itself, or to past performance. The final effectiveness judgement will depend on this choice.

Using these guides makes the definition of effectiveness used by the researcher very clear and helps to establish a comprehensive framework for the study. The descriptions of the models contained in this review, along with the analysis of their strengths and weaknesses, give researchers and theorists a "menu" of defining models of effectiveness from which to choose. By reviewing these models and responding to the "guiding questions" with their own value preferences, they can more wisely choose the design for their studies and further the important research agenda on organization effectiveness. Thus, these guides provide a framework for choosing an effectiveness approach for this study.
The "Mission Accomplishment" Choice

This study will utilize the "mission accomplishment" approach to effectiveness. The "mission accomplishment" choice is based, first, on the notion that an organization, itself, is primarily responsible for declaring its own purpose and mission, and accountable for its own accomplishments. Further, the organization has the responsibility to set the measures--Mission Performance Measures--on which its effectiveness will be determined. The "mission accomplishment" approach is most suitable for organizations which hold that they have these responsibilities and which are committed to accomplishing their respective missions. Organizations which do not hold that they have these responsibilities or which are not committed to accomplishing their missions would not want to use this approach.

The "mission accomplishment" approach is also only suitable for an organization which defines its "mission" as a commitment to make a difference in the world in which it operates. The approach, then, seems particularly fitting for philanthropic organizations since they were earlier described as those which assist in the "improvement in the quality of human life." The "mission accomplishment" approach goes on to state that an organization would set its "Mission Performance Measures" to determine the difference it is making.

A philanthropic organization should be held accountable for working towards the accomplishment of its mission and
should set Mission Performance Measures—to state what difference it intends to make in the world. After all, the Internal Revenue Service grants special tax considerations to these organizations based on their statement of intent to perform philanthropic or "charitable" functions. Therefore, it seems appropriate for the public to hold these organizations accountable for showing what difference they are making, what results they are producing. This is a point made by a panel of experts in the philanthropic field, in response to the question: "Do nonprofits owe society results because of their tax-free status?" Following is a sample of their responses:

Richard Schubert, President, Points of Light Foundation: "The bottom line of nonprofits is to change lives. And nonprofits, to me, should demonstrate that they are doing that or they shouldn't get that [tax] benefit. The problem there would be to clearly define what 'results' are."

Gracia M. Hillman, Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, League of Women Voters: "I think for sure that nonprofits owe society concrete results. If there were no tax breaks, then presumably the government would be doing things that philanthropies and nonprofits currently are doing. But because the government has recognized the need for a partnership, whether with an institution or with wealthy individuals, I think there is a responsibility to get results both for the tax-exempt nonprofit and the individuals who benefit from the tax breaks."

Raul Yzaguirre, Executive Director, President, Chief Executive Officer, National Council of La Raza: "We owe results. If we are not true to what we said we were about then we shouldn't exist. . . . We have got to produce results and they can't be simply effort. You can't forever be saying, 'well, we tried.' I think eventually you have to say, 'we
succeeded.'"

Brian O'Connell, President, INDEPENDENT SECTOR: "In a democratic society, democratic government is ultimately responsible for allowing these organizations the tax exemptions, the tax deductions, and while I would argue for very broad definitions of what those organizations can do, ultimately the government has to decide whether those privileges are deserved."

A philanthropic organization may be obligated to state the difference it is making to those beyond the government and general public. The organization may consider its obligation to its many "investors"—those contributing time and financial resources to the organization. Those "investments" were likely made with the expectation that the organization would deliver on its promise to make a difference. Without the capacity to state the difference it is making in real terms, the organization may be relegated to haplessly asserting, as in Brian O'Connell's fictional "Our Organization," that "Any organization made up of such bright people, who are so dedicated and who have worked so hard, must be doing a great deal of good."67

The "mission accomplishment" approach should be used by those who want to design organizations for mission accomplishment. As explained earlier, it is the intention of this study to be a contribution to the development of theory for designing philanthropic organizations for producing increased levels of effectiveness. An organization cannot design itself, in a well-informed way, to increase effectiveness unless it knows what "effects" it intends to
produce. By requiring the organization to specify these results as Mission Performance Measures, the organization has a "target" toward which coordinated action can be directed.

The other organization effectiveness approaches reviewed, with the possible exception of the goal approach, focus attention on the "means" the organization uses to produce results. The various models assumptively suggest that utilizing their respective interrelationships of means will produce improved results, without providing a way to measure them. The "mission accomplishment" approach focuses on the intended results, which then gives the organization the opportunity to experiment with various "means" to see how results are impacted. It is the only approach in which effectiveness is defined as the difference the organization is making in the world.

To answer the first of Cameron & Whetten's guiding questions on choosing an organization effectiveness model, then, ("From whose perspective is effectiveness being judged?") this study most highly values the perspective of the organization to say what its mission is and how it intends to measure the accomplishment of the mission. The "domain of activity" on which the judgement is focused (Question #2) and the "level of analysis" used (Question #3) are set by the Mission Performance Measures the organization creates. The purpose of judging effectiveness (Question #4) is to support the organization in designing itself to increase
effectiveness. The "time frame" (Question #5), "data to be used" (Question #6), and "referents against which effectiveness is being judged" (Question #7) are all set by the organization when it designs its Mission Performance Measures.

As mentioned earlier, the key disadvantage of this approach is that it cannot be used for comparing the effectiveness of one organization to another. The Mission Performance Measures set by organizations would be unique, each to themselves. However, since it is not the intention of this study to make organization comparisons, this weakness is not a factor.

The balance of this study takes the perspective that philanthropic organizations should and can be designed for the accomplishment of their missions. Further, it will consider how organizations which are designed for mission accomplishment would be structured. Data has been collected to see if philanthropic organizations are designed for mission accomplishment. Finally, the implications of those findings will be discussed.
B. Mission Literature Review

The "mission" of an organization is a frequently cited issue of importance in organization theory, including writings on management, marketing, strategic planning, and excellence. The importance of "mission" is even more frequently discussed in the literature on philanthropic organizations, citing its role in board effectiveness and fund-raising, as well as management, etc. In order to consider how philanthropic organizations can be designed for accomplishment of their missions, it is important to first consider how mission has been defined and what role it has been said to play in organizations.

Definitions of "Mission"

One of the most frequently cited definitions of "mission" is from Peter Drucker's Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices, in which he asserts that the clear definition of business purpose and business mission is an answer to the question "What is our business and what should it be?" Answering two sub-questions, "Who is the customer?" and "What is value to the customer?" helps define what the business mission is. This definition may owe its birth to Theodore Levitt who, in 1960, wrote "Marketing Myopia," which argued the importance of an organization defining its business. Many others have used or adapted this definition, including
Similarly, there are those who define mission as the purpose of the organization, or its reason for existence. Bryson says that "a mission statement is a declaration of purpose." Others who share this view of "mission as purpose" include Knauff, Berger, & Gray, Ingram, Kennedy, The National Assembly, Houle, Kaufman, Pearce, Daft, and Kiefer & Stroh. While "purpose" and "what business the organization is in" are very similar definitions, they are not necessarily identical. Most of these authors do not make a distinction between the two, but Pascarella & Frohman consider a "mission statement" to be part of a much broader "purpose statement." The purpose statement also includes sections on the values and beliefs of the organization, performance measures by which employees can check their progress, its orientation towards assets--including employees, its practices, and its goals or vision.

While the majority of the literature is filled with authors using the "what business the organization is in" and "purpose" definitions, there are those who define "mission" more specifically. Carver says that mission "answers the simple questions 'What is this organization for? How will the world be different as a result of our being in business?'" He acknowledges that the other "type" of mission definition is used by many organizations, and says that both types can
coexist in an organization. He refers to this "type" of mission as a "mega-ends policy" which describes the "change" the organization intends; "what really matters in the long run is the effect an organization has upon its world."\(^6\)

The definition of mission used by Ford & Ford is very similar to and consistent with Carver's. They first point out that, according to Webster's, "A mission is 'a sending out, or being sent out, with authority to perform a special service.'\(^7\) In this way, "Mission addresses the possibility of making a difference," or "having an impact" in the user community.\(^8\) Products are "sent out" from the organization to the world with the intention that they produce results for the user. Therefore the "organization's mission is a statement of what the organization intends to accomplish beyond its borders . . . of the differences an organization intends to make in the world in which it operates."\(^9\) It is the organization saying "What we are committed to providing to others independent of benefit to us."\(^10\) Ford & Ford distinguish the "mission" of an organization from its "purpose," which they say is the more general intention of the organization. Mission is just that part which is "sent out."

The definition which Carver and Ford & Ford use is much more specific than the broader previous definitions. Considering the dictionary definition, one might even say it is a more rigorous definition. But, one can see how the broad definitions could include a statement of intention which
corresponds to the Carver and Ford & Ford definitions, but is not called the "mission." In fact, Carver comments "It is very important that nonprofit and public boards develop the type of mission I describe. It is very unimportant that they call it mission."91

The Role of "Mission"

Mission is discussed as playing an important role in management, strategic planning and management, marketing, board effectiveness, fund-raising, and other important areas of an organization's performance. While the role it is said to play shifts somewhat depending on the definition used, it is a pervasive issue in the organization theory literature.

Management. There are many who have pointed out that the mission of the organization is key to its entire operation. Drucker, for example, says:

"Only a clear definition of the mission and purpose of the business makes possible clear and realistic business objectives. It is the foundation for priorities, strategies, plans, and work assignments. It is the starting point for the design of managerial jobs and, above all, for the design of managerial structures."92

Knauf, Berger, and Gray identified "primacy of mission" as one of the four "hallmarks of excellence" in their extensive Profiles of Excellence research project on effective nonprofit organizations. It was the most frequently mentioned characteristic of an effective organization in surveys and interviews. In excellent organizations, the mission "serves
as the focal point of commitment for the board and staff and is the guidepost by which the organization judges its success and makes adjustments over time. Those that invest the time and effort necessary to formulate a sound mission statement build a platform from which to soar."93

The idea that the mission is the foundation for all effective management is echoed by Kennedy, who says that a "mission statement that is clear and specific" is the first step for nonprofit organizations to take in developing quality services. "Every operational activity of a nonprofit organization should be focused on fulfilling the requirements set forth in the mission statement."94

Peter Vaill also sees mission as central to organization management. He says that "purposing," which "is the process of gaining clarity, consensus, and commitment on the mission," should be one of the key activities of top management. "It follows that purposing is the development of clarity, consensus, and commitment to a concept of the organization, present and future, that integrates strengths, opportunities, and responsibilities of economic, technological, communal, sociopolitical, and transcendental kinds, and that is what the top team ought to be talking about."95

Ford & Ford say that the development of a mission statement then allows the organization to "be designed to support the formulation of organization structures and functions so that the likelihood of a large impact is
increased."96 In this way, mission provides a "framework for implementation" that allows for the "establishment of such diverse functions as marketing, administration, MIS, production, purchasing, and planning is made easier and more straightforward with the commitment to generating a particular impact in the user environment."97 The coordination of these activities is based upon the creation and communication of "Mission Performance Measures," which are statements that "specify the conditions of satisfaction for mission accomplishment" using specific measures.98 The Mission Performance Measures give the organization a "scoreboard," and the results it produces are its scores. They provide a target for organization members to organize around.

Beyond the role of mission as central to the design of organization operational structures, Ford & Ford point out the important role of the context which "mission" creates. This aspect is unique to the specificity of the mission definition they, and Carver, put forward, that of mission as "what we are committed to providing to others independent of benefit to us." Defining mission this way creates a "for-them" context which shifts the focus of attention of the organization members to the "users." This creates a context in which the organization is focusing on being a contribution, a service, to the world. With the attention shifted to the outside world, the focus is on "future-building" for the world, rather than issues of survival and problem-solving for the
organization. Issues of survival will still exist, but they will be experienced differently in a qualitative sense because the "senior commitment," or focus, is on the contribution being made to the outside world. Finally, the mission also creates a large enough context for participation in the organization by all its constituents--members, stakeholders, users, associates, and opponents. Because the mission focuses on the outside world, it provides a basis from which all these relationships can be established and maintained.

Strategic Planning and Management. Many researchers have paid specific attention to the important role mission plays in strategic planning and strategic management. Frequently, Pearce & David say, the mission statement is viewed as "an important first step in the strategic planning process, according to both practitioners and research scholars."99 King & Cleland say that "the heart of strategic management is a series of choices that must be made."100 They state that mission is the highest level element of choice on which the rest of the series of choices is based. Pearce, Robinson, & Roth say that mission must "clearly identify and communicate the long-term intentions of the firm so that the firm's goals can serve as a basis for shared expectations, planning, and performance evaluation."101 This general view is shared by many others, including David, Bryson, Pearce, Unterman & Davis102, and Barry.103
Kaufman agrees with the importance of mission to the planning process, but also introduces the concepts of the "mission objective" and "mega-, macro-, and micro-planning." "A mission objective is a mission statement with measurable criteria."\textsuperscript{104} This is a very similar concept to Ford & Ford's "Mission Performance Measures." Microplanning is at the individual or small group level, macroplanning views the primary planning client as the organization itself, and megaplanning takes the "outside-the-organization" view of what it can contribute to the world.\textsuperscript{105} Planning for mission accomplishment at the "mega-" level would be aligned with Carver and Ford & Ford's definition of mission.

**Marketing.** Kotler & Andreasen point out that a "marketing program does not occur in a vacuum."\textsuperscript{106} They explain that marketing strategic planning should be nested within organization-level strategic planning, and that the cornerstone of the entire planning process begins with the organization mission. Boone & Kurtz\textsuperscript{107}, Johnson\textsuperscript{108}, and Stern\textsuperscript{109} all concur with this view. Lefferts has pointed out the possible conflict which can arise in nonprofit organizations using a marketing approach. It is possible, he says, for an organization to mistakenly equate its programs for its mission, and marketing with promoting its programs. The marketing approach would advocate listening to the program wants of consumers and creating new programs if that was their desire. This would advance the organization and its mission,
even though old programs may have to be discontinued.\textsuperscript{110}

**Board Effectiveness.** Ingram states that the board's fundamental responsibility is to determine the organization's mission and purposes. He sees it setting the stage for fund-raising strategies, board and staff decision-making, and planning.\textsuperscript{111} Carver agrees, adding "Stating a mission can be the most powerful single action a board takes."\textsuperscript{112} Houle says that the first function of a board is to "keep the overall mission of the program clearly in focus and satisfy itself that the objectives of the particular parts of the work or units of the organization are in harmony with the mission."\textsuperscript{113} Herman & Heimovics add that "In the absence of clarity in mission, it is not surprising to find either a board on which members may be working hard but pulling in different directions or a board not working very hard at all because individual board members do not know which way to direct their efforts."\textsuperscript{114} Drucker, too, points out the need for a board that provides "the clear focus on mission, the definition of results" for a non-profit to be effective.\textsuperscript{115}

**Fund-Raising.** The mission provides the basis for strategic planning, which may in turn result in an organization's decision to engage in fund-raising. Thus, mission is connected to this important function of philanthropic organizations. Rosso points out that "The mission is the magnet that will attract and hold the interests of trustees, volunteers, staff and contributors. Fund raising
cannot function apart from the organization; apart from its mission." Pocock adds that "the mission creates a framework of needed resources, which must be provided through fund-raising... the mission sets the tone of the fund-raising effort as it cultivates potential donors. Without a mission statement, development is flying blind." Peavy's study of 268 non-profit groups showed the importance of a clear mission statement, incorporated into sound planning, before effective fund-raising could take place."

Teamwork. Kiefer & Stroh, explain that clarity of purpose or mission catalyzes "alignment." This is "the special condition wherein people operate freely and fully as part of a larger whole. It is created when people see their organization's purpose as an extension of their personal purposes. People who are aligned identify with the organization and consciously assume responsibility for its success." Alignment is more than people agreeing on the organization's goals, and results in higher level commitment to keeping agreements. Senge points out that this kind of commitment is the result of the process of "enrollment," freely choosing to be part of something. He says that commitment "describes a state of being not only enrolled but feeling fully responsible" for the organization. The enhanced teamwork benefit of common mission has also been pointed out by Bassett and King, among others.
Utilizing the "Mission" Concept

The preceding review provides a rich grounding from which the development of theory for designing philanthropic organizations for mission accomplishment can be produced. Regardless of the exact definition used and the domain of activity discussed, it is clear that the concept of "mission" provides a powerful platform, a foundation, from which an organization can design and implement its operations. And without a clear mission, an organization "is like a traveler without a destination."[23]

C. Important Mission Structures

Given the importance that has been given to "mission" in the literature, it is interesting to study how philanthropic organizations actually use their "missions" in their operations and how they organize themselves for the accomplishment of the mission. Based on the preceding literature, "mission" may be used, operationally, in strategic planning, marketing, fund-raising, and board operations. Further, again based on the literature, a philanthropic organization which was designed for the accomplishment of the mission would be expected to use the mission in performance measures, management and accountability structures, and the
development of teamwork. The previous section reviewed how "mission" would be used in strategic planning, marketing, fund-raising, and board operations, and presented some basic notions of how a philanthropic organization could be designed for mission accomplishment. This section more fully describes how philanthropic organizations designed for the accomplishment of mission would use "mission" in performance measures, management and accountability structures, and in the development of teamwork. These important "mission structures" would integrate the mission into the operations of the organization.

Performance Measures

Significant literature exists which provides a basis for understanding how philanthropic organizations designed to accomplish their mission would use performance measures. The measure of performance that is most interesting is the results by which the organization knows if it is accomplishing its mission. Drucker says "Non-profits fail to perform unless they start out with their mission. For the mission defines what results are in this particular non-profit institution."124 Defining the results, says Drucker, is the first step in developing strategies, goals, and objectives which will lead the organization to success. As Bryson points out, these "performance criteria" are important so the organization knows what it is planning for.125 And Carver
says that "results terminology" is a critical characteristic of a mission that is powerful.\textsuperscript{126}

It is important that the results used to measure the accomplishment of the mission are, in fact, measurable. Kaufman calls these results the "mission objective." "A mission objective is a mission statement plus measurable indicators to answer the question 'How will we know when we have arrived?' A mission objective is a mission statement with measurable criteria."\textsuperscript{127} Kaufman also identifies four types of measurement:

"Nominal: naming something (for instance, 'excellence,' 'fun,' 'Jan,' 'productivity')"

*Ordinal:* Defining things as greater than, equal to, or less than other things

*Interval:* Relating items along a scale beginning at an arbitrary zero-point and divided into equal intervals (for instance, means and standard deviations on production runs from line 7; temperature in degrees Celsius)

*Ratio:* Relating items along a scale beginning at a known zero-point and divided into equal intervals (for instance, temperature in degrees Kelvin, weight, distance, annual income)\textsuperscript{128}

Kaufman explains that "ratio" measurement is the most reliable of measures, while "nominal" is the least. "Interval and ratio-scale terms will provide the most reliable bases for planning, doing, and evaluating."\textsuperscript{129}

The importance of the rigor of the measurement used in the mission accomplishment results is supported in the goal research literature. Research on goal specificity--the degree of quantitative precision of the goal--has shown that
"specific goals lead to higher output than do vague goals such as 'Do your best.' Field experiments using clerical workers, maintenance technicians, marketing personnel, truckers, engineers, typists, and manufacturing employees have compared specific versus do-your-best goal-setting conditions. The vast majority of these studies support, partly or in total, the hypothesis that specific goals lead to better performance than do vague goals. In fact, 99 out of 100 studies reviewed by Locke and his associates, specific goals produced better results."\textsuperscript{130}

Since the purpose of philanthropic organizations is to make a difference, or impact, on the outside world, it is important that the measures used represent an impact, or change in condition, in a person, place, or thing outside the organizations. Ford & Ford call the measurements associated with the accomplishment of the mission "Mission Performance Measures." As discussed in the prior section, these are indicators that "specify the conditions of satisfaction for mission accomplishment" using specific measures.\textsuperscript{131} The Mission Performance Measures give the organization a "register" or a "scoreboard," and the results it produces are its scores. They provide a target for organization members to organize around. An example of a Mission Performance Measure is:
Franklin County Children Services

Mission

Elimination of maltreatment of children in Franklin County.

Mission Performance Measure

Number of reported and substantiated cases of maltreatment.

Specific measures of the accomplishment of the mission provide a clear communication to members of the organization regarding the "register" it will be using to determine the extent to which the mission is being accomplished. If the key personnel and key volunteers of the organization share the exact same understanding of the measures by which the organization is judging its performance, they can work together with fewer misunderstandings, have the opportunity to coordinate activities more effectively, and present a more consistent message to the outside stakeholders. Fewer wasted actions--based on different interpretations of what someone "thought" was important--will be taken. A focus on the specificity of results has also been put forward as a key factor in producing more successful change programs.\(^\text{132}\)

Management and Accountability Structures

With the specificity of the measures for the results of the accomplishment of the mission set, the next structures of interest become those which will best enable it to produce those results. According to Pascarella & Frohman, this is
different than the question often asked in organizations: "What functions should we perform that fit our current structure and organization?" In the previous section, Drucker was quoted as saying:

"Only a clear definition of the mission and purpose of the business makes possible clear and realistic business objectives. It is the foundation for priorities, strategies, plans, and work assignments. It is the starting point for the design of managerial jobs and, above all, for the design of managerial structures." Given the mission as "foundation" for plans and design of jobs and managerial structures, we would expect the philanthropic organization designed to accomplish its mission to reveal a feature for coordinating action between organization components to produce intended results. As Pearce explains, the mission is "the basis of orchestrating managerial action." And Fry & Smith point out: "An extensive body of literature suggests that an organization's ability to achieve its goals is a function of the congruence between various organizational components. If the components 'fit well,' then the organization functions effectively; if they 'fit poorly,' it will not."

Pascarella & Frohman say "As the organization uses purpose to shape its structure, job content, controls, and reward systems, these mechanisms make the purpose operational in the world of action. The purpose statement and these supporting structures and systems align members of an organization. However, they are not used in an attempt to set
the organization in concrete. They become a platform on which people can stand so they can shape their organization's future."\textsuperscript{137}

Ford & Ford say that coordinated action requires that organization components establish between themselves "Mission Performance Agreements." These are agreements of accountability to produce results which either relate to results on the Mission Performance Measure register or support the production of these results by coordinating their action with other components. Mission Performance Agreements would not be entered into unless they support the accomplishment of the mission. Each agreement would include agreements for performance on registers collecting results it has produced, breakdowns it has experienced in action towards producing results, and the status of relations with other components.\textsuperscript{138}

A set of agreements for results between the components give an organization what Kaplan & Norton describe as "a 'balanced scorecard'--a set of measures that gives top managers a fast but comprehensive view" of the entire organization's operations.\textsuperscript{139} They have used this approach with continuous improvement programs in companies.

The idea of integrating the mission into the operation of the organization by creating agreements between components regarding the results they will produce is consistent with Drucker's management approach, with Kaufman's call for "detailed performance indicators," and concepts used in "total
quality management" and "continuous improvement." In fact, the failure of some "total quality management" efforts is attributed to the lack of integrating quality standards within the entire operation of the organization.

It is important that the results in the agreements between components also be measurable--just like the results for the accomplishment of the mission. One would also expect them to relate, in total, to the producing of the results for mission accomplishment. According to Kaufman, these "performance indicators" should exist at all levels of the organization and for every element of it. Further, each indicator should include the following five features: "a clear, unambiguous statement of desired or required results; does not include any means or resources; precise, rigorous criteria to measure actual results; statement of who or what will demonstrate the intended results; statement of under what conditions will the results or performance be observed."  

**Development of Teamwork**

In the previous section, it was reviewed that Kiefer & Stroh and Senge point to the powerful impact members of an organization can have when "alignment" is present. "Alignment" is created when people see their organization's purpose as an extension of their personal purposes. People who are aligned identify with the organization and consciously assume responsibility for its success." In this way,
"alignment" is an important linkage between the organization mission and the individual. Senge points out that this kind of commitment is the result of the process of "enrollment," freely choosing to be part of something. He says that commitment "describes a state of being not only enrolled but feeling fully responsible" for the organization.144

Knauf, Berger, & Gray say that mission "is the rallying point for commitment" in the organization."145 And Pascarella & Frohman say that the "source of commitment" is the purpose people find with the organization.146

The assertion here is that all persons have a number of commitments, and that some are more "senior" than others. If the "personal senior commitments" of an individual are highly congruent with the organization mission, motivation increases. This is because they will perceive the organization as a vehicle--a means--to carry out their personal mission. Expectancy theory explains that motivation to increase effort will grow as an individual's expectations that their performance will result in a desired outcome increases.147

This added motivation to increase effort may manifest itself in greater productivity and more actual hours worked--for staff and volunteers. The additional motivation may also manifest itself by increases in financial contributions made by staff and volunteers to the organization.

A philanthropic organization designed for the accomplishment of mission would use its mission in the
development of teamwork to create alignment. It would have a high congruence between the perceived personal missions of staff and volunteers and perceived organization mission. Senge calls this an attitude of commitment to the organization vision, and suggests a set of possible attitudes which people in an organization may report:

"Commitment: Wants it. Will make it happen. Creates whatever 'laws' (structures) are needed.

Enrollment: Wants it. Will do whatever can be done within the 'spirit of the law.'

Genuine compliance: Sees the benefits of the vision. Does everything expected and more. Follows the 'letter of the law.' 'Good soldiers.'

Formal compliance: On the whole, sees the benefits of the vision. Does what's expected and no more. 'Pretty good soldier.'

Grudging compliance: Does not see the benefits of the vision. But, also, does not want to lose job. Does enough of what's expected because he has to, but also lets it be known that he is really not on board.

Noncompliance: Does not see benefits of vision and will not do what's expected. 'I won't do it; you can't make me.'

Apathy: Neither for nor against vision. No interest. No energy. 'Is it five o'clock yet?'

Thus, "the committed person brings an energy, passion, and excitement that cannot be generated if you are only compliant, even genuinely compliant. A group of people truly committed to a common vision is an awesome force. They can accomplish the seemingly impossible."
CHAPTER III. RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Research Questions

The organization theory literature is replete with descriptions and prescriptions regarding the importance of "mission" in organizations, generally, and specifically in philanthropic organizations. Yet, there has been little empirical research done which reveals how philanthropic organizations actually structure themselves to accomplish their missions. In fact, there has been little empirical research done on how for-profit organizations use their missions. In their 1987 study of how Fortune 500 firms use their missions, Pearce & David explained that "no reported empirical studies describe the composition of business mission statements." Their study, and a follow-up by David in 1989 of Business Week 1,000 firms, has provided some insight into how businesses use their missions.

Profiles of Excellence, based on the INDEPENDENT SECTOR's five year research project on philanthropic organization effectiveness, describes the importance of "primacy of mission" and points to the importance of further research on philanthropic organization missions. The study revealed that
philanthropic organization chief staff officers and volunteer board chairs most often listed "a clear sense of mission accompanied by goals to carry out that mission" as a characteristic of an effective organization. The importance of mission was confirmed by further research in the study, including their case studies of ten outstanding philanthropic organizations located across the country. While the Profiles of Excellence project revealed the importance of "mission," it was not designed to collect extensive data on how philanthropic organizations use their missions. Given these research findings and the importance of mission in the organization literature, further research regarding how philanthropic organizations use their missions represents a timely contribution to the field.

The preceding literature review provides guidance as to how one might expect philanthropic organizations which are committed to mission accomplishment to design themselves. The following questions have guided this inquiry:

1. Is the mission expressed as an intention to impact the world outside itself, or itself, or both?

2. Is the mission communicated outside and inside the organization, and if so, how?

3. Do performance measures assess mission accomplishment? In what other ways is mission accomplishment assessed?

4. What performance measures exist which link the performance of members of the organization to the accomplishment of the organization mission? How else do members of the organization know if what they are doing supports the accomplishment of the mission?
5. What are the attitudes which members of the organization report having toward the mission?

6. In what other ways does the organization use its mission in its operations?

B. Methodology

A blend of quantitative and qualitative data have been collected during this project in order to produce new understandings, from a variety of perspectives, of how philanthropic organizations are designed for mission accomplishment. Findings have been collected through mailed questionnaires to a large set of organizations and case studies, which included interviews, of other organizations. Through this process, a rich body of new data regarding philanthropic organization mission structures has been made available for study and discussion.

Geographic Focus Area

This study was conducted by researching philanthropic organizations in Franklin County (Columbus area), Ohio. The database of these organizations was provided by INDEPENDENT SECTOR'S National Center for Charitable Statistics. This database is sourced from the Internal Revenue Service's listing of all 501(c)(3) philanthropic organizations required
to file the IRS tax form 990. Organizations with revenues of under $25,000 are not required to file this form and may not be included in the database. For the purposes of this study—for reasons discussed in the earlier chapter, hospitals and institutions of higher education were purged from the database (churches do not file 990 forms and are not on the database). Franklin County provided a large, diverse set of philanthropic organizations (a total of 645) for this research with characteristics similar to the total pool of philanthropic organizations in America. A breakdown of the number of philanthropic organizations nationally and in Franklin County, by function, as categorized by INDEPENDENT SECTOR's National Center for Charitable Statistics, is listed in Table 1. More general categories—also used by INDEPENDENT SECTOR—which more easily summarizes the above statistics, are listed in Table 2.

Case Study Organizations

While mailed questionnaires have a number of advantages as a research technique, such as low cost in reaching a large number of respondents, convenience, and reduced interviewer bias, they also have some disadvantages. Some of these include lack of interviewer involvement—which means that unclear questions cannot be explained, and lack of open-ended questions—which allow respondents to more fully explain their answers. The research strategy used for this project has
Table 1

The number of philanthropic organizations nationally and in Franklin County, by function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Arts, Culture</td>
<td>67 10.39%</td>
<td>12,550 10.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Education</td>
<td>66 10.23%</td>
<td>13,307 11.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Environment</td>
<td>9  1.40%</td>
<td>1,574 1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Animal Related</td>
<td>10 1.55%</td>
<td>1,644 1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Health</td>
<td>32 4.96%</td>
<td>7,893 6.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Mental Health</td>
<td>14 2.18%</td>
<td>3,530 2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Disease</td>
<td>23 3.57%</td>
<td>2,788 2.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Medical Resrch</td>
<td>13 2.02%</td>
<td>692  .58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: Crime</td>
<td>19 2.95%</td>
<td>1,799 1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Employment</td>
<td>15 2.33%</td>
<td>2,012 1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: Food</td>
<td>9  1.40%</td>
<td>1,323 1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L: Housing</td>
<td>49 7.60%</td>
<td>5,570 4.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: Public Safety</td>
<td>1  .16%</td>
<td>1,172  .99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: Recreation</td>
<td>40 6.20%</td>
<td>6,214 5.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O: Youth Devment</td>
<td>21 3.26%</td>
<td>3,904 3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Human Services</td>
<td>77 11.94%</td>
<td>18,791 15.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: International</td>
<td>5  .78%</td>
<td>953  .80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Civil Rights</td>
<td>7  1.09%</td>
<td>656  .55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Community Imp</td>
<td>37 5.74%</td>
<td>6,048 5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Philanthropy</td>
<td>22 3.41%</td>
<td>44  .04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: Science</td>
<td>7  1.09%</td>
<td>1,157  .97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: Social Science</td>
<td>4  .62%</td>
<td>420  .35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: Public Affairs</td>
<td>8  1.24%</td>
<td>975  .82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X: Religion rldt</td>
<td>24 3.72%</td>
<td>6,004 5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y: Memb Benefit</td>
<td>3  .47%</td>
<td>297  .25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z: Unknown</td>
<td>63 9.77%</td>
<td>17,368 14.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>645 100.07%</td>
<td>118,685 99.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Generalized categories of philanthropic organizations nationally and in Franklin County, by function.

**HUMAN SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Crime</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Employment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: Food</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L: Housing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: Recreation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O: Youth Devment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Human Services</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>39,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Education</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HEALTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E: Health</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Mental Health</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Disease</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Medical Resrch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 2 (continued)

ARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Arts, Culture</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.39%</td>
<td>10.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC SOCIETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M: Public Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.16%</td>
<td>.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: Civil Rights</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Community Impm</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Philanthropy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W: Public Affairs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C: Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Animal Related</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: International</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.78%</td>
<td>.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.62%</td>
<td>.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X: Religion reltd</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y: Memb Benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.47%</td>
<td>.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z: Unknown</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.77%</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.29%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
taken advantage of the benefits of mailed surveys, while also utilizing case studies and interviews to augment the findings and counter-balance some of their disadvantages. The case study approach can be a particularly effective technique for studying organizations, as pointed out by Yin, among others. The approach allows the researcher to develop a familiarity with the internal and external contextual complexities of the organizations studied.

Six philanthropic organizations which vary according to function and budget size were selected for case study research. Each of the case studies included personal interviews with the chief staff officer, two key staff--identified by the CSO, and three key volunteers--also identified by the CSO. The majority of these interviews were completed during July-November 1992. Prior to the interviews a wide variety of the organization's official documents were reviewed, including annual reports, board minutes/reports, fund-raising campaign materials, newsletters, organizational charts, strategic planning documents, and financial reports. These documents allowed the researcher to develop a basic familiarity with the organizational context and served as additional sources of evidence. This use of multiple sources of information has been advocated by a number of scholars who encourage researchers to "triangulate" the development of their understandings of phenomena.
Prior to the interviews, the chief staff officer was asked to complete a written questionnaire (see Appendix, pp. 197-204) and each informant was asked to complete a questionnaire which consisted of Section B (which deals with the research questions) of the questionnaire. All interviews were confidential and tape recorded. These tapes, along with the official documents collected and the completed questionnaires, have been compiled into a "case study data base" for each organization studied.\footnote{157}

The responses to the questionnaire were used as cues for questions during the interviews. Each question and the answer written was reviewed and, depending on the answer, the informant was asked to elaborate on or clarify the response. This approach required the researcher to choose the appropriate times to probe more deeply into responses which provided additional insights into the question asked. This was a technique used in a pilot case study for this project in the October, 1991, and worked well for the researcher.

The completed questionnaires were analyzed according to the same protocol described in the next section so the results could be compared with the mailed questionnaires. The results from the questionnaires were also compared with the rest of the data in the case study data base for each organization. Data from the interviews and the official documents provided additional contextual background
concerning the responses to each question.

**Surveyed Organizations**

The questionnaire used for the case study interviews was reviewed upon the completion of those interviews. Minor improvements and modifications were made in it prior to its use as a mailed questionnaire. This final version, along with the cover letter, is included in the Appendix, pp. 205-214.

The 639 questionnaires were mailed first class in March, 1993 to the chief staff officers of Franklin County (Columbus area), Ohio, philanthropic organizations. A follow-up post card was mailed to all non-respondents four weeks after the initial mailing.

The questionnaire included both general organization description questions (taken, with permission, from an INDEPENDENT SECTOR survey) and those relating to the research questions. Following is an explanation of how each of the research questions were engaged in the questionnaire and then analyzed:

1. Is the mission expressed as an intention to impact the world outside itself, or itself, or both?

The following questions were asked on the questionnaire:
"Does your organization have a mission statement which has been approved by its board of directors?

______ Yes. If yes, please attach a copy of the mission statement. Please state the year in which this current version was approved: _______. When was the mission statement last reviewed: _______.

______ No. If no, what would you say the mission of the organization is:"

The organization's board of directors is given the responsibility and authority to assure that it is fulfilling the purpose for which it was created, and stating the mission is fundamental to this responsibility. If a board approved mission statement does not exist, this is the first structure missing for the organization to be designed for mission accomplishment.

Given the definition of philanthropic organizations used in this study, the mission statements collected should have expressed an intention to impact the outside world. If many of these statements do not express such an intention, this is an indication that a flaw—an inconsistency—in the design of the organizations exist.

Content analysis, utilizing a team of raters working independently, was used in this situation to determine if the organization mission is an intention to impact the outside world, itself, both, or neither. This same Research Analyst Team was used for analysis on this and other questions. The team was trained by the researcher,
utilizing a very specific, protocol (see Appendix, pp. 215-222). Inter-rater agreement for each question analyzed varied. For this question, the four analysts agreed 100% of the time on 78 of 100 responses; 75% of the time on 14 responses; and 50% on 8 responses.

The mission statements on which there was only 50% agreement were reviewed by the analysts in a meeting together after scores were totaled. In all of these situations a question arose over whether or not a mission which states an intention to impact "members" is impacting itself or outside the organization. Opinions varied, as did the types of membership organizations--some are exclusive and others, such as arts organizations, publicly seek members as a way of impacting outside the organization. In these eight situations, the researcher's opinion of the intention was used as the "tie-breaking vote" for reporting purposes.

2. Is the mission communicated outside and inside the organization, and if so, how?

The following questions were asked in the questionnaire:

a. "Does your organization communicate its mission internally--to staff and volunteers? _____ No. _____ Yes. If "yes," In what ways is the mission communicated internally?"

b. "Does your organization communicate its mission externally--to others in the community? _____ No _____ Yes. If "yes," In what ways is the mission communicated externally?"
The communication of the mission of the organization, of its intentions, is an important first step in designing itself for mission accomplishment. Thus, whether or not this communication takes place, and how, is of interest. The communication means listed by the respondents are recorded in Tables 12 and 13 on pages 92-93. Similar responses were summarized together in these Tables in order to determine the frequency of responses.

3. Do performance measures assess mission accomplishment? In what other ways is mission accomplishment assessed?

The following questions were asked in the questionnaire:

a. "Please explain how you determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination."

b. "Does the board of directors determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission in the same way as you have explained in response to the previous question? _____ Yes. _____ No. If no, please explain how the board makes this determination. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence the board looks at to make this determination."

Two main steps of analysis were performed on the responses to the first question by the research analyst team. The first step was to identify which of the determinants listed—the results, outcomes, evidence—were "measurable." The level of each of the measurements listed
were identified, according to Kaufman's explanation. Categories are: Nominal, Ordinal, Interval-Ratio. Only those determinants which fell into the "Interval-Ratio" category were considered truly reliable "measures." Interrater agreement for these 101 responses was 100% for 74 responses; 75% for 19; and 50% for 8. Only ratings of 75% and 100% were considered valid for reporting purposes for this question. Responses on which only 50% agreement was reached were not reported as reliable measures.

The next step of analysis was an assessment of the logic and adequacy of the explanation of how the measure indicates mission accomplishment. This was a judgement as to whether or not the responses listed represented an "impact" on the condition of a person, place, or thing. Interrater agreement for the 101 responses was 100% for 66 responses, 75% for 23 responses and 50% for 12 responses. Again, only ratings of 75% and 100% were considered valid for reporting purposes for this question. Responses on which only 50% agreement was reached were not reported as reliable measures.

The results of the analysis were designed to reveal whether or not an organization has a reliable performance measure which assesses mission accomplishment. As was discussed in the literature review, this is a fundamental design necessity. Philanthropic organizations without this mission structure are not well designed for accomplishing
their missions.

Responses to the second question were designed to reveal the level of agreement between the CSO and the board of directors on the way in which mission accomplishment is determined. Agreement here is highly desirable. Otherwise, designing accountability structures with high reliability throughout the organization would be difficult.

If the CSO reported that the board uses different determinants for mission accomplishment, then those determinants were analyzed in the same way as those the CSO listed. That is, the responses were first analyzed to see if they were reliable measures, then analyzed to see if they represented an "impact" on the condition of a person, place, or thing. Responses for the CSO and the board were then compared and contrasted.

Responses to the above questions which were not judged to be reliable measures which assess an impact on the outside world were categorized and coded for reporting purposes. The researcher created a set of categories of models of effectiveness based on the literature review. The research analyst team used these categories, which are listed and explained in Table 3, to identify any of these models which appeared in the responses. The inter-rater agreement for the analysis of these 101 responses averaged 70 at 100%, 21 at 75%, and 8 for 50%. Again, only ratings of 75% and 100% were considered valid for reporting
Table 3

Explanations of the different categories of models of effectiveness used by research analyst team for content analysis.

**Efficiency.** This category would include statements that show concern for operating without wasting effort or resources, such as making sure costs are low and that there is a balanced budget.

**Goal.** Meeting goals and/or objectives would be given importance.

**Internal Process.** This category would include statements regarding the importance of following certain operational procedures closely.

**Resource Acquisition.** Importance would be given to growth and acquiring resources, perhaps through fund-raising, memberships, or providing services.

**Human Relations.** This category would include statements which give importance to how satisfied workers are on the job and how they feel about the working conditions.

**Constituency.** Importance is given to the opinions of supporters, clients, and "the public" regarding the performance of the organization.
purposes. Responses on which only 50% agreement was reached were not reported.

4. What performance measures exist which link the performance of members of the organization to the accomplishment of the organization mission? How else do members of the organization know if what they are doing supports the accomplishment of the mission?

The following question was asked in the questionnaire:

a. "Please explain how you determine whether what you do personally--on your job--does or does not contribute to the accomplishment of the organization mission. Please list any feedback you receive from others in addition to any results, outcomes, performance evaluation criteria, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination."

Each of these responses were analyzed by the research analyst team using the same protocol as above to determine which were "reliable measures." Inter-rater agreement for the 101 responses was 100% for 81 responses, 75% for 14, and 50% for 6. Again, only ratings of 75% and 100% were considered valid for reporting purposes. Responses on which only 50% agreement was reached were not reported as measures.

The responses to this question reveal the connection between the accomplishment of the mission and the management and accountability structures of the organization. These structures allow for coordinated action within the organization toward the intention of accomplishing the mission.
5. What are the attitudes which members of the organization report having toward the mission?

The survey questionnaire utilized Senge's levels of possible attitudes toward organization vision, which were reviewed in the previous section, to collect responses for this question. The question in the survey questionnaire was:

"The following statements are possible attitudes which members of an organization could report having toward the organization mission. What statement do you say represents your attitude regarding the organization mission? Please place a check mark in the one appropriate space.

_____ Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment.

_____ Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished.

_____ See the benefits of mission. Do everything expected and sometimes more. "Good soldier."

_____ On the whole, see the benefits of mission. Do what is expected and no more. "Pretty good soldier."

_____ Do not see the benefits of mission. But, also, do not want to lose job. Do enough of what's expected because you have to, but also let it be known you are not really on board.

_____ Do not see the benefits of mission and will not do what's expected. "I won't do it; you can't make me."

_____ Neither for nor against mission. No interest. No energy. "Is it five o'clock yet?"

Easily quantifiable scores from these instruments were calculated for the chief staff officers. Their responses reveal their relationship, their reported attitude, toward the mission. It is important for purposes of "alignment,"
that the CSOs show a high level of commitment to the mission.

6. In what other ways does the organization use its mission in its operations?

The following question was asked in the survey questionnaire:

"In which of the following operational areas does the organization mission play a significant role in your organization? Please place a check mark beside the appropriate spaces. Check as many as apply.

_____ Strategic Planning
_____ Marketing
_____ Fund-Raising
_____ Board of Directors operations

Responses to this question are reported on numerically. Again, the literature suggests that the mission should play a significant role in each of these operational areas.

Follow-up Questionnaires

Once the survey responses from the population of the 639 chief staff officers were received and scored through the content analysis process, a follow-up questionnaire had been planned to fifteen of the organizations which reported "reliable impact measures" as determinants of mission accomplishment. The literature suggests that an organization designed for the accomplishment of its mission would have reliable measures which assess impact. The
literature also suggests that measures used to assess impact should be agreed upon by the CSO and board of directors. These key structures support the design of accountability structures with high reliability throughout the organization. Tasks and responsibilities for groups and individuals can be designed with the intention of producing results along the agreed upon measures.

Therefore, it had been planned that a follow-up questionnaire would be mailed to a representative sample of fifteen of the organizations reporting reliable impact measures in order to more fully investigate the extent to which there was agreement on these measures throughout the organizations. Unfortunately, only fourteen organizations listed reliable impact measures. These fourteen organizations were contacted for follow-up questionnaires, rather than a representative sample.

These organizations targeted for extended surveying were contacted through their CSOs. The volunteer chairs of the board, two key staff—identified by the CSO, and two key board members—also identified by the CSO, were asked to complete a questionnaire that included the following three questions:

1. Please explain how you determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination.
2. How does your organization determine the allocation of resources (time, funding, etc.) between different programs and/or areas of activity? Please list any factors which are considered as the organization compares programs and/or activities to one another.

3. Please explain how you determine whether what you do personally—in your board member capacity—does or does not contribute to the accomplishment of the organization mission. Please list any feedback you receive from others in addition to any results, outcomes, performance evaluation criteria, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination.

Responses to these questions were designed to provide additional data for the research questions, and to be particularly useful for the questions dealing with measures linking the performance of members of the organization to mission accomplishment. It also provides data on the number and percentage of these respondents which report the same organization performance measures.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND RESULTS

A. Questionnaire Respondent Characteristics

A total of 101 responses were received to the questionnaire mailed out to the 639 philanthropic organizations surveyed, for a 15.81% response rate. The survey collected descriptive information on each organization. The respondents represent a diverse and interesting set of organizations according to various factors.

Geographic Focus

The questionnaire first inquired as to the geographic focus of each organization: "Is this a national, state or local organization?" The results:

National: 14  13.86%
State: 34  33.66%
Local: 53  52.48%

No statistics exist which provide a breakdown of the geographic focus of philanthropic organizations, nationally. However, responses to a 1986 survey by INDEPENDENT SECTOR of
a national random sample of philanthropic organizations (utilizing the same definition and parameters used in this study) found that National organizations made up 18% of the respondents, State organizations were 8%, and Local organizations were 74%. There is no way to know which set of respondents most closely represents true national statistics. However, it is not surprising that the Franklin County respondents would have a higher percentage of state organizations responding, given that Columbus is the state capital of Ohio. Regardless, the respondent set represents a solid mix of organizations from each category.

**Affiliation**

Next, it was asked: "Is your organization affiliated with any national or state organizations?" The results:

- **Formal Affiliation:** 52 51.49%
- **Informal Affiliation:** 16 15.84%
- **None:** 33 32.67%

Again, no national statistics exist which track affiliations of philanthropic organizations. The respondent set represents a mix of organizations in each category.

**Function**

As has been explained in the previous section, the database for the questionnaire mailing was provided by INDEPENDENT SECTOR'S National Center for Charitable
Statistics. The functional classification codes for all organizations on the mailing list were provided by the Center so that the respondent set could be compared with the entire Franklin County pool and the national pool of philanthropic organizations. Those comparisons are listed in Table 4.

The respondent set in every functional category very closely represents the percentages of these organizations in the entire Franklin County pool of philanthropic organizations, which—as was discussed in an earlier section—are very close to the national functional categories. By function, the respondent set represents a diverse mix of organizations which are very similar to the national pool of these organizations.

While the classification codes of the respondent organizations were provided by the Center for Charitable Statistics, the questionnaire did ask "What primary type of function or service does your organization provide?" and a detailed description of functional categories (provided by INDEPENDENT SECTOR) was provided. Interestingly, there were some significant differences in how the Center for Charitable Statistics classified these organizations and how they classified themselves. These differences are demonstrated in Table 5. The areas of greatest difference occur where organizations which the Center classified as
Table 4

Number and percentage of total survey respondents by function, compared with percentage of like organizations in Franklin County and nationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Franklin Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Services</td>
<td>30/29.70%</td>
<td>35.66%</td>
<td>33.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educ/Instruction</td>
<td>10/ 9.90%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health</td>
<td>15/14.85%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>12.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>12/11.88%</td>
<td>10.39%</td>
<td>10.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public/Soc Benefit</td>
<td>16/15.84%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>18/17.82%</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Functional categories which organizations selected themselves as representing compared with the categories assigned to them by INDEPENDENT SECTOR's National Center for Charitable Statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>IS-ID</th>
<th>Self-ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Services</td>
<td>30/29.70%</td>
<td>31/30.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educ/Instruction</td>
<td>10/ 9.90%</td>
<td>25/24.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health</td>
<td>15/14.85%</td>
<td>18/17.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>12/11.88%</td>
<td>10/ 9.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public/Soc Benefit</td>
<td>16/15.84%</td>
<td>8/ 7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>18/17.82%</td>
<td>9/ 8.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Other" and "Public/Society Benefit" classified themselves as "Education." Other researchers have reported similar findings (e.g., "Widespread Mistakes Found in Effort to Classify Nation's Non-Profit Groups," The Chronicle of Philanthropy). These differences will be reported to the Center for their review, and are not surprising, given how relatively new the classification system and computer program used by the Center are.

Age

The age of each organization was recorded: "How long has your organization been in existence? If it has undergone any reorganization, please date from original founding." While no national statistics on the ages of philanthropic organizations exist, the previously mentioned 1986 national survey by INDEPENDENT SECTOR did collect this data on its respondents. The six-year time difference between these two surveys would have an impact on "age" responses. However, given the lack of other comparative data, it is nonetheless interesting to see how the two respondent groups compare (Table 6).

Even though the two surveys did differ in time by six years, there are similarities in the age categories. The Franklin County group is slightly "younger" than the INDEPENDENT SECTOR group, but again, it is unknown what the true national statistics are. Most importantly, though, the
Table 6

The age of the survey respondent organizations compared with the age of organizations which responded to a similar survey by INDEPENDENT SECTOR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>IS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years:</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years:</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years:</td>
<td>8 7.92%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years:</td>
<td>22 21.78%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17 years:</td>
<td>14 13.86%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22 years:</td>
<td>10 9.90%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-49 years:</td>
<td>19 18.81%</td>
<td>49%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ years:</td>
<td>27 26.73%</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer:</td>
<td>1 .99%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*The INDEPENDENT SECTOR questionnaire used an age category of 23+ years. The Franklin County Respondent Set would be 45.54% compared to the 49% INDEPENDENT SECTOR set.*)
Franklin County Respondent Set does include a broad range of age categories--adding yet another element of diversity to the responses.

**Total Revenues**

Total revenues were reported by each responding organization: "What was the total amount of revenues, from all sources, received by your organization during your most recently completed fiscal year?" No national statistics have been made available publicly on total revenues of philanthropic organizations in recent years. However, this may be data which the Center for Charitable Statistics could produce in coming years.

**Table 7**

Total annual revenues reported by survey respondent organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Perct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100,000:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-249,999:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250-499,000:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-999,999:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1-2,499,999:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500,000+:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents, by every organizational characteristic collected, represent a very diverse and
interesting set of organizations. And, in the case of the organization function category, the respondents very closely match the entire set of Franklin County philanthropic organizations and the entire national pool of philanthropic organizations.

B. Questionnaire Responses and Analysis

Mission Statement

A set of questions were asked regarding the mission statement of the organization. First was "Does your organization have a formal mission statement which has been approved by its board of directors?" The responses:

Yes: 92 91.09%
No: 8 7.92%
No Answer: 1 .99%

If the answer to the above question was "Yes," the respondents were asked to provide a copy of the mission statement—which all 92 did. If the answer was "No," they were asked to write what they would say is the mission of the organization—which all 8 of them did. The one respondent which did not answer the above question did not record its mission statement and instead wrote "Sorry, cannot attach a copy of the mission statement because it is for internal use only. We are working on an external
statement." This is an interesting finding. It is perhaps even more interesting that the chief staff officer decided to complete the rest of the questionnaire even without this important portion of the data.

Respondents which answered the above question "Yes" were also asked to record the year in which the current version of their mission statement was approved (see Table 8). The median year in which mission statements were approved is between 1990 and 1991. Respondents were also asked when the mission statement was last reviewed by the board of directors. This question was answered by 73 of the 78 respondents who answered the previous question (see Table 9).

It is a significant finding that attention is being paid to the mission statements of these organizations. A large majority (85.90%) had reviewed their mission statements within the two years prior to the survey, and a majority (56.04%) stated that the current version in use was approved within the four previous years. These findings show that the mission is being used, at least in discussions and reviews. Further findings review just how else the mission is used.
Table 8

Years of mission statement approval for the 92 survey respondent organizations. Columns of percentages shown are based on 1. the total 101 respondents, 2. the 92 with formal mission statements, 3. the 78 respondents which actually answered the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pct/Tot</th>
<th>Pct/Frm</th>
<th>Pct/Ans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
<td>9.78%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
<td>27.17%</td>
<td>32.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Ans:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.86%</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years during which the mission statements of the survey respondents were last reviewed by the board of directors. Percentages shown are based on the 73 respondents to the question, the 78 which answered the previous question, and the total 101 respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Perct/73</th>
<th>Perct/78</th>
<th>Perct/101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992:</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64.38%</td>
<td>60.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Ans:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Statement Impact

The Research Analyst Team examined each of the 100 mission statements to determine whether each statement "expressly stated an intention to impact/benefit the organization itself, to make an impact/benefit outside the organization, to do both, or to do neither." The results of this analysis are:

- Intention to impact organization itself: 2/ 1.98%
- Intention to impact outside organization: 90/ 89.11%
- Intention to impact both: 7/ 6.93%
- Intention to impact neither: 1/ .99%

These results are very consistent with the definition of a philanthropic organization as "making a difference in the quality of life." Nearly all (97/100: 97.00%) of the organizations show an intention to make an impact outside themselves or both to impact themselves and make an outside impact.

Reliable Impact Measures

The analyst team examined the responses to the question: "Please explain how you determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination." The first step of analysis for these responses was to determine which of the statements
were **reliable measures**. Then, each of these measures were analyzed to determine whether or not the reliable measures "represent an impact on (or difference made in) a person, place, and/or thing outside the organization." The results of the analysis are:

Respondents listing reliable measures: 49/48.51%

Reliable measures with impact: 14/13.86%

Table 10 provides some examples of the difference between reliable measures which do not represent an impact and those which do. As these findings show, a vast majority of the reliable measures used by the respondents to determine mission accomplishment do not represent an impact or difference made in the condition of a person, place, or thing outside the organization.

Respondents were then asked "Does the board of directors determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission in the same way as you have explained in response to (the previous question)?" The results:

Yes: 91 90.10%

No: 10 9.90%

The respondents who reported that the board of directors does not determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission in the same way as the
Table 10

Examples of Reliable Measures and Reliable Impact Measures.

Reliable Measures/No Impact

A "reliable measure" relates items on equal interval scales and collects evidence which could be confirmed by an objective observer. Examples of reliable measures which do not represent an impact/difference made on the condition of a person, place, or thing outside the organization include:

* Amount of dollars raised
* Number of program participants
* Number of new volunteers
* Number of educational materials distributed
* Number of programs held
* Cost per participant

Reliable Impact Measures

Reliable Impact Measures are reliable measures which do represent an impact/difference made on the condition of a person, place, or thing outside the organization. Because they specifically represent the difference the organization intends to make, general examples cannot be given. Some specific examples would include:

* Number of program participants who complete job training program and secure a job for a year following completion of it.

* Number of program participants who complete drug rehabilitation and are "clean" for at least one year after completing program.

* Number of program participants who increase reading level after completing program.
chief staff officer were asked to "list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence the board looks at to make this determination." The same two steps of analysis as described above were used to examine the statements provided by the 10 respondents who reported that the board of directors does make this determination differently. The results of this analysis are:

Respondents listing reliable measures: 3 of 10/30.00%
Respondents listing reliable measures with impact: 0/0%

**Chief Staff Officer Performance Measures**

The questionnaire asked each chief staff officer to "Please explain how you determine whether what you do personally--on your job--does or does not contribute to the accomplishment of the organization mission. Please list any feedback you receive from others in addition to any results, outcomes, performance evaluation criteria, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination." The Research Analyst Team examined these responses to determine which of them were reliable measures. The results of this analysis are:

CSO Reliable Measures: 18/17.82%

**Other Performance Explanations**

Finally, the Research Analyst Team again reviewed the responses to the question: "Please explain how you determine
whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination." This time, the analysts were asked to compare the responses to the question with the following categories of "performance explanations" which--as is earlier discussed in the Chapter II literature review--are frequently used by researchers and practitioners. The categories and the brief descriptions of each which were given to the analysts are listed in Table 3 on page 69.

The analysts were instructed to record as many of the categories of models of effectiveness as they identified in each response. The results of the analysis are:

Table 11

Number and percentage of respondents which listed methods of determining mission accomplishment according to the following models of effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Process:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Acquisition:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Communication

The questionnaire asked "Does your organization communicate its mission internally--to staff and volunteers? If 'yes,' in what ways is the mission communicated internally?" The results:

- Yes: 94  93.07%
- No:  6   5.94%
- No Answer: 1  .99%

The means of communication listed by these 94 respondents answering this question "Yes" are recorded in Table 12.

The questionnaire then asked: "Does your organization communicate its mission externally--to others in the community? If 'yes,' in what ways is the mission communicated externally?" The results:

- Yes: 88  87.13%
- No:  12  11.88%
- No Answer: 1  .99%

The means of communication listed by the 88 respondents answering this question "Yes" are recorded in Table 13.
Table 12

Means of communicating the mission internally as reported by survey respondents. Similar responses were summarized together in order to determine frequency of responses.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff Meetings</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organization Literature</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In-Service Training</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Board of Directors Meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Policy Manual/Handbook</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Informal Discussion</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Internal Correspondence</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>During Staff Planning Sessions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Staff Retreat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Organization Programs/Events</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>One-on-One Meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Board Retreats</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Posted Internally</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Volunteer Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Creation of Statement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bulletin Boards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strategic/Long Range Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Reflected in Position Descriptions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>In Constitution &amp; By-Laws</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fund-Raising Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Annual Staff Project Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Annual Distribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Volunteer Handbook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Grant Proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Posted on Information Center Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Organization Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>CEO Correspondence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Staff Performance Reviews</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Through Evaluation Process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Means of communicating the mission externally as reported by survey respondents. Similar responses were summarized together in order to determine frequency of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Presentations</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organization Literature</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brochures to Target Audiences</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grant Proposals</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fund-raising Letters/Solicitations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Organization Program Events</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Relations Releases</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Television-Newspaper-Radio</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Individual Meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Information Packets to Target Audiences</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Frequently in Correspondence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fund-raising Events</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>In Organizational Exhibit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Reports to Funders/Donors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>On Letterhead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Correspondence to Legislators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>In Organization Marketing Literature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Video Public Service Announcements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Advertising Campaigns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Annual Conference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>In Constitution &amp; By-Laws</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Annual Membership Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Biennial Convention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Volunteer Recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reported Attitude toward Mission

The questionnaire asked "The following statements are possible attitudes which members of an organization could report having toward the organization mission. What statement do you say represents your attitude regarding the organization mission?" The statements and results are recorded in Table 14. The respondents report exceptionally high levels of commitment to their organizations' missions. These are "self-reports" on commitment level and--while respondents were encouraged to answer all questions openly and honestly--could be influenced by feelings that this "should" be their response or that it is the "right answer."

Role of Mission

The questionnaire asked "In which of the following operational areas does the organization mission play a significant role in your organization? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces. Check as many as apply." This question gave respondents the option of selecting any or all of the following operational areas, and many did select all of them. The literature suggests that the mission should play a significant role in all these areas.

91/90.10% Strategic Planning
66/65.35% Marketing
75/74.26% Fund-Raising
76/75.25% Board of Directors operations
Table 14

Personal attitudes toward mission as reported by survey respondents. Number of respondents selecting each level is recorded, along with percentage of the total selecting that level.

1. 85/84.16% Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment.

2. 11/10.89% Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished.

3. 4/3.96% See the benefits of mission. Do everything expected and sometimes more. "Good soldier."

4. 0/- On the whole, see the benefits of mission. Do what is expected and no more. "Pretty good soldier."

5. 0/- Do not see the benefits of mission. But, also, do not want to lose job. Do enough of what's expected because you have to, but also let it be known you are not really "on the team."

6. 0/- Do not see the benefits of mission and will not do what's expected. "I won't do it; you can't make me."

7. 0/- Neither for nor against mission. No interest. No energy. "Is it five o'clock yet?"

No Answer: 1/.99%
C. Extended Questionnaire Response Analysis

As is discussed in the prior section, fourteen respondents reported statements that were judged to be "reliable impact measures" by the Research Analyst Team in response to the question regarding determinants of mission accomplishment. Of these fourteen, eleven respondents agreed to return and returned follow-up questionnaires which were distributed to them. Six questionnaires were directed to each respondent, one for the them to return themselves (the chief staff officers), one for their Board Chair, two for other members of the organization's staff, and two for other members of its board of directors. The functions of these organizations are recorded in Table 15. Of the total 66 (six per eleven respondents) questionnaires distributed, 41 were returned. The breakdown of responses by each organization's board and staff respondents is recorded in Table 16.

The questionnaire included a copy of the formal mission statement of the organization and three questions. Following is a summary and analysis of the responses to those questions.

Reliable Impact Measures

The first question was identical to one asked in the original questionnaire to the chief staff officers. It
Table 15

Number and percentage of extended survey respondents by function, compared with percentage of like organizations in total pool of survey respondents and in all of Franklin County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Ext Survey</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Frnkln Cty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Services</td>
<td>4/36.36%</td>
<td>29.70%</td>
<td>35.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educ/Instruction</td>
<td>1/ 9.09%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health</td>
<td>0/ -</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>0/ -</td>
<td>11.88%</td>
<td>10.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public/Soc Benefit</td>
<td>4/36.36%</td>
<td>15.84%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>2/18.18%</td>
<td>17.82%</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Number of responses to extended survey by each organization's board and staff respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board Responses</th>
<th>Staff Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization #1:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #2:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #3:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #4:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #5:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #6:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #7:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #8:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #9:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #10:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization #11:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only two staff in entire organization.
asked: "Please explain how you determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination."

The responses to this question were analyzed by the researcher using the same protocol as the analysis performed by the Research Analyst Team for the chief staff officer questionnaire. Each response was analyzed to determine whether or not it included "reliable impact measures." These were then compared with the response of the chief staff officer for that organization to see if there was agreement. General examples of these responses are similar to those recorded in Table 10 on page 88. Specific samples of responses cannot be given as they would reveal the identity of the organizations involved and anonymity was guaranteed to them.

In only four of the eleven organizations (Organizations #1, #2, #9, #10 from Table 16) did at least one respondent list a reliable impact measure identical to the chief staff officer. In only one organization (Organization #2) was there agreement between the chief staff officer and more than one other respondent. Two of this organization's respondents--(a board member and a staff member)--agreed with the chief staff officer. There was not agreement with the fourth respondent, a staff member. It is unfortunate that the other two questionnaires distributed to this
organization were not returned to determine further agreement within the organization.

In the other three organizations (1#, #9, #10) one respondent agreed with the chief staff officer. In one situation (#10) this was the only other respondent (a board member) from the organization. Again it is unfortunate that more respondents did not return their questionnaires in order to determine further possible agreement in the organization.

The final two organizations (#1, #9) had three respondents in addition to the chief staff officer. The one organization (#9), in which two of the respondents were staff and the other was a board member, had one of the staff in agreement with the chief staff officer. For the other (#1), in which two of the respondents were board members and the other was staff, one of the board members agreed with the chief staff officer.

Because more of the questionnaires from the first two organizations (#2, #10) were not returned, the extent to which agreement on the reliable impact measures exists in the organizations is uncertain. Even though one person agreed with the chief staff officer in the other two organizations, there is obviously not extensive agreement within the organization. So, even though the chief staff officers of the eleven organizations returning the follow-up questionnaires listed reliable impact measures as
determinants of organization accomplishment, very little agreement was found throughout the organizations—from staff or the board—on these determinants.

**Program vs. Organization Level Measures**

The second question asked: "How does your organization determine the allocation of resources (time, funding, etc.) between different programs and/or areas of activity? Please list any factors which are considered as the organization compares programs and/or activities to one another." Again, each response was analyzed to determine whether or not it included "reliable impact measures." None of these responses—except those made by chief staff officers—were found to be reliable impact measures. Rather than reliable impact measures, the types of measures as are listed in Table 10, page 88, were more frequently given.

**Individual Performance Measures**

The final question asked: "Please explain how you determine whether what you do personally—(on your job/in your board member capacity)—does or does not contribute to the accomplishment of the organization mission. Please list any feedback you receive from others in addition to any results, outcomes, performance evaluation criteria, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination." These responses were examined to determine which of them
were reliable measures. The results of this analysis are:

Reliable Performance Measures: 10/41: 24.39%

Again, the types of reliable measures mentioned by respondents were similar to those listed in Table 10, page 88. The measures often related to financial data or the completion of specific activities.

D. Case Study Organization Characteristics

Six organizations agreed to participate in the case study portion of this project. They were intentionally chosen to reflect diversity according to function and organization size. The same descriptive information collected for the organizations which were mailed questionnaires was also collected on the case study organizations. Following are the specific characteristics of the organizations, along with comparisons to the mailed questionnaire respondent group.

Geographic Focus

In response to the question regarding the geographic focus of each organization: "Is this a national, state or
local organization?" The results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National:</td>
<td>14 13.86%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>34 33.66%</td>
<td>2 33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local:</td>
<td>53 52.48%</td>
<td>4 66.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, there is no way to know if these statistics represent true national statistics. However, the two sets are similar with the exception that none of the case studies represented national organizations.

**Affiliation**

Next, it was asked: "Is your organization affiliated with any national or state organizations?" The results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Affiliation:</td>
<td>52 51.49%</td>
<td>3 50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Affiliation:</td>
<td>16 15.84%</td>
<td>2 33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None:</td>
<td>33 32.67%</td>
<td>1 16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No national statistics exist which track affiliations of philanthropic organizations. The case study organizations represent a mix of organizations in each category.
Function

The case study organizations are also diverse, based upon the function of the organizations. The functions of these organizations compared to the survey respondents, the Franklin County pool, and the national pool, are recorded in Table 17.

Age

The age of each organization was recorded according to the question: "How long has your organization been in existence? If it has undergone any reorganization, please date from original founding." Half of the case study organizations are in the oldest category (see Table 18), which is consistent with the national statistics collected by INDEPENDENT SECTOR. Two organizations are in one of the "younger" categories and the others are in a moderate age range. Again, the organizations reflect diversity.
Table 17

Number and percentage of total survey respondents by function, compared with percentage of like organizations in Franklin County and nationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Frnkln Cty</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Services</td>
<td>2/33.33%</td>
<td>30/29.70%</td>
<td>35.66%</td>
<td>33.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educ/Instruction</td>
<td>1/16.67%</td>
<td>10/9.90%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health</td>
<td>1/16.67%</td>
<td>15/14.85%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>12.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arts, Culture, Humanities</td>
<td>1/16.67%</td>
<td>12/11.88%</td>
<td>10.39%</td>
<td>10.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public/Soc Ben</td>
<td>1/16.67%</td>
<td>16/15.84%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>1/16.67%</td>
<td>18/17.82%</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

The age of the case study organizations, compared with the age of survey respondent organizations and the age of organizations which responded to a similar survey by INDEPENDENT SECTOR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>IS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.78%</td>
<td>2/33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17 years:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.86%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22 years:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>1/16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-49 years:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ years:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.73%</td>
<td>3/50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.99%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*The INDEPENDENT SECTOR questionnaire used an age category of 23+ years. The Franklin County Respondent Set would be 45.54% compared to the 49% INDEPENDENT SECTOR set.*)
Total Revenues

According to annual revenues, two of the organizations are in the highest category, two are in one of the lower categories, and the two others are in a high to moderate category.

Table 19

Annual revenues of case study organizations compared with survey respondent organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100,000:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-249,999:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250-499,000:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-999,999:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1-2,499,999:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500,000+:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Case Study Questionnaires and Interviews

Six individuals from each organization were interviewed as a part of the case study research—the chief staff officer, two additional staff, and three volunteers—usually board members. Since confidentiality was guaranteed to each interviewee and organization, the findings will be recorded
here in a general fashion. The organizations are only referred to by designated roman numerals.

Prior to the interviews, subjects were asked to complete a written questionnaire. The responses to the questionnaire were discussed with the interviewee. Where appropriate, an analysis of the written responses is included below along with any comments of interest the subject made regarding the issue.

Mission Statements

Each organization submitted a formal mission statement for review. These mission statements were reviewed by the researcher using the same protocol as was used by the research analyst team in reviewing those submitted by the mailed questionnaire respondent group. One organization's mission statement was found to include intentions to impact both the organization itself and outside the organization. All five others were found to have intentions to make an impact outside the organization.

Mission Accomplishment Determinants

The questionnaire completed prior to the interviews asked each respondent: "What specific measures does the organization have that tell it when it is accomplishing the organization mission? These would tell you whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please
explain how each measure is an indication of the organization accomplishing its mission." A companion question asked "In what other ways--besides the specific measures listed in your answer to (the prior question) does the organization know it is accomplishing the organization mission?" These responses were reviewed with each person during the interview. Respondents were encouraged to discuss their responses and to add other determinants they could think of at that time.

The written and verbal responses to these questions were analyzed by the researcher to determine whether or not the responses included "reliable measures" and "reliable impact measures." The protocol used for this analysis was the same as that used by the research analyst team for the analysis of the mailed questionnaires.

ORGANIZATION I

Measures. While each of the six respondents listed "reliable measures" which are used to determine the accomplishment of the mission, none of them listed or discussed any "reliable impact measures."

Comments of Interest:

*By staff person: "The mission gets interpreted by the board. It is a basic mission for (organizations like this one) and it is up to the board to emphasize one particular aspect of the mission or another. This does cause us some dilemmas over how to balance our programming. Financial challenges impact decisions over priorities. . . While the mission has remained the same over many years the assumptions we have about what
it means have changed."

*From another staff person: "We find it challenging to determine how to balance our programming."

*From board member: "The mission has remained the same over the years—with some different emphases that various (staff people) have given it as they have changed over time."

*From a board member, listed response to above question on questionnaire: "Cannot answer."

ORGANIZATION II

**Measures.** Every staff person and board member listed reliable measures in response to the questions. Among the reliable measures listed by all of the staff and one of the three board members was a written, formal set of annual goals and objectives. More than 30 reliable measures were listed among these goals and objectives. Of those measures, two were judged to be "reliable impact measures." They measured the impact of two of the organization's programs. The other two board members did not refer to the annual goals and objectives in their responses.

**Comments of interest:**

*Two different board members listed "low administrative-overhead cost percentages" as important indicators of mission accomplishment. One suggested this might just be a "personal hang-up."

*By staff person: "Even though we have the performance indicators it is difficult to tell—qualitatively—if the activities are making a difference."
ORGANIZATION III

Measures. Every one of the staff and board members listed various "reliable measures." Two of these measures, which were listed by each respondent, were "reliable impact measures."

Comments of Interest:

*By board member, discussing the annual changes in the statistics for what she said was the most important of the two "reliable impact measures": "Oh yeah, and in this year (pointing to chart) it went back up. We were really concerned. We thought 'What has happened?' We finally concluded we needed make major changes in what we were doing. It really shook us up and we realized we couldn't continue going on the same way with the same activities we had been carrying out. And now the number has been going back down again for the last few years."

ORGANIZATION IV

Measures. All board members and staff listed various "reliable measures," none of which were judged to be "reliable impact measures."

Comments of Interest. Although no "reliable impact measures" were listed or stated by the interviewees of this organization, every one of them commented on the importance of this and shared ideas for such measures which had been discussed among the board and staff in recent months. Some specific comments:

*By board member: "We can measure the 'inputs' and have felt 'so we must be making an impact.' But we are moving closer to figuring out some measures for impact. .. It is very difficult for this organization."
Another board member: "An 'after' evaluation is coming."

By a staff member: "We want to make this (impact assessment) part of our routine operation."

By another staff member: "There are no national standards (of impact assessment), so we have to create our own."

ORGANIZATION V

Measures. Each of the board members and staff interviewed listed "reliable measures." One board member and one staff person listed two identical "reliable impact measures." This organization is a regional component of a national organization. The "reliable impact measures" which were listed were of a national scope. No companion "reliable impact measures" were listed which related to the specific geographic area of service of the organization.

Comments of Interest:

By staff person: "We have been focused on inputs and are now looking at how to shape measures of success. But, there are such a variety of levels of success to consider."

By staff person: "Most of our measures are on activities and number of people served."

By a board member: "We really don't know (whether or not the organization is accomplishing the mission), do we?"

ORGANIZATION VI

Measures. Five of the six staff and volunteers listed "reliable measures"--one staff person did not. Two staff
persons listed "reliable impact measures." However, there was agreement on only one of the measures among those both listed.

Comments of Interest:

*By board member: "I have a large network of contacts--I go to a lot of cocktail parties and that sort of thing. I hear things about our reputation in the community and figure if it is positive we must be doing well."

*By staff person: "We are in the process of developing these types of measures. It is easier to measure services. Otherwise, it's tough to measure."

SUMMARY

A vast majority of the respondents (35/36: 97.22%) listed some sort of "reliable measure" in response to either the written questionnaire or the interview discussion of the question. A minority of the respondents (14/36: 38.88%) listed some sort of "reliable impact measure" as a determinant of mission accomplishment. None of the respondents from two of the organization's listed any "reliable impact measures," and two of six respondents in two organizations listed them. Four of the six respondents in one organization listed "reliable impact measures," and in only one organization did all six respondents list them.

Individual Performance Measures

The questionnaire asked "What specific measures do you have that tell you that what you do personally--(on your
job/in your volunteer capacity)--contributes to the accomplishment of the organization mission? Please explain the connection between these measures and the accomplishment of the organization mission." And a companion question asked "In what other ways--besides the specific measures listed in your answer to (the previous question)--can you tell that what you do contributes to the accomplishment of the organization mission?" The responses to these questions were analyzed by the researcher to determine which individuals listed "reliable measures." The number of individuals in each organization which listed "reliable measures" out of the three staff and three volunteers from each organization questioned are listed in Table 20. The types of responses given are similar to the examples provided in Table 10, page 88.

**Mission Communication**

The written questionnaire asked "In what ways does your organization communicate its mission internally--to staff and volunteers, and externally--to others in the community?" The means of communication were listed by respondents in each organization are recorded in Table 21 and summarized in Table 22. Duplicate responses are summarized together in order to determine frequency of responses.
Table 20

Number of individual reliable performance measures listed by staff and volunteers interviewed in case study organizations, and percentages of total respondents listing individual reliable measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>TOTAL/PCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Reliable Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10/18: 55.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Reliable Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/18: 44.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number Reliable Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td>5/6: 83.33%</td>
<td>2/6: 33.33%</td>
<td>4/6: 66.67%</td>
<td>3/6: 50.00%</td>
<td>4/6: 66.67%</td>
<td>0/6: -</td>
<td>18/36: 50.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Means of communicating the mission internally and externally as listed by respondents in each case study organization. Duplicate responses are summarized together in order to determine frequency of responses.

**ORGANIZATION I—Internal**

1. Volunteer Meetings  
   2. Staff Meetings  
   3. Board Meetings  
   4. Employee Handbook

**ORGANIZATION I—External**

1. Press Releases  
   2. Public Presentations  
   3. Educational Programs  
   4. Publications  
   5. Special Events

**ORGANIZATION II—Internal**

1. Mission plaque on walls  
   2. Staff Meetings  
   3. Board Meetings  
   4. Employee Handbook  
   5. Board Manuals  
   6. Annual Board Retreat

**ORGANIZATION II—External**

1. Public Presentations  
   2. Publications  
   3. Mission plaque on walls  
   4. Annual Report  
   5. Letterhead  
   6. Fund Appeals

continued
Table 21 (continued)

**ORGANIZATION III--Internal**

1. Publications 2
2. Printed Policies & Guidelines 1

**ORGANIZATION III--External**

1. Publications 5
2. Public Relations Campaigns 4
3. Public Presentations 3
4. Educational Programs 2
5. Press Releases 1

**ORGANIZATION IV--Internal**

1. Standard Operating Procedures 3
2. Volunteer Training 2
3. Board Orientation 2
4. Board Handbook 1

**ORGANIZATION IV--External**

1. Publications 5
2. Press Releases 2
3. Annual Report 2
4. Fund Appeals 2
5. Grant Applications 1
6. Public Presentations 1
Table 21 (continued)

**ORGANIZATION V--Internal**

1. Mission plaque on wall 3
2. Volunteer Meetings 1
3. Staff Meetings 1
4. Board Meetings 1
5. Publications 1
6. Board Handbook 1
7. Recognition Events 1
8. Informal Staff Discussion 1

**ORGANIZATION V--External**

1. Publications 4
2. Press Releases 1
3. Public Presentations 1
4. Annual Report 1
5. Fund Appeals 1
6. Grant Applications 1
7. Special Event Fundraisers 1
8. Ongoing correspondence 1
9. Video 1

**ORGANIZATION VI--Internal**

1. Job Interviews 2
2. Staff Retreats 2
3. Staff Training 1
4. Staff Meetings 1
5. Volunteer Orientation 1

**ORGANIZATION VI--External**

1. Grant Applications 2
2. Public Presentations 2
3. Publications 2
4. Fund Appeals 1
5. Ongoing correspondence 1
6. Press Releases 1
Table 22

Summary of means of communicating the mission internally and externally as listed by respondents in the case study organizations. Duplicate responses are summarized together in order to determine frequency of responses.

**SUMMARY—Internal**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Volunteer Meetings 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff Meetings 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mission plaque on wall(s) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Publications 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Board Meetings 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedures 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Volunteer Training 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Board Orientation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Board Handbook 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Employee Handbook 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Job Interviews 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Staff Retreats 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Printed Policies &amp; Guidelines 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Recognition Events 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Informal Staff Discussion 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Staff Training 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Volunteer Orientation 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Board Manuals 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Annual Board Retreat 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY—External**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Publications 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Public Presentations 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Press Releases 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fund Appeals 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Public Relations Campaigns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Annual Report 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Grant Applications 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ongoing correspondence 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Educational Programs 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Special Events 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mission plaque on walls 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Educational Programs 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Letterhead 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Video 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reported Attitudes Toward Mission

Each interviewee was asked, on the questionnaire, to identify the attitude they--themselves--have toward the mission. These responses, and the average of all responses, are recorded in Table 23. It is interesting to note that all the chief staff officers selected the highest level of commitment as their attitude toward the mission.

Interviewees were also asked to report on the attitude they have concluded that other staff and the board of directors have toward the mission. These responses, and the average of all responses, are recorded in Table 24.
Table 23

Personal attitudes towards mission reported by case study interviewees for Organizations I-VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Attitude</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment.</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished.</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>30.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. See the benefits of mission. Do everything expected and sometimes more. &quot;Good soldier.&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. On the whole, see the benefits of mission. Do what is expected and no more. &quot;Pretty good soldier.&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do not see the benefits of mission. But, also, do not want to lose job. Do enough of what's expected because you have to, but also let it be known you are not really &quot;on the team.&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not see the benefits of mission and will not do what's expected. &quot;I won't do it; you can't make me.&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Neither for nor against mission. No interest. No energy. &quot;Is it five o'clock yet?&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Attitudes of other staff and the board of directors towards the mission as concluded and reported by case study interviewees for Organizations I-IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Attitude</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment.</td>
<td>20.17%</td>
<td>9.33%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>47.50%</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>28.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished.</td>
<td>29.33%</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
<td>31.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. See the benefits of mission. Do everything expected and sometimes more. &quot;Good soldier.&quot;</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
<td>21.83%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>24.20%</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
<td>21.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. On the whole, see the benefits of mission. Do what is expected and no more. &quot;Pretty good soldier.&quot;</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>20.50%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do not see the benefits of mission. But, also, do not want to lose job. Do enough of what's expected because you have to, but also let it be known you are not really &quot;on the team.&quot;</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.83%</td>
<td>.20%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not see the benefits of mission and will not do what's expected. &quot;I won't do it; you can’t make me.&quot;</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>.16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.60%</td>
<td>.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Neither for nor against mission. No interest. No energy. &quot;Is it five o’clock yet?&quot;</td>
<td>.83%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role of Mission

The questionnaire asked "In which of the following operational areas does the organization mission play a significant role in your organization?" The responses for the individuals in each organization, and the average of all responses is recorded in Table 25. It is interesting to note that Strategic Planning was the one operational area which each of the chief staff officers of these organizations selected—even though not all of their staff and board members concurred.
Table 25

Percentage of interview respondents who stated that the mission plays a "significant role" in the following operational areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Area</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>69.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-Raising</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors operations</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Further Case Study Findings

Organizational Documents

Prior to the interviews for the case studies, a wide variety of each organization's materials and official documents were reviewed, including annual reports, board minutes, board reports, fund-raising campaign materials, newsletters, organizational charts, strategic planning materials, and financial reports. These documents allowed the researcher to confirm statements made by various respondents. In no case did these documents provide any evidence to disconfirm the responses or claims by interviewees. And, in many cases, these documents further supported statements made during interviews. For example, materials were collected from each organization which confirmed the means used for communicating the mission. In another important example, the materials reviewed from the one organization in which all respondents reported the identical "reliable impact measures" very frequently discussed the measure and current statistics regarding the measure.

Case Study Comparative Findings

The findings for the case study organizations and the organizations which were surveyed with mailed questionnaires are very similar.
Mission Statements. All (100%) of the case study organizations had formal mission statements, compared with 91.09% of the survey organizations. Five of the six mission statements for the case study organizations (83.33%) were judged to state an intention to impact outside the organization compared to 89.11% for the survey organizations. One of the six case study organization mission statements (16.67%) was judged to state an intention to impact both the organization and outside it compared to 6.93% for the survey organizations.

Mission Accomplishment Determinants. While 48.51% of the survey organizations reported "reliable measures" as determinants of mission accomplishment, nearly all (35/36: 97.22%) of the respondents to the case study interviews listed reliable measures. And in the case studies, respondents in four of the six organizations and 38.89% (14/36) of the total interviewees listed "reliable impact measures," compared with 13.86% of the survey organizations. This seeming inconsistency is largely due to the difference in methods used to collect the data. The collection of organization documents and interviews--in addition to written questionnaires--provided more opportunities for the case study respondents to report both reliable measures and reliable impact measures. For example, six of the fourteen respondents reporting reliable impact measures did not list them on their written questionnaires--they were reported in
interviews. This reduces the response percentage considerably and brings it more in line with the survey group.

Given that the more in-depth interviewing revealed additional reliable impact measures, it is important to review exactly what was revealed. In Organization II, four of the six respondents referred to a list of over thirty performance indicators which they said was evidence of mission accomplishment, and only two of those were reliable impact measures. As a small part of a very large overall set of indicators, these are measures of "program impact"—not the sole indicators of mission accomplishment. They could be part of a set of overall reliable impact measures which indicate mission accomplishment. Even though respondents in Organizations V and VI listed reliable impact measures, the fact that only two of the six interviewed in each case listed them indicates that the measures either are not widely understood and accepted or that they represent only part of the impact the organizations are making. Only Organization III has reliable impact measures which every interviewee listed.

One could speculate that more in-depth interviewing of the members of the survey organizations could result in more reliable impact measures being listed by people in those organizations. However, the fact that the chief staff officer did not list it in a written questionnaire response
may indicate that those measures are not truly reliable impact measures of the entire operation's performance which are well understood by most in the organization. It may be more likely to uncover responses similar to those in Organizations II, V, and VI--some good ideas of reliable impact measures which may indicate partial mission accomplishment and which are understood by a few people in the organization.

**Individual Performance Measures.** A higher percentage (50.00%) of the case study organization respondents reported "reliable measures" which indicated that they were contributing to the accomplishment of the mission compared to 17.82% of the chief staff officers and 24.39% of the extended respondents in the survey organizations. Again, this difference is attributable to the different research methods used--interviews provided more opportunity for a respondent to mention a performance indicator which was measurable.

**Mission Communication.** All of the case study organizations communicated their mission internally and externally, compared with 93.07% (internal) and 87.13% (external) for the survey organizations. The means of communication listed by both sets of organizations were very similar.

**Reported Attitude to Mission.** All six (100%) of the case study organization chief staff officers reported the
highest level of commitment to the organization mission compared with 84.16% of the survey organization chief staff officers.

**Role of Mission.** The only operational area selected by all six (100%) of the case study chief staff officers as one in which the mission plays a "significant role" was Strategic Planning. This was also the highest area (90.10%) selected by the survey organization chief staff officers. The overall comparisons are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>90.10%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>65.35%</td>
<td>69.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-Raising</td>
<td>74.26%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board operations</td>
<td>75.25%</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

A. Missions and Important Mission Structures

Missions

While a high percentage of respondents (survey organizations: 91.09%; case study organizations: 100%) indicated that their organizations had formal mission statements which were approved by the board of directors, it is still unclear what percentage of all philanthropic organizations--in Franklin County or otherwise--have formal statements. The 15.81% questionnaire response rate is not high enough to generalize these findings to all other organizations in Franklin County or nationally. This will remain unknown without a full set of responses from the pool of organizations or full responses from a random sample of them. In this sense, these organizations have been "self-selected" by choosing to respond to the questionnaire. One can imagine, for example, a chief staff officer of an organization without a formal mission statement taking a look at the questionnaire and tossing it into a "circular file," rather than admit to not having a formal statement.
Given this possibility, one might speculate that even fewer organizations have formal statements than represented in the respondent set.

Even though this finding cannot be generalized to the entire population of philanthropic organizations, it is an important finding with regard to the respondent set. That is, a vast majority of the respondents do have the first important design feature that, based on the earlier literature review, one would expect to find in a philanthropic organization designed for the accomplishment of its mission—a formal mission statement.

Further, of those reporting that they have formal statements, a large majority stated they had reviewed (survey: 85.90%) the mission statement within the past two years and a majority (survey: 56.50%) stated that the current version of the statement had been approved within the previous four years. These findings show that the mission statement is receiving at least some attention in a majority of the respondent organizations. It was not approved upon the founding of the organization and filed away for historical purposes—never to be seen again—as may be the case in other organizations.

A high percentage of the organizations (survey: 96.04%; case study: 100%) were judged to have mission statements which stated an intention to impact outside the organization (survey: 89.11%; case study: 83.33%) or to impact both the
organization itself and outside the organization (survey: 6.93%; case study: 16.67%). This finding is consistent with the definition of a philanthropic organization given earlier as assisting in the "improvement in the quality of human life." So, this is not a surprising finding, but it is very important. It confirms an important distinction which makes philanthropic organizations at least somewhat unique. For example, one could imagine that a study of the purposes and missions of for-profit organizations might reveal a high percentage of intentions to impact the organization itself--"for profiting." And it would be interesting to see what a similar study of government agencies would reveal. These possibilities will be discussed further in the latter "Research Issues" section.

The final finding of interest with regard to the mission statements themselves is that, in their conversations about their organization missions, interviewees mentioned various "levels" of impact their organizations make. The organizations monitor "inputs" and carry out activities which are intended to have a certain impact, and that result creates further impacts--like a "ripple" effect or a "cause-effect chain." Examples of interview comments revealing these levels, from inputs to impacts, include:

*By board member (Organization IV): "We can measure the 'inputs' and have felt 'so we must be making an impact.' But we are moving closer to figuring out some measures for impact. . . It is very difficult for this
organization."

*By staff person (Organization V): "We have been focused on inputs and are now looking at how to shape measures of success. But, there are such a variety of levels of success to consider."

*By staff person (Organization V): "Most of our measures are on activities and number of people served."

*By staff person (Organization VI): "We are in the process of developing these types of measures. It is easier to measure services. Otherwise, it's tough to measure."

Confidentiality precludes using an actual mission statement from this study as an example for discussion. However, using elements of truth in the findings from a variety of organizations, a somewhat hypothetical example can be utilized. The hypothetical example to illustrate this point would be the fictitious case of "Charles County Homeless Services" with a mission "To provide services to the homeless in Charles County." One could imagine such an organization providing employment services to the homeless in this county. The positive impact of this service could be that the homeless person finds and keeps a job. The next "level" impact could be that, by having a job that pays well enough, the homeless person is able to secure personal housing--they are no longer homeless. The further "cumulative" impact of the service could include many others finding jobs and securing housing. The further "level" impact from this result could be that homelessness in the county is reduced.
This issue of "levels of impact," demonstrated in this example, is similar to Senge's view of the importance of identifying the result of "greatest intrinsic difference." In discussing this concept, Senge points out that "means" produce certain "results" which in turn produce other "results," just as is discussed above. Identifying, as Senge says, the result of "ultimate intrinsic" value involves simply looking at the cause-effect "chain" and determining which "effect/result/impact" is most inspiring. For individuals, Senge states that selecting and focusing on the "ultimate intrinsic" impact is "the cornerstone of personal mastery" and performance. Different individuals will associate different value with the various levels of impact. There is no one "right" answer, just a selection that is most inspiring for an individual.

One implication of this notion of the importance of focus on the result of ultimate intrinsic value concerns the formal mission statement itself. Applying this concept to the organization would mean that the board of directors would want to identify the level of impact which most inspired the organization. Again utilizing the hypothetical "Charles County Homeless Services" example, that organization's board could consider the various impacts identified and decide if they preferred modifying the mission statement. Options could include that the mission is:
"To provide services to the Homeless in Charles County."

"To provide services to the Homeless in Charles County which enable them to find jobs."

"To provide services which secures housing for the Homeless in Charles County."

"To provide services which will end Homelessness in Charles County."

"To end Homelessness in Charles County."

The importance here is not to "wordsmith" every preposition and punctuation mark of the mission statement in search of exact magical words, but to simply identify the level of impact which most inspires and excites most people in the organization in order to provide a focused rallying point for action. This exercise also allows the board to more explicitly state the difference or impact the organization intends to make. A mission to "provide services" does seem to indicate an intention to impact something outside an organization, but explicitly stating the difference in condition which the services are intended to make and for whom or what would add clarity to the mission statement.

In summary, most of the organizations in the respondent set report that they do have the first design feature one would expect to find in an organization designed to accomplish its mission—a formal mission statement, adopted by the board, which states an intention to impact the
outside world.

**Performance Measures**

The first important mission "structures" which, according to the prior literature review, one would expect to find in an organization designed for the accomplishment of its mission, are performance measures which indicate whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. As reported in the previous chapter, 48.51% of the survey respondents and 97.22% of the case study respondents listed actual reliable measures which they said they used to determine whether the organization was or was not accomplishing the mission.

However, only 13.86% of the survey respondents listed "reliable impact measures," which represent an impact or "difference made" in the condition of a person, place, or thing. And follow-up surveys showed that these were not found to be widely understood within most of those organizations. And only one organization of the six in the case studies, was found to have reliable impact measures which are a true measure of mission accomplishment and are widely understood and articulated by those throughout the organization.

Given the definition of philanthropic organizations as those which make a difference in the quality of life in the world and given that a vast majority of the mission
statements of the respondents were judged to include an intention to impact outside the organization, then the measures of mission accomplishment would be those which represent an impact made on a person, place, or thing—the "reliable impact measures." Any other measures listed are not evidence of mission accomplishment. They may be measures of inputs, such as dollars spent or staff hours utilized, or they may be measures of activities completed, but they are not measures of mission accomplishment.

This is a finding of great significance with important implications. It means that the vast majority of this set of respondents do not know whether or not they are accomplishing their missions. This finding is even more significant given that the respondents are not just a set of backward organizations which had buried their mission statements in a vault somewhere since their founding. They are organizations with formal mission statements which are reviewed regularly and utilized in a variety of ways. For example, a very high percentage of organizations reported they communicate the mission internally (survey: 93.07%; cases: 100%) and externally (survey: 87.13%; cases: 100%), and a high percentage of organizations reported that the mission played a "significant role" in strategic planning (survey: 90.10%; cases: 80.56%), marketing (survey: 65.35%; cases: 69.44%), fund-raising (survey: 74.26%; cases: 80.56%), and board of directors operations (survey: 75.25%;
cases: 72.22%). Even though these organizations are using their missions in a variety of ways, they have no reliable impact measures which tell them if they are accomplishing their missions or not.

Sources examined in the literature review pointed out the importance of these results measures. For example, Drucker pointed out that defining the results is the first step in developing strategies, goals, and objectives which will lead the organization to success. And Bryson stated that these "performance criteria" are important so the organization knows what it is planning for.\textsuperscript{164}

Without the reliable impact measures, all the organization has to rely on for a determination of mission accomplishment are the varied opinions of board members, staff, and other constituents. And, as the case study interviews revealed, the basis of these opinions vary widely within and among organizations. These opinions could range from "we are good-hearted people working hard so we must be accomplishing our mission" to "we are providing services which people seem to like so we must be accomplishing our mission" to "we balanced the budget and so must be accomplishing our mission." To effectively coordinate action within an organization by "managing opinions" of board members, staff, and volunteers is inefficient if not impossible.
One interesting—and perhaps not too unique—example of these differing opinions which was revealed in the case study interviews was the board member from Organization VI who explained the determination of mission accomplishment in this way:

"I have a large network of contacts—I go to a lot of cocktail parties and that sort of thing. I hear things about our reputation in the community and figure if it is positive we must be doing well."

It would be difficult for this board member's chief staff officer to monitor the kinds of cocktail parties this person attends, and with whom they speak, to make sure a positive report on mission accomplishment is received. And, of course, a good reputation may not automatically mean that the mission is being accomplished.

Another interesting example from the case study interviews is the staff member from Organization I who says the board interprets the mission and the board member stating that the staff interprets it:

*By staff person: "The mission gets interpreted by the board. It is a basic mission for (organizations like this one) and it is up to the board to emphasize one particular aspect of the mission or another. While the mission has remained the same over many years the assumptions we have about what it means have changed."

*From board member: "The mission has remained the same over the years—with some different emphases that various (staff people) have given it as they have changed over time."

The opinions of the roles of staff and board members differ in this organization. Without clarity on reliable mission accomplishment determinants, these differences of opinion
will result in a variety of miscommunications and misunderstandings.

The lack of reliable impact measures in these organizations is a finding is similar to that reported by Osborne and Gaebler in Reinventing Government. They comment on the lack of impact measurements: "Because they don't measure results, bureaucratic governments rarely achieve them. They spend ever more on public education, yet test scores and dropout rates barely budge. They spend ever more on job training for welfare recipients, yet welfare rolls continue to grow. They spend ever more on police and prisons, yet crime rates continue to rise." 

Reliable impact measures for philanthropic organizations are similarly important if they are to produce results. And, given the special tax status of philanthropic organizations, many feel results are important. As Raul Yzaguirre, Chairman of INDEPENDENT SECTOR, was quoted in an earlier section "We owe results." One can imagine that donors, volunteers, and clients of a philanthropic organization would feel the same way.

But significant implications exist for the performance of philanthropic organizations exist beyond the fact that they "owe results." Because they cannot tell success from failure without reliable impact measures they cannot determine if specific programs or activities should be continued, expanded, or cut. Perhaps most importantly, they
cannot learn from any mistakes they may be making because they are unclear as to whether or not they are making a mistake--it becomes a matter of opinion. Likewise, they cannot learn from their successes. And, they cannot appropriately acknowledge themselves or others for their accomplishments and successes.

A vast majority of the respondents in this study are missing a fundamental mission "structure" required for a philanthropic organization to be designed for mission accomplishment. Because, as was pointed out earlier, these respondents are somewhat "self-selected," these findings cannot be reliably generalized as a representation of all philanthropic organizations in Franklin County or in America. However, some informed speculation on this point is of interest.

First, even though they are self-selected by choosing to respond or not to the questionnaire, the respondents do represent a very diverse set of philanthropic organizations according to function, revenues, and age. And, in the case of function, the respondents are very comparative to pool of Franklin County philanthropic organizations and those in the entire country. Secondly, it makes intuitive sense that chief staff officers who felt they didn't have "good" answers to the questionnaire might tend to not return it. In that sense, the respondents may represent a group of some of the more (self-perceived) advanced organizations in the
county. Finally, it is likely that Franklin County philanthropic organizations may tend to be more managerially advanced than the average American philanthropic organization. Influences in Franklin County which make this likely include a number of institutions of higher education capable of providing management training to these organizations, a very active and successful United Way organization which provides management education services to numerous organizations, and a large community foundation which encourages effective management practices in these organizations—even providing funding for such purposes.

The cumulative effect of these factors is the informed speculation that probably a much lower percentage of organizations would report reliable impact measures if all organizations in Franklin County or in America were individually investigated. This is unknown without further research, but it seems likely.

Regardless, these reliable impact measures or Mission Performance Measures as Ford and Ford have termed them, are missing in the respondents to this study. Creating these measures will likely prove to be a challenging process for organizations. Osborne and Gaebler report that, in government, "it takes several years to develop adequate measures: an agency's first attempt often falls woefully short." But these efforts are well worth the payoff. A later section will discuss the positive implications and
possibilities for organizations with these measures. Organizations may have one or more than one Mission Performance Measure for their particular mission. Given that confidentiality was guaranteed the respondents for this research, following are examples of Mission Statements and Mission Performance Measures for some hypothetical organizations. Again, these hypothetical examples are based on the findings in this study and contain elements of truth from the findings.

CHARLES COUNTY HOMELESS SERVICES

MISSION STATEMENT

"To end Homelessness in Charles County."

MISSION PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Number of Homeless people in Charles County, as reported by County officials.

MERLE COUNTY INFANT NUTRITION PROJECT

MISSION STATEMENT

"To assure that infants born in Merle County begin life healthy and well-nourished."

MISSION PERFORMANCE MEASURES

"County infant birth weights."

"County infant mortality rates."
THOMPSON ACADEMY

MISSION STATEMENT

"To prepare young men and women for excellence in collegiate education and performance."

MISSION PERFORMANCE MEASURES

"Percentage of yearly graduates enrolled in college the next year."

"SAT/ACT scores of yearly graduates."

"Satisfaction of Preparation survey scores administered to graduates two years following graduation."

"Percentage of graduates who receive a college degree within five years of Thompson graduation."

Other "Effectiveness Models" Used

The analysis of the questionnaire responses revealed evidence that respondents often use some of the other "defining models" of effectiveness which were discussed in the literature review. Of the six "models" the research analyst team looked for (as explained in Table 3, page 69), the Goal Model was found in 31.68% of the responses, the Constituency Model was found in 28.71% of the responses, and the Resource Acquisition Model was found in 9.90% of the responses. The other models—Efficiency, Internal Process, and Human Relations—were found only twice (1.98%), once
(.99%), and none at all, respectively. While these first three models were found to be in use, they each have problems as compared with the use of reliable impact measures for determination of mission accomplishment.

Goal Model. As was discussed earlier, the term "goal" is used very loosely in practice and theory today. First, a "goal" may or may not be "specific and measurable" depending on who is using the term. The term "goal" is often used to represent a general statement of intention, such as "It is the goal of this organization to give an exceptional effort this year." If the statement of a goal is specific and measurable, then it may or may not represent an "impact" or difference the organization makes. It could well refer to inputs or activities, such as "It is our goal to conduct 40 programs with 100 participants each by the end of this year." While specific and measurable, this statement would only measure the completion of the activity--it is not a measure of the impact the activity had on the participants. Further, even if a goal statement does represent a reliable impact, it may be only a measure of one of many programs the organization operates. Mission Performance Measures are broader than a "goal" might be in that they are measures of the entire organization's performance according to the intention it states in its mission, rather than being a measure of just a small segment of the organization's activities or performance as could be the case with a
"goal."

Constituency Model. The opinions of an organization's constituents are important and should be sought as the organization designs its Mission Performance Measures. However, to base the determination of the accomplishment of the organization mission solely on the opinions of constituents is unreliable. First there is the matter of which constituents to listen to and which to ignore. Then one must determine if a more formal--and then more reliable--survey of constituents is to be made regularly, or whether informal--and more unreliable--opinions will be sought (the board member soliciting comments at cocktail parties comes to mind). Even if the regular, more reliable surveys are made of constituents, their opinions may not be valid representations of the impact the organization is actually making. Reputations of programs and organizations are often inaccurate. Organizations may be popular, but ineffective or effective but not popular. The only way to determine the accomplishment of the mission accurately is to employ reliable impact measures.

Resource Acquisition Model. While resources are very important for philanthropic organizations to carry out activities towards the accomplishment of their missions, using resource acquisition as the indicator for accomplishment is incomplete and may be totally inaccurate. While perhaps in general terms organizations which succeed
in acquiring resources may tend to produce more impacts, a specific organization which has successfully acquired resources may or may not be producing impacts. After all, the organization could very inefficiently utilize the resources—they could be easily wasted. And, even if they are not intentionally wasted, the activities towards which the resources are applied may not produce the positive intended impacts. The acquisition of resources may be an important organizational function to monitor, but it does not represent the accomplishment of the mission.

**Management and Accountability Structures**

The lack of reliable impact measures has a negative effect on management and accountability structures. In the literature review, for example, Drucker pointed out that defining the results to be produced by the organization is the first step in developing priorities, strategies, goals, and work assignments, and "for the design of managerial structures."\(^{169}\) And Fry & Smith stated: "An extensive body of literature suggests that an organization's ability to achieve its goals is a function of the congruence between various organizational components. If the components 'fit well,' then the organization functions effectively; if they 'fit poorly,' it will not."\(^{170}\) So, without reliable impact measures, an organization cannot design itself for coordinated action towards the accomplishment of the
mission.

As previously reported, this study revealed that 93.07% of the survey respondents and all the case study organizations indicated that they communicated the mission of the organization internally. While this is a large majority and is the kind of first step which would be required to design internal management structures towards the accomplishment of the mission, it is of little value without the reliable impact measures around which to coordinate action. Similarly, a large majority of 87.13% of the survey respondents and all the case study organizations reported that they communicated the mission externally. Again, this is a positive first step, but the reliable impact measures are required to develop effective agreements with those external to the organization towards the accomplishment of the mission.

In fact, the low level of agreement on reliable impact measures among board and staff as revealed in the case study research and the follow-up surveys shows that the 90.10% of the chief staff officers who reported that their board members determine the accomplishment of the mission in the same way they do are likely mistaken. This factor would further add to the problems of "management by opinion" already created without reliable impact measures. As Herman & Heimovics were quoted as saying in an earlier section: "In the absence of clarity in mission, it is not surprising to
find either a board on which members may be working hard but pulling in different directions or a board not working very hard at all because individual board members do not know which way to direct their efforts."

Another important finding related to the issue of management and accountability structures is that only 17.82% of the chief staff officers in the survey organizations reported any reliable measures which they used to determine if what they do contributes to the accomplishment of the organization mission. And only 50% of the case study respondents listed reliable measures. As was pointed out in the literature review, effective coordinated action requires agreements between various units and individuals—within and outside of the organization—to produce results which are reliably measurable. The low percentage of reliable measures reported by the chief staff officers is an indicator that reliable measures may not exist for others within these organizations.

Significant breakdowns were revealed in the findings even for the respondents which did list reliable impact measures of mission accomplishment. Only one organization, one of the six from the case study research, was found to have reliable impact measures which were widely understood and articulated by those throughout the organization. In all of the other organizations there was little to no agreement on reliable impact measures which indicate mission
accomplishment.

Development of Teamwork

The final mission structure of importance is the use of the mission to create alignment in the organization where people "identify with the organization and consciously assume responsibility for its success."\(^{172}\)

The first finding relative to this structure is that 84.16% of the chief staff officers in the survey organizations and 100% in the case study organizations reported that their "attitude" toward the organization mission was "Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment." This is Senge's highest level of commitment and fulfills the "alignment" requirement of taking personal responsibility for the organization's success.\(^{173}\) Another 10.89% of the survey organization chief staff officers reported the following "attitude" about the mission: "Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished." This is Senge's second highest level of commitment.

In the chief staff officer position, the respondent organizations report a very high level of commitment and this finding shows that most of the respondent organizations
have alignment for the individuals in this position. This is consistent with an organization designed to accomplish its mission.

The findings on the reported attitudes of other respondents in the case studies showed 66.67% choosing the top commitment level and 30.55% the second. This total of 97.22% placing themselves in the top two levels is actually higher than the chief staff officer total for the two of 95.05%. Again, alignment is reportedly high for those in these positions.

As for the case study respondents opinions of the attitudes of others in their organizations, a lower degree of alignment is reported. A total of 31.72% of others were reported in the top commitment level and 21.17% in the second, for a total of 60.52%. Whether the opinions of respondents of the attitudes of others accurately reflects what they themselves would report is unknown without further research. If accurate, however, this finding shows that improvement in alignment could be made throughout these organizations.

Creating alignment is, according to Senge, the result of "enrollment."\textsuperscript{174} This is a process of communication which produces higher levels of commitment and leads to a person freely "placing one's name on the roll."\textsuperscript{175} Earlier in this chapter the existence of the various "levels of impact" or results which an organization has was discussed,
as was the idea that different people would find "inspiration" at different "levels," depending on personal preference. It would seem important, then, for those in an organization who seek to encourage the increased commitment of others to make sure to communicate the entire range of impacts the organization makes. This would provide for a more complete understanding of the organization and would give others a full opportunity to "enroll," to increase their commitment to the organization. This process of communication has implications for use by and/or with staff, board members, other volunteers, donors, and other constituents.

B. Utilizing Mission Performance Measures for Increased Effectiveness

This study has found that reliable impact measures, or Mission Performance Measures, which represent the impact a philanthropic organization makes are not utilized by the respondents covered in this research project. Once creating such measures, philanthropic organizations can use them to design themselves for higher levels of effectiveness. The Mission Performance Measures can be utilized to comprehensively coordinate the functions of strategic
planning and management, fund-raising, board operations, and the overall management and growth of the organization in a coherent way.

Strategic Planning and Management

The "mission" literature review showed that writings on strategic planning and management frequently discussed the important role of the organization mission in these activities. Likewise, this research project found that 90.10% of the chief staff officers in the survey organizations and 100% in the case study organizations reported that the mission played a "significant role" in strategic planning. However, what has been lacking in the literature are ideas on how the mission can be translated into terms of performance and then utilized in strategic planning and management.

A recent, extensive review of the strategic management literature for nonprofit organizations by Stone and Crittenden found this lack of performance criteria to be a "noticeable gap" in the literature: "Works on strategic management in nonprofit organizations have just begun to address the thorny topic of performance, a delay due largely to the well-articulated difficulty in designing appropriate measures."

They identified as an important topical area for future research the question: "How should performance or effectiveness be measured in nonprofit organizations?"
The "mission accomplishment" approach described herein provides such a model of effectiveness--through the use of Mission Performance Measures--which can be applied to the strategic planning and management process. The balance of this section describes how philanthropic organizations with Mission Performance Measures--approved by the board and well-understood by staff--could use them in the strategic planning and management process. The use of the Mission Performance Measures, along with the new concept of "strategic intent" can augment the value organizations derive from traditional strategic planning and management approaches.

Strategic Intent. With Mission Performance Measures, a philanthropic organization could fully utilize Hamel and Prahalad's concept of "strategic intent" as the first step in the strategic planning process by setting "stretch goals" for the planning period--often three to five years--under consideration. While traditional strategic planning models often suggest setting goals or intentions based upon the organization's resources and an understanding of the constraints of the environment, utilizing "strategic intent" suggests setting goals based upon the organization's commitment and aspirations even though it may be very unreasonable to think the goals could be accomplished--based on resources and the environment.
The "strategic intent" term was created by Hamel and Prahalad as a result of their study of companies—such as Honda, Komatsu, and Canon—which have come to global leadership during the past twenty years:

"Companies that have risen to global leadership over the past 20 years invariably began with ambitions that were out of all proportion to their resources and capabilities. But they created an obsession with winning at all levels of the organization and then sustained that obsession over the 10- to 20-year quest for global leadership. We call this obsession 'strategic intent.'"178

And they contrast this approach with the traditional concept of "strategic fit" between resources and opportunities—a concept they believe has "often abetted the process of competitive decline."179

"Strategic intent implies a sizable stretch for an organization. Current capabilities and resources will not suffice. This forces the organization to be more inventive, to make the most of limited resources. Whereas the traditional view of strategy focuses on the degree of fit between existing resources and current opportunities, strategic intent creates an extreme misfit between resources and ambitions. Top management then challenges the organization to close the gap by systematically building new advantages."180

Strategic intent represents a new "strategy frame" which philanthropic organizations can apply to strategic planning. As Hamel and Prahalad say "The essential element of the new strategy frame is an aspiration that creates by design a chasm between ambition and resources."181 And they believe that "Creating stretch, a misfit between resources and aspirations, is the single most important task senior management faces."182
The creativity which Hamel and Prahalad say is produced as a result of this "chasm" or misfit between aspirations and resources is similar to the "gap" between "vision and reality" which Senge says is "the source of creative energy." He calls this gap "creative tension." The "tension" between the vision and current reality requires resolution--creativity is ignited to resolve the tension. Fritz refers to this same "gap" as "structural tension," and also highlights its role in generating creativity.

One example of the power of this creativity, as pointed out by Hamel and Prahalad, is the Apollo program. Although the technology needed to put a man on the moon did not exist in the early 1960s, President Kennedy set the goal to do so by the end of the decade. The creative tension of the "stretch goal" inspired Apollo engineers to create the technology needed to achieve the goal.

Senge points out that people often confuse "creative tension" with "emotional tension"--anxiety, stress, and other "negative" emotions such as fear of failure. This is an important distinction, without which philanthropic organizations cannot fully utilize the concept of strategic intent.

Goals set using strategic intent, i.e. goals based on aspirations rather than projections or "fit," are by definition unreasonable and unlikely--by reasonable prediction--to be accomplished. In fact, given the rapidity
of change in the environment it is difficult to make accurate forecasts of any kind with regard to producing outcomes. This means that the predictable possibility for failure is high. Organizations using strategic intent must understand this and accept the possibility of failure as a tradeoff for the possibility of extraordinary performance. In fact, organizations using strategic intent may actually have both failure and extraordinary performance. For example, if an organization sets a three-year goal to make a 100% increase in a Mission Performance Measure—an exceptional "stretch"—and achieves a 90% increase, it has "failed" to reach its goal completely, but it has probably far outperformed the results it would have produced had it set modest or reasonable goals.

Organizations using strategic intent must create a high level of trust among the board and staff that they are all pursuing the "stretch goals" together as a collective group. Failures are not to be used for blame and finger-pointing. Bruce Marlow, chief operating officer of Progressive Insurance, one of the most successful insurance companies in the country says "We never punish failure. We only punish sloppy execution and the failure to recognize reality." And at Motorola, the motto is "we celebrate noble failure."

Philanthropic organizations must maintain their focus on their strong feelings about their aspirations to achieve "stretch goals," on a feeling of "pride" that they are
willing to "go for it," on what they do accomplish, and on what they can learn from their failures. As Senge says:

"Mastery of creative tension transforms the way one views 'failure.' Failure is, simply, a shortfall, evidence of the gap between vision and current reality. Failure is an opportunity for learning—about inaccurate pictures of current reality, about strategies that didn't work as expected, about the clarity of the vision. Failures are not about our unworthiness or powerlessness. Ed Land, founder and president of Polaroid for decades and inventor of instant photography, had one plaque on his wall. It read: A mistake is an event, the full benefit of which has not yet been turned to your advantage."^{188}

Another organization recently acknowledging the power of using "stretch goals" is General Electric. GE Chairman John F. Welch Jr. discusses the use of "stretch" in the company's recent annual report (from *The Wall Street Journal*):

"(Welch) tells shareholders that 'stretch is a concept that would have produced smirks, if not laughter, in the GE of three or four years ago, because it essentially means using dreams to set business targets— with no real idea of how to get there.' Indeed, he says 'if you do know how to get there, it's not a stretch target.' Such targets, he says, 'are making seemingly impossible goals exciting, bringing out the best from our teams.' Incremental goals, he says, 'inspire or challenge no one, capture no imaginations."^{188}

Once the board and staff have determined the time period to be covered by their strategic planning process, they can use the concept of "strategic intent" to set "stretch goals" for their Mission Performance Measure(s). They would specifically indicate the result they intend to produce for each measure, if they have more than one, based upon their aspirations. This is the initial and most
important part of the strategic planning and management process. These are goals to which the entire board and staff agree to take responsibility for producing. Specific agreements for action are detailed later. Once the goals are set, annual benchmarks or "milestones" can also be set for each goal.

It is not suggested here that an organization apply the use of "strategic intent" and "stretch" to all aspects of operations. For example, setting a break-even budget based on "stretch goals" for revenues could severely damage the organization if the goal was not met. A more responsible approach in situations like these would be to set a budget based on reasonable projections. Then, "stretch goals" can be added afterward--giving the organization the benefit of the creativity of the "stretch" and a responsible safety net if the goal is not met. Likewise, not all "stretch goals" are appropriate for all external audiences. "Stretch Goals" which, if unmet, would lead to undo public ridicule for the organization are best kept internal.

A philanthropic organization would not need to have Mission Performance Measures to use "strategic intent" to think "ambitiously" about the future. However, as will be specified in upcoming sections, it would be impossible to translate that aspiration into reality--to create coordinated action for the accomplishment of the mission--without the Mission Performance Measures.
Strategic Planning Group. The next step in the strategic planning and management process is the recruitment of a Strategic Planning Group by the leadership of the board and staff. As with traditional strategic planning models, it is important here for the group to represent key "actors" in the internal and external environment, based—particularly—on their opportunity to provide ideas and impact the success of the plan. Major donor prospects are often key members of the group.

Group members are recruited with an explanation of the "stretch goals" the board and staff have committed to and an invitation to participate in the process of creating the plans to achieve the goals. These are conversations of "enrollment" with the intention of encouraging commitment to the mission and to creating this bold new future for the organization. Strategic Planning Group members, then, begin their participation in the process with a clear and focused understanding of the results the group's plan is to achieve.

Strategic Assessment. This next step in the process is very similar to the activities used in traditional strategic planning—such as reviewing historical trends, events, and directions, assessing strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, and identifying strategic issues. However, there is one important difference from the traditional activities usually carried on at this stage. The focus on
the "stretch goals," which every member of the Strategic Planning Group has been given as a part of their invitation to join the group, creates a powerful context for the assessment.

For example, a traditional review of strengths and weaknesses of an organization might involve asking planning group participants to list the skills, capabilities, resources, etc. that the organization may find useful in the future and the skills, capabilities, resources, etc. that the organization may be lacking. Those same questions would be asked, but with this important addition:

"Given our commitment to achieve the stretch goals, what skills, capabilities, resources, etc. may we find useful in the future and what skills, capabilities, resources, etc. may we be lacking."

This focus on the commitment to achieve the stretch goals increases the likelihood that strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats which pertain specifically to the success of the goals will be identified by group members. They may identify organizational attributes which can be leveraged towards the achievement of the goals. This context creates an environment which encourages what Mintzberg refers to as "strategic thinking," creativity beyond the step by step process of packaging action plans.190

The context of the "stretch goals" is used during the strategic assessment in conjunction with the various group process techniques used in more traditional strategic
planning and management approaches, such as the extensive treatment of these techniques by Nutt and Backoff in *Strategic Management of Public and Third Sector Organizations.*

The result of this stage of the process is that the group has identified the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, and strategic issues which are most important for the organization to consider as it pursues its "stretch goals."

**Strategic Action.** Utilizing the insights from the strategic assessment, the Strategic Planning Group's next task is to design new sets of actions--activities, programs, etc.--which will result in the milestones and "stretch goals" being met. The intention is to design coordinated action for achieving dramatic new levels of performance.

"Stretch goals" are, by definition, dramatic improvements in performance for an organization. Hammer and Champy point out that dramatic or "breakthrough" improvements require "reengineering," which they define as the "fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance such as cost, quality, service, and speed." When an organization, which has been producing results at a certain level, sets "stretch goals" it must expect that new processes, activities,
programs, and responsibilities will have to be created to achieve those goals. All operations need to be reviewed to assure that they are leading to the accomplishment of the "stretch goals." Obsolete activities must be discontinued. New "strategic actions" must be created toward achieving the goals.

As new ideas are generated and plans for action are designed, individuals and/or units of the organization will make agreements to be responsible and accountable for carrying out certain activities and producing certain results. These individuals and components may be a formal part of the organization or may be in its "environment." It is important that as these agreements are made, the individuals and/or units clearly understand any limitations, such as budget levels, which must be followed. Ford and Ford call these agreements "Mission Performance Agreements" because the performance of the individual/unit is directly tied to the Mission Performance Measures. They point out that the agreement should indicate the specific, measurable results which the individual/unit agrees to produce—these are the conditions of satisfaction for the agreement. The Mission Performance Agreement should also specify to whom and by when the individual/unit is to report regarding the status of the agreement. In this way, Mission Performance Agreements are formulated between these "coordinating components" and "reporting components" in the
organization. The ultimate "coordinating component" in a philanthropic organization is the board of directors.

Some units which are "reporting components" in philanthropic organizations will undoubtedly have responsibility for implementing programs. In this case, the specific, measurable results for which the unit is responsible should be stated in terms of the impact "outcomes," rather than inputs or outputs, of the program. The importance of outcome impact program evaluation for public and nonprofit organizations has been made extensively. However, a recent study by United Way of America of twenty of the largest (by annual dollars raised) local United Ways reported that in only three of them do all or some of the agencies they fund conduct outcome evaluations. It is imperative that a philanthropic organization use outcome evaluations in its programs in order to be completely designed for the accomplishment of its mission. Otherwise the organization will have no idea as to whether or not the program is making its intended difference and will not be able to make appropriate decisions regarding the program.

**Strategic Management.** The "coordinating components" within the organization monitor the results produced by the "reporting components." All individuals in the organization should be provided with the Mission Performance Measures
"scores" as they are produced. Depending on the measures, some organizations may be able to update these more frequently than others. The one organization identified in the case studies as having Mission Performance Measures had monthly as well as annual reports on their measure.

Monitoring the Mission Performance Agreements and Mission Performance Measures gives the organization true "performance monitoring," not just monitoring of completed activities or the counting of inputs—program costs, etc. The importance of true performance monitoring has been well documented for public organizations in maintaining public accountability and trust. The same is true for philanthropic organizations.

Most importantly, though, focusing on the results of the Mission Performance Measures and Mission Performance Agreements can allow the organization to really "manage" itself to stay on course towards the "stretch goals." If a unit has an agreement to produce certain results and has a plan of action which it implements flawlessly, it may find that—for a variety of reasons—the results are not being produced. Once this is clear, the unit can design a new plan to get back on course towards the results rather than continue with the same action plan that is not producing the desired results. According to Hammer and Champy, this focus on results rather than activity is a hallmark of an organization committed to reengineering.
Kiefer and Stroh also point out the importance of this focus for high performing organizations: "these organizations acknowledge that it is impossible to determine the 'right' process in advance because the environment is inherently complex and unpredictable. Hence, they stress experimentation. Do something and adjust it while always focusing on the desired result." In this way an organization is "continuously reengineering."

By focusing on the Mission Performance Measures and Mission Performance Agreements an organization can identify "missing" activities or programs. For example, consider again the hypothetical case of Charles County Homeless Services and imagine that the organization implements two programs towards its mission of ending homelessness in the county. One program is a 12-step drug rehabilitation program and the other an employment services program; both have outcome impact measures.

CHARLES COUNTY HOMELESS SERVICES
MISSION STATEMENT
"To end Homelessness in Charles County."

MISSION PERFORMANCE MEASURE
Number of Homeless people in Charles County, as reported by County officials.
PROGRAMS & IMPACT MEASURES

Program #1: 12-Step Drug Rehabilitation Program

Impact Measure: Number of identified homeless diagnosed drug addicts who are rehabilitated ("clean" for at least one year) through the program.

Program #2: Employment Services Program

Impact Measure: Number of identified homeless unemployed who get back to work for at least one year after completing the program.

Imagine that the organization is monitoring its performance and finds that both programs are operating to capacity and producing exceptional outcomes--people are getting clean and people are getting jobs. Yet, the organization looks at its Mission Performance Measure of county homelessness--which it has a "stretch goal" to lower significantly--and finds it has not changed. This performance feedback is very important to the organization--its programs are working very well and yet homelessness is the same.

Something's missing, and some additional investigation can inform the organization. It can discern whether or not the graduates of its programs are getting housing and if not why not. Perhaps very limited low cost housing exists in the county. If this is what is missing then the organization can mobilize to start a new program to develop this housing. Or maybe something else is missing. Maybe all the graduates are securing housing but the rate of new homeless people coming into the county is increasing.
Perhaps what is missing is a higher capacity in both programs.

Regardless, without both the Mission Performance Agreements—in this case outcome evaluation for programs—and Mission Performance Measures, the organization would not have known whether or not it was accomplishing its mission and wouldn't have been able to begin to investigate the situation intelligently and take meaningful action. As reported in the previous chapter, an example of using Mission Performance Measures in just this way was revealed in the case study research in an interview with a board member from Organization III who was discussing the annual changes in the statistics for what she said was the organization's most important "reliable impact measure":

"Oh yeah, and in this year (pointing to chart) it went back up. We were really concerned. We thought 'What has happened?' We finally concluded we needed make major changes in what we were doing. It really shook us up and we realized we couldn't continue going on the same way with the same activities we had been carrying out. And now the number has been going back down again for the last few years."

Mission Performance Measures and Mission Performance Agreements allow for real strategic management.

Fund-Raising

Combining the use of Mission Performance Measures with the concept of "strategic intent" can lead to exceptional increases in fund-raising results. Imagine that some donors to the hypothetical Charles County Homeless Services were
involved on the Strategic Planning Group that—in pursuit of their "stretch goals"—decided to start the drug rehabilitation and employment services programs described above. As "co-creators" of the plan that led to the implementation of these programs they would be likely candidates to make increased contributions to fund them—this is classic fund-raising: involvement leading to support.\textsuperscript{19}

Imagine that these same donors then learned that even though the programs were working very well, homelessness was not declining. Further, they then learned from the organization’s staff that investigation showed a lack of low cost housing in the county and a need to start another program—one more piece to the puzzle should start homelessness on the decline. This would make a very compelling case for additional financial support from these donors for the new program. The organization has successfully implemented the first two programs and can demonstrate results. This is a "winning team" in which many donors would be compelled to "invest" further. As fund-raising legend "Si" Seymour suggests:

"That the people love winners is part of our folklore. And by now it should be one of the accepted legends of fund-raising that support flows to promising programs rather than to needy institutions. You may think, as too many often do, that people will rally around if you tell them things are going badly. But they won’t. You have to whistle a happy tune and keep on the sunny side of the street, where success lies just around the corner."\textsuperscript{200}
Fund-raising is most effectively implemented when the funding objectives are the result of a comprehensive strategic plan for an organization and consistent with its mission. After all, fund-raising is not an end in itself. Its sole purpose is to provide support for the accomplishment of the mission. Resources will always be required to implement a mission and, in philanthropic organizations, this often means fund-raising dollars. Mission Performance Measures give the organization "evidence" to show donors and prospective donors that their support makes a real difference.

Board Operations

Mission Performance Measures give boards of directors a clear, reliable "scoreboard" by which they can determine the effectiveness of the organization. By using the Mission Performance Measures in the strategic planning and management process as described above, the board—as the ultimate "coordinating unit" of the organization—can provide comprehensive oversight. All accountability ultimately leads to the board as the legal entity which governs the organization. The Mission Performance Agreements it creates with other individuals/units—often many of these are with the chief staff officer—give the board the opportunity to monitor the performance of the organization.
Without the results reported in Mission Performance Measures and Mission Performance Agreements, the attention of board members—as evidenced in this study—shifts to other aspects of the organization, such as the activities. The opinions of whether the organization's activities are being carried out properly can vary and cause conflict among board and staff members. When the focus is on the results recorded on the Mission Performance Measures, opinions are secondary—results are either being produced or not. Mission Performance Measures provide a board with focus and a coherent view of the organization's performance. With this clear, coherent view the board can make more informed decisions regarding the organization's future. Operating in this fashion is very consistent with Carver's board governance model in which he recommends that "focusing on results" is a key board function.202

Organization Management and Growth

The organization mission is integrated into every aspect of the organization's operations by using the Mission Performance Measures and—through the strategic planning and management process—designing Mission Performance Agreements for all the organization's components. The organization, as a system, is comprehensively designed according to the same purpose—it is truly "mission driven."
The importance of "constancy of purpose" throughout a system is emphasized by Deming as the first of his 14 points used in Total Quality Management. In a system, defined by Deming as "a network of interdependent components that work together to try to accomplish the aim of the system," there "must evolve a sense of agreement upon the aim that extends throughout the organization." The "agreement" Deming calls for in a system is provided--in a philanthropic organization--by the Mission and the Mission Performance Measures. They state what the difference the organization intends to make and how it will determine if it is making that difference. Application of Deming's #1 point for Total Quality Management, and therefore of all the others that follow, cannot be made in a philanthropic organization without the Mission Performance Measures. Without them there would be no agreement throughout the organization on its "aim," there would be only varied opinions and interpretations of mission by individuals in the organization. (Imagine a football team in which every player had his own "opinion" of the direction of the goal line.) Hence, attempts to apply Total Quality Management principles without this fundamental "point" in place will ultimately produce dissatisfying results.

By utilizing the concept of "strategic intent" with the Mission Performance Measures, the organization ignites creativity--giving it access to ongoing "breakthroughs" in
performance. "Stretch goals," "milestones," and Mission Performance Agreements are set during every planning period. As is discussed above, when any intended result is not produced the individual/unit responsible for it reviews what happened and considers what is missing—what can be done differently in the future to produce the result. This creates an opportunity for new creativity and for learning by continually focusing attention on the inspired commitment to produce the result which started the entire strategic planning process. In this way the organization grows, develops, learns, and achieves higher and higher levels of performance.

Utilizing the Mission Accomplishment approach, with the establishment of Mission Performance Measures as its cornerstone, provides an additional model for practitioners to utilize in designing philanthropic organizations for increased effectiveness and for scholars to use in studying these organizations.

**Barriers to Utilization of Mission Performance Measures**

Given the evidence that Mission Performance Measures are not being utilized broadly by the organizations included in this study, and the likelihood that they are not being utilized extensively by other philanthropic organizations, the questions "Why are these organizations not currently utilizing Mission Performance Measures (or by any term:
'reliable impact measures' at the organization level)?" and "How can Mission Performance Measures be successfully introduced into an organization?" come to mind. While this research project did not engage these specific questions, it is of interest at this point to speculate on possible explanations which could be studied at a further time.

"Why are these organizations not currently utilizing Mission Performance Measures?" As was reported earlier in the literature review, the multiple models of organization effectiveness which have been developed over the years have caused confusion for researchers and practitioners. The lack of an agreed upon definition of effectiveness was cited and is widely acknowledged. It was also pointed out that the formal "Mission Accomplishment" approach to organization effectiveness has not been widely published. Though similar in some ways to other approaches, it is a relatively new "defining model" among many which exist in the literature.

Given the extensive "menu" of effectiveness models which exist, it could be that practitioners have simply chosen different approaches--such as the goal, resource acquisition, or constituency models--to design and manage their operations. It is likely that most practitioners have not--at this point in time--read or heard about the "Mission Accomplishment" approach. Unless they had conceived of the idea, on their own, of using reliable impact measures at the organization level as their determinant of organization
effectiveness, then they would not have considered using the "Mission Accomplishment" approach. Without the knowledge of the approach, and the benefits of the approach, then it makes sense that they would not be utilizing it. So, one possible explanation for the lack of utilization of Mission Performance Measures is that practitioners are not even aware of them as an option of effectiveness determination.

A second, and related, explanation for the lack of utilization of Mission Performance Measures is that practitioners do not have the full understanding—or set of skills—necessary to develop them for their organizations. The skills required to develop reliable impact measures for an organization are similar, though more advanced, than those required for developing reliable impact measures for programs. Yet, the respondents to a recent survey by the United Way of America regarding the low percentage of organizations which use reliable impact measures for programs selected "lack of skilled staff" as the second greatest "barrier" to the utilization of these measures.\textsuperscript{205} If organizations feel they lack the skilled staff to utilize program impacts—about which much has been written for many years—then it is unlikely they would feel they have the skills to create reliable impact measures at the organization level.

The number one "barrier" to the utilization of reliable impact measures for programs from this same United Way study
provides yet another possible explanation for the lack of Mission Performance Measure utilization. That number one "barrier" was identified as "insufficient financial resources." Therefore, it is conceivable that organizations would also feel they have insufficient time and financial resources to design and utilize Mission Performance Measures.

Yet one more possible explanation for the lack of utilization of Mission Performance Measures is a misunderstanding of the benefits of doing so. If the board and staff of an organization feel they are already overly busy, they may not want to take the time to develop and use the measures. They may feel that since they are well-intentioned and working hard they do not need to know much more—and there is a certain comfort level of activity which may hold them back from adding something more to their agenda. This lack of understanding of the benefits could even exist to the point of fearing that the results could be used punitively against the organization. This fear of accountability or of ridicule by outside sources may not be totally unfounded because the results of the activities of the organization will be much clearer. Of course, it has been suggested here that the full benefits of using Mission Performance Measures would outweigh all these concerns.

"How can Mission Performance Measures be successfully introduced into an organization?" Fully educating staff and
board members of philanthropic organizations—through a variety of means—on the benefits of the Mission Accomplishment approach to designing their organizations could be the first step to their successful introduction. This educational process could also include specific instruction on how to design these measures for their organization. Once the benefits are fully understood and the skills to utilize the measures have been developed, most of the barriers listed above will have been overcome.

It would be important that the key board members and staff from any organization interested in designing and utilizing Mission Performance Measures receive this educational experience. Without the board and staff both working in agreement on the measures, the effort would surely be doomed for failure, or lead to significant staff and or board turnover. The measures are to be used to design the organization for increased effectiveness, not to be used as evidence to distribute blame for failures.

The key for the successful introduction of Mission Performance Measures into an organization will be for its top board and staff members to keep their commitment to accomplishing the organization's mission foremost in their minds and in their being. This study found that these staff and board members report very high levels of commitment to the accomplishment of the mission. They will need to maintain a focus on this commitment and not be distracted
from the work of mission accomplishment.

C. Further Research Issues

Further Research with Philanthropic Organizations

Longitudinal case studies. The preceding section represented the theoretical implications and uses of Mission Performance Measures by philanthropic organizations. While this discussion was informed by the insights gleaned from the empirical findings in this research project, it is still a theoretical discussion. Organizations which actually use these concepts in the way described have not yet been studied.

Longitudinal case studies of philanthropic organizations which do use these concepts would be a valuable addition to the research on these organizations. The experiences of these organizations, as they apply the concepts, could be compared and contrasted. Additional prescriptive theory could be generated and the practical feasibility of the use of these concepts could be evaluated. These case studies could probe deeper into each organization--interviewing higher numbers of board members and staff. Among other findings, a more accurate picture of the levels of commitment of board and staff to the mission
could be revealed.

**National Random Phone Survey/Questionnaire.** Since the respondents to the questionnaire in this study were somewhat "self-selected," it would be interesting to conduct a national random study of philanthropic organizations asking some of the same questions in this project. For example, phone calls could be made to a random set of these organizations and a brief survey could be conducted with chief staff officers on the existence of formal mission statements--information could be recorded on organization characteristics as well. Then the chief staff officers could be asked if they would be willing to complete a written questionnaire, similar to the one used in this study. This would allow for further analysis on the existence of reliable impact measures as determinants of mission accomplishment. The results could be compared to findings reported here and the implications discussed.

Similarly, an identical questionnaire as the one used in this study could simply be mailed to a randomly selected set of philanthropic organizations across the country. This would be a lower cost method of adding to the database and providing comparative information. However, the "self-selection" issue would still remain with this option.
Applications to other Non-Profit Organizations

Applying the same research questions used in this study to other types of non-profit organizations would be of interest. These could include churches, hospitals, colleges/universities, grant-making foundations (including corporate, private, public, community types), and associations. All of these, except for perhaps associations, are organizations which are created to make an impact outside themselves. Hence, they share this initial design feature with the philanthropic organizations studied here and would make for interesting comparisons. It would be interesting to study the mission statements of associations to see if they intend any "impact" beyond themselves and their members.

Research into these organizations could be conducted in a number of ways. Databases of foundations exist and national questionnaires of some or all of the types identified above could be mailed. Case studies of a select group of these foundations could also be carried out. Databases of colleges/universities, hospitals, and associations also exist and studies could be administered similarly. Churches may provide some difficulty for study as no known national database exists for all of them. However, denominational databases may be accessible on a national basis.
Applications to Government Agencies

Similar to philanthropic organizations, government agencies also exist to make a "difference" outside themselves. It would be interesting, then, to conduct a similar study of random sets of federal, state and local agencies to determine--particularly--the existence of mission statements and the use of reliable impact measures to determine mission accomplishment. Given the earlier reported opinions expressed by Osborne and Gaebler on the lack of reliable impact measures in government, this would make for an interesting study.  

Applications to For-Profit Organizations

A survey by Pearce and David, reported on in 1987, showed that 40.4% of the Fortune 500 companies which responded (all were surveyed--43.6% responded) stated that they had no mission statement. However, that may be changing. A recent article in The Wall Street Journal sites a corporate consultant's statement that twice as many big companies have mission statements now than they did five years ago. It is unknown whether this statement is based on empirical data or simply opinion.

It would be interesting to analyze a representative set of corporate mission statements to determine if they include intentions to impact themselves, outside themselves, both, or neither. The Mission Accomplishment approach may have
applications for for-profit organizations which stated their most senior commitment as an intention to impact outside themselves—such as making a difference for their customers. It would be interesting to see how such organizations determine the accomplishment of their missions and compare these findings to those described in this study.
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APPENDIX
THE EXCELLENCE IN PHILANTHROPY PROJECT

Chief Staff Officer Questionnaire

SECTION A: ORGANIZATION DESCRIPTION

1. Is this a national, state or local organization?
   ____ National    ____ State    ____ Local

2. Is your organization affiliated with any national or state organizations?
   ____ Yes, as a member    ____ Yes, informally    ____ No

3. What primary type of function or service does your organization provide? Please choose one. (Please refer to ATTACHMENT A for detailed definition of each category.)
   ____ Arts, Culture, Humanities    ____ Intern'l/Foreign
   ____ Education/Instruction    ____ Public/Soc Benefit
   ____ Environment    ____ Religion
   ____ Health    ____ Human Services
   ____ Other (please specify):
       ____________________________
       ____________________________

4. How long has your organization been in existence? If it has undergone any reorganization, please date from original founding.
   ____ Less than 2 years    ____ 13-17 years
   ____ 2-3 years    ____ 18-22 years
   ____ 4-6 years    ____ 23-49 years
   ____ 7-12 years    ____ 50 years or more
5. What was the total amount of revenues, from all sources, received by your organization during your most recently completed fiscal year?

___ Less than $100,000  ___ $500,000-$999,999

___ $100,000-$249,999  ___ $1-$2,499,999

___ $250,000-$499,999  ___ $2,500,000 or more

SECTION B: ORGANIZATION MISSION

1. Please attach a copy of the mission statement of your organization. If a written mission statement does not exist, please write what you say the mission of the organization is:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
2. In what ways does your organization communicate its mission internally—to staff and volunteers, and externally—to others in the community?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

3. What specific measures does the organization have that tell it when it is accomplishing the organization mission? These would tell you whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please explain how each measure is an indication of the organization accomplishing its mission.

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
4. In what other ways—besides the specific measures listed in your answer to #3—does the organization know it is accomplishing the organization mission?


6. In what other ways—besides the specific measures listed in your answer to #5—can you tell that what you do contributes to the accomplishment of the organization mission?


7. The following statements are possible attitudes which members of the organization could report having toward the organization mission. Based on conversations and interactions you have had with others, what have you concluded to be the attitudes of the organization's staff and board of directors toward the organization mission? Please list the percentage of staff and board members who would be at each level and put a number in each space, even if it is zero. The total of all responses should equal 100%.

___% Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment.

___% Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished.

___% See the benefits of mission. Do everything expected of them and sometimes more. "Good soldiers."

___% On the whole, see the benefits of mission. Do what is expected and no more. "Pretty good soldiers."

___% Do not see the benefits of mission. But, also, do not want to lose jobs. Do enough of what's expected because they have to, but also lets it be known they are not really "on the team."

___% Do not see the benefits of mission and will not do what's expected. "I won't do it; you can't make me."

___% Neither for nor against mission. No interest. No energy. "Is it five o'clock yet?"
8. What statement do you say represents your attitude regarding the organization mission? Please place a check mark in the one appropriate space.

_____ Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment.

_____ Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished.

_____ See the benefits of mission. Do everything expected and sometimes more. "Good soldier."

_____ On the whole, see the benefits of mission. Do what is expected and no more. "Pretty good soldier."

_____ Do not see the benefits of mission. But, also, do not want to lose job. Do enough of what's expected because you have to, but also let it be known you are not really "on the team."

_____ Do not see the benefits of mission and will not do what's expected. "I won't do it; you can't make me."

_____ Neither for nor against mission. No interest. No energy. "Is it five o'clock yet?"

9. In which of the following operational areas does the organization mission play a significant role in your organization? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces.

_____ Strategic Planning

_____ Marketing

_____ Fund-Raising

_____ Board of Directors operations
ATTACHMENT A

Function of Organization

Please indicate the type of function or service your organization provides.

A. Arts, Culture and the Humanities (includes architecture, design, performing arts, cultural/ethnic awareness groups, other cultural groups; historical preservation, arts and cultural societies, other humanistic societies, museums, art exhibits, operas, symphony orchestras, dance groups; photography; theater; and visual aids.)

B. Educational/Instructional/Research (Elementary, secondary or higher education, libraries; research at educational institutions; adult education; information education; educational fund drives for such educational associations as the United Negro College Fund, etc.)

C. Environmental (Environmental quality protection, beautification; animal-related; protection and welfare; endangered species; humane societies, wildlife and wilderness; zoos, animal sanctuaries, and refuges.

D. Health, Including Mental Health (General and rehabilitation; health, including mental health and mental retardation and developmentally disabled; substance abuse; diseases; nursing homes, hospices, crisis counseling, hotlines, etc.; fund drives of private health associations such as American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, March of Dimes, etc.)

E. Human Services (Day care centers, foster care centers, family counseling; consumer protection, legal aid; crime and delinquency prevention; public protection; employment/jobs; food, nutrition, housing/shelter; public safety, emergency preparedness and relief; recreation; leisure, sports, and athletics; Red Cross, YMCA, Junior League, and other similar multiservice organizations; United Way, Catholic Charities, Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, United Jewish Appeal, and other combined multipurpose charity drives; youth development.)

(continued on next page)
ATTACHMENT A

Function of Organization

(continued)

F. International/Foreign, in U.S. and Abroad (includes education; health; peace or security; refugees-related; relief abroad; other social services; student exchange and aid; cultural exchange; economic development; technical assistance; promotion of friendly relations among nations; United Nations and its associations.)

G. Public/Society Benefit (Civil rights, social action, advocacy, minority and women's issues; community improvement, community capacity planning; science; technology; technical assistance; volunteerism; philanthropy, charity, public education about needs of charities.)

H. Religion (Includes organizations providing direct giving to churches, synagogues, monasteries, convents, seminaries, etc.; BUT giving to church affiliated schools offering broad educational curricula, nursing homes, Catholic Charities, Jewish Federation, etc. should be placed under proper sections.)

I. Other (please specify)
Excellence in Philanthropy
Is Vital to our
Quality of Life

Dear Chief Staff Officer,

You, your staff, and your organization's volunteers make a big difference in the quality of life in Central Ohio. Philanthropy greatly contributes to the quality of life all across America.

It is, therefore, important for us to understand how philanthropic organizations operate effectively and this is the objective of the Excellence in Philanthropy Project.

Please take fifteen minutes to complete the attached questionnaire and return it in the enclosed addressed envelope. Your response is vital to the success of this research project. A summary of the results of this survey will be provided upon your request.

It is very important to the validity of this study that you, the Chief Staff Officer, complete the questionnaire yourself. Your response will be CONFIDENTIAL and only reported in the aggregate with other responses. It is vital that you respond completely and candidly to all questions.

Thank you for your assistance. Your participation will further our understanding of important, relevant, and practical issues involved in operating philanthropic organizations. You are contributing to the advancement of philanthropy.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Sheehan, Jr.

P.S. Having served as a Chief Staff Officer for two different philanthropic organizations myself, over the past twelve years, I know how many demands you have on your time. But please respond today. Thanks!
THE EXCELLENCE IN PHILANTHROPY PROJECT

Chief Staff Officer Questionnaire

Your Name ____________________________________________

Name of Organization __________________________________

Organization Address ___________________________________

_____________________________________________________

Organization Phone ____________________________

_____ Please send me a summary of the results of this survey.

Thank you for your response to The Excellence in Philanthropy Project questionnaire. Your responses will be kept CONFIDENTIAL. This cover sheet, which requests your name and your organization's, will be detached immediately upon receipt from the responses you record on the following pages.

We ask for names only so we can track which organizations have responded. Confidentiality is secured by separately analyzing your responses and reporting only aggregate data in this study.

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Thanks once more for your support and assistance!
SECTION A: ORGANIZATION DESCRIPTION

1. Is this a national, state or local organization?
   ____ National   ____ State   ____ Local

2. Is your organization affiliated with any national or state organizations?
   ____ Yes, as a member   ____ Yes, informally   ____ No

3. What primary type of function or service does your organization provide? Please choose one. (Please refer to ATTACHMENT A for detailed definition of each category.)
   ____ Arts, Culture, Humanities   ____ Intern'l/Foreign
   ____ Education/Instruction   ____ Public/Soc Benefit
   ____ Environment   ____ Religion
   ____ Health   ____ Human Services
   ____ Other (please specify):
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

4. How long has your organization been in existence? If it has undergone any reorganization, please date from original founding.
   ____ Less than 2 years   ____ 13-17 years
   ____ 2-3 years   ____ 18-22 years
   ____ 4-6 years   ____ 23-49 years
   ____ 7-12 years   ____ 50 years or more
5. What was the total amount of revenues, from all sources, received by your organization during your most recently completed fiscal year?

_____ Less than $100,000   _____ $500,000-$999,999
_____ $100,000-$249,999   _____ $1-$2,499,999
_____ $250,000-$499,999   _____ $2,500,000 or more

SECTION B: ORGANIZATION MISSION

1. Does your organization have a formal mission statement which has been approved by its board of directors?

_____ Yes. If yes, please attach a copy of the mission statement. Please state the year in which this current version was approved: ______. When was the mission statement last reviewed: ______.

_____ No. If no, what would you say the mission of the organization is:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
2. Please explain how you determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination.
3. Does the board of directors determine whether the organization is or is not accomplishing the mission in the same way as you have explained in response to Question #2?

______ Yes. ______ No. If no, please explain how the board makes this determination. Please list any results, outcomes, and specific evidence the board looks at to make this determination.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Please explain how you determine whether what you do personally—on your job—does or does not contribute to the accomplishment of the organization mission. Please list any feedback you receive from others in addition to any results, outcomes, performance evaluation criteria, and specific evidence you look at to make this determination.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
5. Does your organization communicate its mission internally—to staff and volunteers?

______ No ______ Yes. If "yes," In what ways is the mission communicated internally?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

6. Does your organization communicate its mission externally—to others in the community?

______ No ______ Yes. If "yes," In what ways is the mission communicated externally?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
7. The following statements are possible attitudes which members of an organization could report having toward the organization mission. What statement do you say represents your attitude regarding the organization mission? Please place a check mark in the one appropriate space.

_____ Want it to be accomplished. Will make it happen. Take personal responsibility for making it happen. Will create whatever structures are needed for accomplishment.

_____ Want it to be accomplished. Will do whatever can be done within the existing structures to see it is accomplished.

_____ See the benefits of mission. Do everything expected and sometimes more. "Good soldier."

_____ On the whole, see the benefits of mission. Do what is expected and no more. "Pretty good soldier."

_____ Do not see the benefits of mission. But, also, do not want to lose job. Do enough of what's expected because you have to, but also let it be known you are not really "on the team."

_____ Do not see the benefits of mission and will not do what's expected. "I won't do it; you can't make me."

_____ Neither for nor against mission. No interest. No energy. "Is it five o'clock yet?"

8. In which of the following operational areas does the organization mission play a significant role in your organization? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces. Check as many as apply.

_____ Strategic Planning

_____ Marketing

_____ Fund-Raising

_____ Board of Directors operations
ATTACHMENT A

Function of Organization

Please indicate the type of function or service your organization provides.

A. Arts, Culture and the Humanities (includes architecture, design, performing arts, cultural/ethnic awareness groups, other cultural groups; historical preservation, arts and cultural societies, other humanistic societies, museums, art exhibits, operas, symphony orchestras, dance groups; photography; theater; and visual aids.)

B. Educational/Instructional/Research (Elementary, secondary or higher education, libraries; research at educational institutions; adult education; information education; educational fund drives for such educational associations as the United Negro College Fund, etc.)

C. Environmental (Environmental quality protection, beautification; animal-related; protection and welfare; endangered species; humane societies, wildlife and wilderness; zoos, animal sanctuaries, and refuges.

D. Health, Including Mental Health (General and rehabilitation; health, including mental health and mental retardation and developmentally disabled; substance abuse; diseases; nursing homes, hospices, crisis counseling, hotlines, etc.; fund drives of private health associations such as American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, March of Dimes, etc.)

E. Human Services (Day care centers, foster care centers, family counseling; consumer protection, legal aid; crime and delinquency prevention; public protection; employment/jobs; food, nutrition, housing/shelter; public safety, emergency preparedness and relief; recreation; leisure, sports, and athletics; Red Cross, YMCA, Junior League, and other similar multiservice organizations; United Way, Catholic Charities, Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, United Jewish Appeal, and other combined multipurpose charity drives; youth development.)

(continued on next page)
ATTACHMENT A

Function of Organization

(continued)

F. International/Foreign, in U.S. and Abroad (includes education; health; peace or security; refugees-related; relief abroad; other social services; student exchange and aid; cultural exchange; economic development; technical assistance; promotion of friendly relations among nations; United Nations and its associations.)

G. Public/Society Benefit (Civil rights, social action, advocacy, minority and women's issues; community improvement, community capacity planning; science; technology; technical assistance; volunteerism; philanthropy, charity, public education about needs of charities.)

H. Religion (Includes organizations providing direct giving to churches, synagogues, monasteries, convents, seminaries, etc.; BUT giving to church affiliated schools offering broad educational curricula, nursing homes, Catholic Charities, Jewish Federation, etc. should be placed under proper sections.)

I. Other (please specify)
Analyzing The Excellence in Philanthropy Questionnaire

Thank you for agreeing to assist with the analysis of questionnaires for "The Excellence in Philanthropy Project," a research study intended to support the development of practical theory for increasing the effectiveness of philanthropic organizations in America. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. This guide will explain how to perform the analysis on the questionnaires you will be given.

You will have a photocopy of the actual responses to four of the questions asked on the questionnaire (Questions #1-#4 in Section B). And you will be given a "Questionnaire Scoring Sheet" for each questionnaire. Each questionnaire will have a number listed on the upper right hand corner of the first page. Please record this number--followed by your initials--on your scoring sheet, then use the following instructions to complete the analysis for each questionnaire. Please return the completed scoring sheet with each photocopy of the questionnaire responses you analyze.

There are seven major steps of analysis to be completed for each questionnaire. Following are explanations to assist you in completing each of the seven steps. Thanks again for your assistance.

Step #1

1. Does the mission statement, written for Question #1, expressly state an intention to impact/benefit the organization itself, to make an impact/benefit outside the organization, to do both, or to do neither?

   a. _____ Impact Organization
   b. _____ Impact Outside Organization
   c. _____ Both
   d. _____ Neither

Following are some examples of mission statements:

Example #1. ABC is dedicated to ending homelessness through the creation of safe, decent and affordable housing; to promoting policies which reduce the number of homeless people; to educating the community about the needs of homeless people; and to providing a continuum of services which empower and assist homeless people to achieve self-sufficiency.
Example #2. The mission of XYZ is to provide a high quality musical experience for patrons and to become one of the world's five top-ranked symphony orchestras.

Both of these statements express an intention to make an impact outside the organization, but the second example also expresses an intention to impact the organization itself, i.e. "to become one of the world's five top-ranked symphony orchestras." So for Example #1, you would mark "b" and for Example #2 you would mark "c."

Step #2

2. Please write down the statements which, in response to Question #2, you judge to be reliable measures.

Space is provided on the answer sheet for you to record these reliable measures. For this study, the definition of a reliable measure is one which relates items along a scale at an arbitrary or fixed zero-point and divides the scale into equal intervals (e.g., temperature in degrees, length in feet or meters, etc.) Therefore, something which defines things as greater than or less than, without equal intervals, would not count as a reliable measure. A reliable measure would collect evidence which someone outside the organization could observe and confirm. Following are examples of possible responses to the question:

Example 1, Homelessness Agency:
A. Average number of monthly residents in county shelters--tells us by how much homelessness is increasing or decreasing.
B. Number of times we testify at legislature on homeless issues--shows we are promoting our policies.
C. How happy shelter residents act--shows we are empowering them.

Example 2, Symphony:
A. Smiles on faces of patrons following performance--shows they had a high quality musical experience.
B. Yearly rankings of world orchestras by "Symphonia Magazine"--tells if we are in the top five.
Measures "A" and "B" in Example #1 are reliable measures, while "C" is not. "Happiness" depends on one person's interpretation, and different people will have different interpretations. The same type of problem exists for measure "A" in Example 2. Whether a facial expression qualifies as a smile is an interpretation, therefore it is not reliable. Measure "B," however, is a listed ranking and, though based in someone's opinion, has been quantified.

Step #3

3. Which of these measures represent an impact on (or difference made in) a person, place, and/or thing outside of the organization? (Simply list the above letters corresponding to the measures.)

Are any of these measures inconsistent with the impact the organization says it intends to make in the mission statement? If so, please list the above letters corresponding to the measures.

An "impact" on a person, place, and/or thing refers to a change in his/her/their/its condition. Referring to the examples provided in Step #2, we see that Measure "A" in Example #1 does represent an impact on people—it shows if there are more or fewer homeless people each month. Measure "B," however, does not represent an impact on any person, place, or thing outside the organization. The measurement of the number of times the organization testifies to the legislature simply represents the completion of activities—not an outside impact. In Example #2, even though Measure "B" is reliable, it represents an impact on the organization only—its world ranking.

So, of the reliable measures previously identified, only Measure "A" in Example #1 represents an outside impact. By comparing this measure to the mission statement, we can complete part two of Step #3. We see that this measure is consistent with the organization's mission to eliminate homelessness.

Step #4

4. If the response to Question #3 on the questionnaire is "No," then write down the statements recorded there which you judge to be reliable measures.

If additional measures are listed, use the same reasoning as provided in the guidelines for Step #2.
Step #5

5. Which of these measures represent an impact on (or difference made in) a person, place, and/or thing outside of the organization? (Simply list the above letters corresponding to the measures.)

______________________________

Are any of these measures inconsistent with the impact the organization says it intends to make in the mission statement? If so, please list the above letters corresponding to the measures.

______________________________

Use the same reasoning as in the guidelines for Step #3.

Step #6

6. Please write down the statements which, in response to Question #4, you judge to be reliable measures.

Use the same reasoning as provided in the guidelines for Steps #2 & #4 to determine reliability.

Step #7

7. Please look at the responses to Question #2 again. What, if any, of the following categories of performance explanations are listed in that response. Check as many categories as you find in the explanations.

   ___ Efficiency (low waste, balanced budget)
   ___ Goal (meet annual goals & objectives)
   ___ Internal Process (follow procedures)
   ___ Resource Acquisition (growth, fund-raising)
   ___ Human Relations (people feel good/satisfied)
   ___ Constituency (the opinions of "the public")

Following are extended explanations of the different categories:

Efficiency. This category would include statements that show concern for operating without wasting effort or resources, such as making sure costs are low and that their is a balanced budget.
Goal. Meeting goals and/or objectives would be given importance.

Internal Process. This category would include statements regarding the importance of following certain operational procedures closely.

Resource Acquisition. Importance would be given to growth and acquiring resources, perhaps through fund-raising, memberships, or providing services.

Human Relations. This category would include statements which give importance to how satisfied workers are on the job and how they feel about the working conditions.

Constituency. Importance is given to the opinions of supporters, clients, and "the public" regarding the performance of the organization.
Questionnaire Scoring Sheet

Questionnaire #: _____

Please be sure to note the Questionnaire # and your initials in the space above, and to record a number in every space below, even if it is a zero ("0"). Please turn in your marked questionnaire along with this scoring sheet for each questionnaire you analyze. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Does the mission statement, written for Question #1, expressly state an intention to impact/benefit the organization itself, to make an impact/benefit outside the organization, to do both, or to do neither?
   a. _____ Impact Organization
   b. _____ Impact Outside Organization
   c. _____ Both
   d. _____ Neither

2. Please write down the statements which, in response to Question #2, you judge to be reliable measures.
   a. ____________________________ ____________________________
   b. ____________________________ ____________________________
   c. ____________________________ ____________________________
   d. ____________________________ ____________________________
   e. ____________________________ ____________________________

3. Which of these measures represent an impact on (or difference made in) a person, place, and/or thing outside of the organization? (Simply list the above letters corresponding to the measures.) Are any of these measures inconsistent with the impact the organization says it intends to make in the mission statement? If so, please list the above letters corresponding to the measures.
4. If the response to Question #3 on the questionnaire is "No," then write down the statements listed there which you judge to be reliable measures.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 
   e. 
   f. 
   g. 

5. Which of these measures represent an impact on (or difference made in) a person, place, and/or thing outside of the organization? (Simply list the above letters corresponding to the measures.) 

   Are any of these measures inconsistent with the impact the organization says it intends to make in the mission statement? If so, please list the above letters corresponding to the measures. 

6. Please write down the statements which, in response to Question #4, you judge to be reliable measures.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 
   e. 
7. Please look at the responses to Question #2 again. What, if any, of the following categories of performance explanations are listed in that response. Check as many categories as you find in the explanations.

_____ Efficiency (low waste, balanced budget)
_____ Goal (meet annual goals & objectives)
_____ Internal Process (follow procedures)
_____ Resource Acquisition (growth, fund-raising)
_____ Human Relations (people feel good/satisfied)
_____ Constituency (the opinions of "the public")
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