

Recommendations for Best Work Practices between Nonprofit Organizations and Foundations 2015–2017

Conclusions from a Series of Meetings of Nonprofit and Philanthropic Foundation CEOs in Israel

An Initiative of the CEOs Organization, a representative body of hundreds of CEOs from the nonprofit sector in Israel - and the Forum of Foundations in Israel

2017



Recommendations for Best Work Practices between Nonprofit Organizations and Foundations 2015–2017

Conclusions from a Series of Meetings of Nonprofit and Philanthropic Foundation CEOs in Israel

An Initiative of the CEOs Organization, a representative body of hundreds of CEOs from the nonprofit sector in Israel – and the Forum of Foundations in Israel

Writing: Ron Gerlitz, Orly Silbinger, Galia Granot, Talia Horev, Dafna Dor

Translation: Abbie Rosner

Design: Ronit Izraeli



The Participants:

From the Foundations:

Galia Granot, Program Officer, Ruderman Family Foundation

Offi Zisser, CEO, Azrieli Foundation Israel

Talia Horev, Director, Forum of Foundations in Israel

Uri Leventer-Roberts, Executive Director, UJA-Federation of New York, Israel Office

Barak Loozon, Israel & Global Network Director, UJA Federation of San Francisco

Yael Nakhon Harel, Director, Posen Foundation – Israel

Dr. Ronit Amit, CEO, Gandy Foundation

Efrat Shaprut, CEO, Opportunity Fund

From the Non-Profits:

Kher Albaz, Co-Executive Director, AJEEC-NISPED

Ron Gerlitz, Co-Executive Director, Sikkuy

Dafna Dor, Director, Shiur Acher

Ariel Dloomy, Co-Executive Director, AJEEC-NISPED

Dr. Hilla Hadas, CEO, Enosh

Miki Ron, Director, CEO Organization, Civic Leadership

Orly Silbinger, CEO, B'terem

Dr. Ilana Tischler, Director General, Ben Shemen Youth Village

The process was an initiative of the CEO's Organization – Dafna Dor, Efrat Shaprut, Avrami Torem and Esther Sivan, and the Forum of Foundations in Israel – Talia Horev and Dr. Ronit Amit, and voluntarily facilitated by organizational consultant Rakefet Keret-Karavani. To all involved, we express our gratitude.

This document is the outcome of a series of meetings of directors of foundations and non-profits in Israel. It represents the opinions of its authors, and the intended goal of enriching dialogue related to our ongoing work relationships.

We permit and encourage copying, citing, and/or reproducing all or parts of this document, on the condition that appropriate credit is given. All feedback is welcome – ffi@matanisrael.org.il

Introduction

No director of a nonprofit will ever forget the moment s/he received major funding for an important project, and realized that the initiative for social change they dreamed of was about to become a reality. Likewise, no director of a philanthropic foundation will ever forget the moment s/he realized that a decision taken years past to fund a particular project had ultimately proved to be transformative in improving the lives of many. These are magical moments. Yet every nonprofit and foundation director can also recall moments of frustration and contention that occur in the relations between grant makers and grantees.

This report is the outcome of an extended and in-depth series of meetings held by CEO's of nonprofits dedicated to social change and philanthropic foundations. We were driven by shared recognition and a sense of urgency over the need to revisit the way nonprofits and philanthropic foundations relate to one another. Both nonprofits and foundations invest significant time, funding and managerial resources in these relationships. **The goal of this collaborative process, and the recommendations that it produced, was to suggest insights and methods that will make work relationships between foundations and nonprofits more effective and efficient,** and thereby maximize the resources that can be dedicated to the their mutual goal of social change.

Successful work relationships between nonprofits and philanthropic foundations are critical, yet they are also complicated by numerous factors, some of which are described in this document. In light of this complexity, and to facilitate their work together, open, candid and direct discussions are necessary, yet nonprofits and foundations often find it difficult to achieve this level of communication. The CEOs Organization of social change nonprofits and the Forum of Foundations in Israel initiated a series of meetings between CEOs of eight nonprofits and eight philanthropic foundations over the past two years, to openly discuss and examine their common interests, the complexities and challenges they contend with, and suggest models of how nonprofits and foundations can better work together to increase their effectiveness and reach their social goals.

After an initial process of getting to know one another and relationship-building, the participants came to recognize and understand the needs and challenges faced by the foundations and the nonprofits. As a group, we acknowledged the underlying asymmetrical relationship between funders and grantees, and the tensions, sensitivities and concerns that naturally arise from

encounters between those who are perceived as the source of funding and those who are dependent upon them.

We agreed that one of the goals of this process was to create a document that summarizes the principles and recommendations we would collaboratively reach, and disseminate it to a wider audience. This document would cover:

1. The continuum concept - a range of relationships between foundations and nonprofits
2. Principles for optimal collaborative work practices
3. Recommendations for nonprofits on how to work with foundations
4. Recommendations for foundations on how to work with nonprofits

We believe that following the recommendations outlined in this document will make the work between nonprofits and foundations more productive and pleasant, and significantly improve their joint capacity to achieve the broad and impactful social change to which they aspire.

The Continuum Concept

A range of relationships between foundations and nonprofits

One of the main challenges that nonprofits and foundations face when working together is conducting authentic and effective dialogue about a desired project or social change outcome. Unfortunately, in many cases, such a dialogue does not take place.

An underlying assumption – symmetry or asymmetry

There is a fundamental asymmetry in the relationship between foundations and nonprofits. Foundations, which provide financial support and choose which projects to fund, are often perceived as being in a position of power. Yet it is important to remember that, without the nonprofits who carry out the projects, foundations would have a hard time achieving their goals. In fact, the reciprocal relations that develop between the two sides enable each side to achieve its organizational and mission goals. Taking into account the perspective and needs of the “other side” can increase mutual understanding and improve work relationships.

A range of possibilities - types of relationships between nonprofits and foundations

In relationships between foundations and nonprofits, the levels of involvement can range across a continuum, from minimal, where the foundation provides only financial support and the nonprofit carries out the project, to the opposite extreme, where the foundation closely partners with the nonprofit and is fully involved to ensure that the goals of the project are achieved. In some cases, the foundation actually initiates a project and invites nonprofits to be involved in it.

It is important to emphasize that there is no “right” or “wrong” position on the continuum. That said, establishing where a relationship stands on it can be a useful prelude to conducting effective dialogue between foundations and nonprofits, and can help them reach consensus on the sphere of operations and the nature of the relationship. This, in turn, will assure that the expectations of both sides are clear and consensual, optimizing the work relationship between them and, most importantly, their capacity to reach the goals of the project.

For these reasons, it is important to define the type of relationship between the foundation and nonprofit at the outset: is it a broad partnership? A collaboration? A grant for a specific purpose? What responsibilities are shared, and what level of involvement is expected of the foundation? Will additional funds need to be raised in the future to reach the shared goals, and if yes, who is responsible? And more...

Principles and Recommendations for Best Work Practices between Foundations and Nonprofits

Collaborations between nonprofits and foundations can be complicated by underlying power issues. In this series of meetings, these issues were perceived most strongly at the beginning of the process. Over time, however, we reached a level of trust that enabled open, equitable and balanced dialogue, where all of the participants felt that their positions were heard and understood.

We are fully aware that the deep and thorough collaborative process we underwent is unique. And yet, those of us who work in foundations and nonprofits must return again and again to the reason for which we are all here: our mutual social goals, and remember that productive relationships and open dialogue are essential to achieving these goals. Mutual respect is a critical base from which to create good work relationships between foundations and nonprofits.

In this section, we will present several principles that can help build optimal and effective work relationships between nonprofits and foundations. We will also outline the topics we recommend that foundations and nonprofits begin to discuss at the outset of their collaborations. We believe that such discussions can prevent difficulties and misunderstandings along the way, and significantly contribute towards building an effective work relationship. In the following sections we will present specific recommendations for foundations and nonprofits.

Prevent wasted efforts – first assess feasibility for collaboration

Nonprofits and foundations waste significant resources writing and reviewing large numbers of grant applications that do not end up being selected. Overall, we believe that this waste of resources is worse than the potential damage of missing an opportunity to fund, or receive funding for, an impactful project. Thus, every effort should be made to minimize the submission of grant applications that will not ultimately be selected.

We recommend that both sides work together to ensure that existing resources be allocated for grants and projects, and not wasted on ineffectual efforts. This is in everyone's best interest, and is the responsibility of both the foundations and the nonprofits.

We have established three guidelines to prevent fruitless grant application submissions:

1. Foundations should provide detailed, clear and accurate specifications regarding the grant.

2. Foundations should adopt an “Early No” strategy (see below).
3. Nonprofits should only submit appropriate grant applications.

Define the characteristics of collaboration

(a) When possible, avoid deviating from the organization’s core work principles and/or plans

- Nonprofits often apply for grants that do not relate to their core operations, principles and/or work plans, hoping they will connect to a foundation and secure funding. Both the nonprofits and the foundations are responsible for preventing this from happening.

(b) Clarity and Transparency

- Foundations and nonprofits maintain clarity throughout all stages of the relationship, ensuring that every stage is clearly defined and structured, from the initial feasibility assessment through final decision-making. This should include clear and detailed information on how a decision will be relayed, how the project should be carried out, and what reporting is expected. Who are the entities involved in the process? What actions are required of each side and according to what timetable?
- Foundations clearly state the amount or general range of a grant, from the earliest stages of contact with the nonprofits.
- Both sides agree upon the grant period, funding terms, conditions and milestones from the outset, as well as additional approvals required, and options for changes under specific circumstances, etc.
- Both sides are clear about the type of cooperation and mutual expectations related to the project and the processes needed to carry it out.
- Both sides update each other in the event of any developments within their organizations or the project that may affect the agreement between them.

(c) Define a Common Task

- Both sides define the core principles and expected achievements that will not be compromised.
- Both sides jointly determine desired outcomes, main activities to achieve them, and measures of success.
- Divide the main mission into components: an agreed upon work plan, milestones, a budget that reflects the agreed upon activities, and reporting documentation required (content and deadlines).

- Clarify the connection between the common task and the larger context of each organization - its mission, goals and the macro-processes within which it operates.

(d) Match expectations, define the work relationship and responsibilities of each side

- Foundation and nonprofit representatives match expectations and define their methods for communication, including interpersonal communications.
- Both sides agree upon the levels of involvement and intervention on each side of the collaboration, including professional, managerial, organizational and financial involvement, defining the beneficiaries, and others.
- Clarify and articulate the form of collaboration in the contractual agreement and its main contents (budget, timetables, funding schedule).
- Both sides agree upon how the collaboration will terminate and their obligations following termination, including assurance regarding continuation and sustainability, responsibility to the beneficiaries, ownership of intellectual property, etc.
- Nonprofits submit full and accurate reports, including any exceptional incidents relevant to the project and/or the grantee organization.
- Define methods and staff level for resolving conflicts and difficulties during the course of the project.

Acknowledgements, public relations and advertising

- Establish clear guidelines for acknowledgement.
- Establish clear guidelines regarding obligations and expectations related to participation in conferences, meetings and visits.
- Coordinate lobbying and public relations initiatives between all sides, if the need arises.
- Clarify what information related to the project can be shared and publicized by each side.

Evaluation, information and data – Types of information and knowledge, ownership and intellectual property

For projects that include an evaluation process, first establish the scope of the evaluation, and clarify which evaluation findings should be submitted to each side.

For projects with a significant data collection component, discuss the following issues at the outset of the project:

- Define the type of data that is required, its quality and sources.
- Responsibility and ownership - determine who is responsible for collecting the data and processing it into a usable format, and who owns the information and intellectual property accumulated during the course of the project.
- Coordinate expectations regarding achieving targets and success in accordance with how they are reflected in the collected data. Discuss openly what should be done if the data indicate partial or no success, and how that affects the continuation of the project.
- Use of data – specify exactly by whom, when and how collected data can be used and shared. This includes professional knowledge and materials, and their use to promote interests and goals that are not directly connected to the project: publishing information on a website, distributing it to other organizations (nonprofits, donors), etc.
- Define if and how a foundation can access a nonprofit's data bases.

Ethical conduct

Both the foundations and the nonprofits must specify and periodically evaluate compliance with the basic principles of ethical conduct, including checking funding sources, fair employment practices, protection of beneficiaries, responsible use of resources, use of project resources only for the allocated project, etc. Ideally, both sides should work together to define and present their positions on these relevant ethical issues.

Concluding the relationship

How relationships between foundations and nonprofits end is just as important as any other stage. We recommend that both sides agree upon how to terminate the project in a clear and transparent manner that ensures its continued impact.

Recommendations for Nonprofits When Working with Foundations

The recommendations in this section are intended to make the interactions between nonprofits and foundations more effective and efficient, thereby saving significant resources that can be directed towards the shared goals of social change, and encourage mutually respectful and pleasant work relationships between nonprofits and foundations.

Because this subject is so important, we will emphasize once again **the importance of limiting as much as possible the submission of grant applications that will not result in an awarded grant.** Preventing these fruitless efforts is in the best interests of both the nonprofits and the foundations, and as such, is the responsibility of both sides.

When should a nonprofit approach a foundation and/or submit a grant request?

- **We highly recommend avoiding submitting a grant request when the chances of receiving it are low. The wasted time and resources and the resulting frustration from a rejected application are worse than losing out on a specific grant.**
- The degree of affinity between the goals of a nonprofit and a foundation is a good indicator of the chances of receiving funding. Thus, it is recommended that a nonprofit seek out and apply to foundations whose areas of involvement are as close as possible to their own. This will not only increase the chances of securing funding, but also reduce as much as possible the investment in preparing and reviewing applications that will not be approved.
- **Before requesting an appointment or submitting an application, learn as much as you can about the foundation's funding from its website and, if possible, from a foundation representative.** What are its areas of interest and its granting policies? Who has received grants in recent years and in what amounts? etc. If your nonprofit's goals are compatible with those of a foundation, identify the most appropriate project, clarify whether the foundation is supporting new projects, ongoing projects or infrastructure, and what its preferences are regarding additional funders; and if it funds the entire budget of a project or only a portion of it.
Conducting thorough research can help in planning and producing a relevant and compelling proposal that matches the needs of the foundation to those of the nonprofit.

- **Conducting thorough research on a foundation before applying can considerably strengthen fundraising effectiveness. If you find that there isn't enough compatibility between your organizations to justify submitting a grant application, foregoing the application process will save both your nonprofit and the foundation time and money.**

Applying to foundations – initial contact and submitting grant applications

The responsibility for communicating with foundations and applying for grants belongs mainly to the nonprofit's fundraisers. It is important that they represent their organizations in a professional manner, in coordination with their CEO.

- It is important to recognize and respect the foundations' policies regarding how to make contact and the grant proposal submission process. **If a foundation member discourages you from making an appointment, do not to persist.**
- Before meeting with a foundation, establish the subject of the meeting in order to prepare effectively and prevent wasted time.
- Ensure that the nonprofit's representatives who will be meeting with the foundation/donor are fully prepared so that their presentation will be meaningful and effective.
- In meetings with a foundation, allow the foundation representatives to present their areas of interest.
- **Respect the foundation representatives and do not try to bypass them to reach a donor directly.** Ultimately, if a donor expresses interest in a project, the application and funding process will be mediated by the foundation representatives. Therefore it is essential to maintain positive work relationships with them.
- Professional or social meetings are not a good time to approach foundation representatives with questions on whether to submit an application for a project, or clarify the status of an application. If you want to initiate a discussion regarding cooperation, it is best to request an appointment.
- If there was no rationale in the past for applying for a grant, or a grant application you submitted was not approved, finding out the reasons why can help you determine whether to reapply (Have the criteria changed? Have the strategies changed?)
- Find out if the foundation has an up-to-date mailing list and ask to be added to it, to stay abreast of updates and future funding opportunities.

Receiving a negative response from a foundation

- Upon receiving a negative response, respect the foundation's decision and avoid contesting or trying to change it.
- Learn from the negative responses, particularly if the foundation is willing to provide explanations for their decision. This can be an important lesson in terms of future connections with the foundation, and also when applying to other foundations, as well as for developing your professional grant application skills.
- Even if you received a negative response, politely thank the foundation for the opportunity to submit a grant request, and for their consideration of your submission. Someone at the foundation invested time and energy assessing it.

Obstacles and full or partial failure when carrying out a project

This is one of the most sensitive issues in the relations between nonprofits and foundations. Foundations don't appreciate hearing – and justifiably – that a project and every aspect of it are a total success, since this clearly can never be the case. Indeed, presenting such a scenario actually hinders the opportunity for promoting social change. **A foundation values a nonprofit that puts its difficulties and failures on the table. A nonprofit's ability to expose its failures also attests to its strengths.** Thus it is important and worthwhile to report promptly, openly and honestly regarding obstacles and delays in carrying out the project, with clear explanations.

When a project fails

Transparency and discussion are critical in such cases. If a project does not develop successfully, the nonprofit needs to promptly notify the foundation and provide a clear and detailed explanation. If the nonprofit representatives have managed to create a personal and respectful relationship with the foundation representatives, it should be possible to contact them personally to share the painful truth, and consult with them regarding the best way to notify the foundation.

In such circumstances, it is recommended that the nonprofit also offer to terminate the project and its funding, or offer an alternative approach to achieving the goals of the original project.

Ethics, communication and work relationship during the funding period or collaboration

(a) A broad agreement on expectations

From the outset, it is recommended that the nonprofit define as clearly as possible the following components related to its relationship with the foundation:

- The foundation's level of involvement – on the continuum between funder and full partner

- The foundation's expectations from the nonprofit: reporting, information, visits, acknowledgment
- Guidelines for clear, transparent and professional communications
- Procedures and staff level for resolving conflicts
- And more – see the section on Principles for Best Work Practices between Foundations and Nonprofits above.

(b) Honesty and credibility

- Double-dipping – receiving funding from different funders in amounts that exceed the project budget, and/or use of donor funds for purposes other than their intended allocation is **a severe violation of the funder's trust and hinders their ability to fulfill their mission.**
- While open, candid discussions between the nonprofit and the foundation are very important under normal circumstances, they are essential when exceptional situations arise. If there are difficulties in carrying out a project, the foundation should hear about it directly.
- The nonprofit is responsible to all the funders of a project, and not only, or mainly, to the funder who made the largest contribution.
- Credibility – the nonprofit must be committed to the accuracy of the data it provides to the foundation, including full and accurate information in its reports.
- The nonprofit must report any unexpected developments, delays in carrying out the project for any reason, and/or failure to meet established goals. In these cases it is recommended that it initiate an open discussion on how to proceed.

(c) Use of information

- It is important that the nonprofit clearly define its guidelines regarding what types of information are appropriate for it to publish and use for its public relations efforts, and determine to what extent they are coordinated with and approved by the foundation.

(d) Feedback to the foundation

- It is important for the nonprofit to provide feedback to the foundations about its work procedures, particularly if the nonprofit encounters difficulties during the application process or the funding/partnership period.

Recommendations for Foundations when Working with Nonprofits

Nonprofits invest significant time and managerial resources in their work with foundations – efforts which otherwise could be directed towards their mission to create social change. If foundations are able to improve their work procedures (and the nonprofits can, naturally, improve theirs – see the previous section), this can translate into saving significant amounts of resources for both foundations and nonprofits. **In particular, every effort should be made to reduce the number of grant applications that do not ultimately receive funding.** This is in the best interest of both the nonprofits and foundations. The waste of time and resources, and the frustration that comes from rejected applications, are worse than the loss of an opportunity to fund a good project.

The recommendations in this section are intended to make the work relations between foundations and nonprofits more effective and efficient, and as such, free up significant resources so that the civil society nonprofits and foundations alike can achieve social change. They may also help foundations create more respectful and pleasant work relations with the nonprofits.

Public information on the foundation

It is important that the foundations supply as detailed information as possible on their websites. This information will facilitate better matching between a foundation's funding goals and the type of organizations and grant application they submit. It will also reduce the resources invested by nonprofits in preparing irrelevant grant applications, and those invested by foundations in reviewing them.

The information provided will include:

- The foundation's funding areas, in as great detail as possible
- A detailed description of the grant application process, including different funding tracks (i.e. specific grant deadlines) requiring special application procedures
- An updated calendar of application deadlines and notification dates
- A list of current and former projects funded

- Information on the scale of grants, such as the average and median amounts awarded. This information is especially important for nonprofits.

When issuing an open call for grant applications, it is important that the foundation indicate how many grants it expects to award and in what amounts, the number of organizations that submitted applications in previous years, if possible, and any other information that will help the nonprofits assess their chances of receiving a grant. This will help nonprofits make informed decisions as to whether to submit a grant application, and avoid fruitless investment of resources.

Adopt an Early-No strategy

Nonprofits dedicate significant resources towards fundraising. In their interactions with nonprofits, **it is recommended that foundations notify them if they believe their chance of receiving funding is low**, particularly before an application is submitted. **An early no will save time, resources and energy which can be allocated to other purposes.** This also applies to requests for informational meetings: foundations should consider whether to hold such meetings if they believe that the chances of funding are low, even if the nonprofit makes the request. It could be preferable not to hold the meeting, to save everyone precious time and avoid unrealistic expectations.

Define the framework for cooperation

The nature of the relationships between foundations and nonprofits should always be clearly defined: what is each party responsible for and where is responsibility shared? Are both parties responsible for fundraising to ensure the project's continuation? Clarify the involvement of both sides – the foundation's involvement can be minimal, simply as a funder, or involve full partnership in carrying out the project and/or meeting specific goals, and even more.

Types of grants

- Multi-year grants are easier for nonprofits, and streamline their interactions with the foundations. We realize that foundations may find it difficult to commit to multi-year grants, but for the nonprofits and the social change work that they do, **the time, energy and funds entailed in annual grants is very high, and can even go at the expense of hiring necessary staff for a project.**
- It is important that foundations also award grants for organizational capacity-building, evaluation, infrastructure and ongoing operational expenses, and not only for projects. When an organization is professional and stable, the projects it operates benefit as well.

Recommendations for Grant Applications and Approvals

- **Create a grant application format that is simple and clear.** Before sending an application form to nonprofits, the foundation may try out a pilot version with several organizations and solicit their constructive feedback.
- It is advisable that at least some foundations create and use one, consistent application form.
- Provide information on how and to whom nonprofits should address their questions about the application process and the required documents.
- Avoid requesting information that is not related and/or does not support the decision-making process.
- Ensure that the amount of information required in a grant application is commensurate with the level of expected funding.
- When the chances of receiving a particular grant are low, we highly recommend offering a two stage application process: a short, initial Letter of Intent (LOI), followed by the full application.
- For large-scale projects that a foundation funds only partially, **it is recommended that the foundation does not ask the nonprofit to “carve out” a sub-project** for it to fund – that is, to artificially create a smaller project within the main project which would be funded separately. **This is a contrived approach that results in wasted resources** during the application process and the narrative and financial reporting stages.
- Simplify how texts can be submitted through the foundation’s computerized system (when possible enable the use of Microsoft Word). Complicated electronic submissions are difficult for the nonprofit staff to edit and add comments, and waste significant amounts of their time. Ideally, the computerized submission process should be simple and easy for multiple editing by the nonprofit staff members.
- Send a confirmation notice when an application is received, indicating the expected date when they will be notified of a decision.
- **Encourage nonprofits to provide constructive feedback on the grant application process.** A request for feedback can be an integral part of the grant application process, enabling the foundations to receive feedback immediately after its completion.

Recommendations: from application submission to decision notification

- Notify applicants if there is any delay in the decision-making process.
- When notifying a positive decision, include the expected date for contract signing and transfer of funds.
- When notifying a negative decision, if possible, provide a detailed explanation for the decision, and indicate whether there is a reasonable chance of receiving funding in the future. This information is extremely important to the nonprofits.

Recommendations: during the funding period

- **Foundations should clarify their reporting requirements to the nonprofits,** including the timeframe for their submission.
- **The scale and frequency of reporting should be commensurate with the size of the grant.** Furthermore, it is recommended that the reporting requirements cover only information that is useful to the foundation. Consider ways to make the reporting requirements easier (i.e., is it really necessary to require the signatures of every board member of a nonprofit? Were clear instructions regarding currency exchange rates included in the report? etc.).
- Be considerate of the nonprofits' regular workload and limit the number of visits, which entail significant advance preparations.
- If a foundation is implementing strategic changes in its funding goals, it is strongly recommended that it notify all the nonprofits it funds so they can respond accordingly.

Other important points

- **Before any meeting with a nonprofit, it is recommended that foundations notify them regarding the subject/s of the meeting,** so they can prepare effectively and avoid wasting time.
- **Sometimes foundations ask nonprofits for information about other organizations.** If the nonprofit prefers not to express an opinion about other nonprofits, this is to be respected, and it is recommended that this be clarified at the time of the request.
- It is recommended that foundations proactively make themselves accessible to smaller organizations that may be less professional in their fundraising capabilities. They can reach out to them via a direct approach, roundtable forums, offering assistance in writing grant applications, etc.

Some Concluding Observations by the Participants

This document is the outcome of a series of meetings we, CEO's of social change nonprofits and philanthropic foundations in Israel, initiated out of our shared desire to improve the work relations between nonprofits and foundations. We recognized that it was important to document and share the insights we gleaned, and the conclusions that we reached. We are convinced that streamlining work processes between foundations and nonprofits is crucial to making our efforts more effective, and freeing up resources towards achieving our shared goal of social change.

We intend to present this document to representatives of foundations and nonprofits in a series of meetings and incorporate their feedback in an updated and improved version.

In this document, we outlined recommendations for foundations and nonprofits that will help them communicate and collaborate in the most productive and optimal manner. We are aware of the asymmetrical relations, difficulties and constraints that nonprofits face in their work with foundations. Yet, **we are convinced that following these recommendations is possible and will significantly improve all of our abilities to bring about significant social change. It is, indeed, in our hands.**

In conclusion, we have chosen to share some of the main insights that we, the participants in these meetings, gained from the process.



Talia Horev, Director, Forum of Foundations in Israel

Deep and significant processes for change require patience, time and determined, committed leadership.



Miki Ron, Director, CEO's Organization, Civic Leadership

The foundations need the nonprofits just as much as the nonprofits need the foundations.



Ariel Dloomy and Kher Albaz, Co-Executive Directors, AJEEC-NISPED



We were able to put ourselves in the shoes of the foundation representatives and understand the considerations and pressures they face. We came away feeling that it is possible to create mutual relationships between foundations and nonprofits that are not one-sided between giver and taker.



Orly Silbinger, CEO, B'terem

The foundations are partners who want the best for the beneficiaries no less than we do, and the collaboration between us can bring about real change.



Dr. Ronit Amit, CEO, Gandyr Foundation

We are all leaders and professionals, truly committed to social change. Once we were ready and open to building trust, getting to know each other and listening to each other, this opened the door for cooperation and mutual agreement, which are essential conditions for social impact.



Ron Gerlitz, Co-Executive Director, Sikkuy

I realized how essential it is to improve the interface between the foundations and the nonprofits in order to expand the social impact that both sides are invested in. In spite of the complexities, directors of foundations and nonprofits can change their working habits and lead this cooperative process. It is our shared responsibility, and it is achievable.



Efrat Shaprut, CEO, Opportunity Fund

I understood the complexities faced by each one of the sides, and the mutual dependency between the directors of the nonprofits and those of the foundations. In order to improve the social services in Israel, we should work together, and do it well.



Dafna Dor, Director, Shiur Acher

We need an ongoing commitment to open and authentic discussion on the power relations, the collaboration towards specific goals, and on the practices of both sides; that also takes into account our target populations. In addition to the beneficiaries of our programs, we need to consider a broader target population that includes the donors as well as the social change organizations and their staff.



Barak Loozon, Israel & Global Network Director, UJA Federation of San Francisco

I came away with a deep understanding that we are not on different sides of the equation, but need each other and complement each other in regard to the challenges.



Galia Granot, Program Officer, Ruderman Foundation

Understanding the diverse and shared needs and interests, while strengthening transparency, is the key to optimal and efficient collaborations. We need to remember that everything begins and ends with relations between people.



Uri Leventer-Roberts, Executive Director, UJA-Federation of New York, Israel Office

There is no point in developing one single work formula, but we can understand the differences, and most importantly, create a foundation of respect and basic mutual understanding.



Dr. Hilla Hadas, CEO, Enosh

This was an opportunity for in-depth acquaintances, open dialogue and also to understand the different approaches of my colleagues, the directors of nonprofits, and the directors of foundations.



Offi Zisser, CEO, Azrieli Foundation Israel

Familiarity, trust and transparency are the basis for relationships between nonprofits and foundations.



Dr. Ilana Tischler, Director General, Ben Shemen Youth Village

Most significant for me was getting to know the foundation directors, and gaining insights into the process from the other side.



Yael Nakhon Harel, Director, Posen Foundation - Israel

The meetings allowed for open and candid dialogue between the two sides, and demanded that we, the foundation directors, examine the role we fill, and that we pay attention to how clear, attentive and considerate we are with the nonprofits we invite to submit grant application.

