COLLOQUIO SCIENTIFICO SULL'IMPRESA SOCIALE

Second national survey on "Foundations' governance & support acstions toward strategic philanthropy"

Giacomo Boesso, Fabrizio Cerbioni
Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Aziendali "M. Fanno"
Università degli Studi di Padova

ABSTRACT

Should non-profit organizations' leaders rely on enhanced governance mechanisms to optimize the social outcomes of the philanthropic strategies their organizations implement? The recent literature on the non-profit sector has investigated the composition, role, responsibilities, and characteristics of non-profits' boards. However, there is a lack of research on the causal link between governance practices and effective philanthropic strategy. This gap should be filled because non-profit organizations are increasingly pivotal elements of the "private welfare state" that exists in Europe and the OCSE. While other kinds of organizations that are involved in philanthropy and public welfare face competition (i.e., corporations), budget constraints (i.e., governments), or fundraising imperatives (i.e., NGOs) that limit their ability to address public welfare, private endowed foundations feel less such pressure, so they can tackle social issues that other organizations or individual donors may not. The purpose of this paper is to present the second survey, which will enlarge an existing pilot study on 112 large Italian foundations, the exploratory results of which show strong correlations between sophisticated governance and more challenging philanthropic strategies. Using a second on-line survey and ex-post structured interviews, the research team is currently collecting data from a representative sample of board members of Italian foundations with the goal of investigating the relevance of factors like board capital, board processes, philanthropic culture, and board leadership in optimizing foundations' grant-making processes and social welfare creation strategies. The results of the study should reveal whether and when well governed private foundations can spend money more effectively and efficiently than individual donors and poorly governed foundations can.

Paper presentato al
X Colloquio scientifico sull'impresa sociale, 10-11 giugno 2016
Dipartimento di Scienze Politiche
Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II"

ISBN 978-88-909832-3-8

Iris Network
Istituti
di Ricerca
sull'Impresa
Sociale

STATE OF THE ART

Foundations are "institutional donors" that are endowed with large financial assets that their trustees (board members) allocate through annual philanthropic budgets by means of one or more grants made to associations, cooperatives, universities, research centers, schools, other operative foundations, and other entities or through one or more projects that the endowed foundation carries out with its organizational resources. Because of foundations' growth and success in creating social value, scholars, politicians, and practitioners have come to expect them to play the unique role of social merchant banks in fostering the positive impact of non-profit organizations on societies. Regulators like the European Commission (2005) and the U.S. Senate Finance Committee (2004) have argued for effective non-profit governance in order to achieve these objectives, thus making the governance of non-profit organizations a hot research topic. However, there is growing concern about governance and accountability in the foundations sector, as foundations and other charities come under closer scrutiny and major regulations for improving corporate governance and audit spill over to the non-profit sector in light of scandals such as excessive pay packages, use of grants for personal purposes, self-dealing, and small capital payouts. Accordingly, the civil and media attention has turned to the institutional governance of non-profit organizations (EFC, 2007).Foundations cannot improve their actions if their governing bodies are poor in terms of their basic competencies and strategic planning skills. The link between appropriate governance and positive strategic outcome (the creation of value) has been analyzed using listed public companies (creation of shareholder and stakeholder value) but has received little attention as it relates to non-profit organizations' strategic outcome (the creation of social value). The literature reviews on non-profits that are currently available (Du Bois et al., 2007; Ostrower and Stone, 2006) show the lack of research on the causal link between governance and strategy. Studies have examined how non-profit boards' performance can affect organizational performance (Brown, 2007; Cornforth, 2003); how the institutional and social context affects boards (Fredette, 2012); the 1ehavior, decision-making processes, and relationships within and outside the board (Frumkin, 2010); and changes inboard composition and action (Green and Griesinger, 1996); but only a few studies have mentioned the relationship between governance and strategy formulation for this particular kind of non-profit player (De Andrés-Alonso, Azofra-Palenzuela and Romero-Merino, 2010; Porter and Kramer, 1992).In addition, the governance problem in private foundations has many characteristics that are not present in other organizations, and these characteristics must be addressed in linking governance and strategy. Foundations may or may not have a funding leader (e.g., a family, a company, the state). They may have one or two boards (one smaller, more operational board and one larger, more strategic and/or scientifically oriented board) or no board at all. They must deal with larger expectations from peculiar stakeholders (e.g., funders, donors, volunteers, beneficiaries) in addition to the typical set of corporate stakeholders (e.g., directors, employees, banks, government, community).The mainstream literature on governance is based on profit maximization and agency theory. However, foundations' directors (trustees) face governance problems that differ from those of for-profit companies. While managerial remuneration, markets takeover, and the owners' active monitoring are less important in the foundations 'environment, other issues, such as stakeholder management, creation of social value, and community management are more relevant. For these reasons the literature has often criticized the corporate view for its narrowness.

THE FIRST SURVEY ON FOUNDATIONS' GOVERNANCE

Italy, Germany, Austria and France are civil law countries that have developed a state-oriented non-profit sector (Anheier and Daly 2006). In these countries, non-profit organizations tend to resemble state agencies more than they do for-profit firms, while in common law countries the non-profit sector is more market-oriented, putting more emphasis on voluntarism than on public or civil service. In Italy, from 2001 to 2011 private non-profit organizations increased their delivery of social and public goods by about 28 percent (Italian National Institution of Statitics, ISTAT, 2011). As a result, foundations' donors, funders, boards and managers have begun to practice their philanthropy based on a more impact-focused strategy. In 2011, the census of Italian non-profit organizations found that 6,325 foundations (with more than 85 billion euros in their financial portfolios) were active in that period. Only 88 of them (1.4%) are foundations of banking origins (FOB), but they manage almost half of the total of foundations' assets.

In order to collect information about foundations' governance and philanthropic strategy, we submitted a questionnaire to the 169 foundations (88 FOB and 81 company, family, or community foundations) contacted through the two main Italian foundations' professional associations, ACRI and ASSIFERO. Before fielding the questionnaire, we validated its terms and other information by presenting preliminary versions to these two professional associations and tested the questionnaire on a focus group of four foundations.

For the main fielding of the questionnaire, done January-June 2010, we asked that only the chair or the general director/secretary answer the survey. After sending three reminders to those who had not responded, we achieved a 65 percent response rate and a final sample of 110 foundations, including most of the largest Italian grant-making foundations. The sample was well mixed in terms of origin (banking, family, corporate, and community), making the result potentially extendable to any type of Italian foundation. In particular, 51 FOB answered our questionnaire (60% of the total number of FOB), providing a good representation of the most important philanthropic players in Italy. In 2014 FOB were managing (directly or through external experts) financial portfolios of more than 41.2 billion euros and generating profits of almost 1.7 billion, and recording social expenditures of 1 billion euros. FOB were created twenty years ago when the Italian legislature decided to privatize the public banking sector and separated banking activity from philanthropic action. At present, FOB have no role in the banks from which they originated, other than voting as shareholders in the annual meetings, and their institutional activity consists of allocating the financial profits derived from their portfolios to social projects.

FOB promoted the establishment of community foundations (CF) in Italy. Thirty CF are currently associated in the ASSIFERO national network, nineteen of which answered our questionnaire (63% of all CF). The remaining thousands of foundations are private family and corporate foundations (PF), but we believe that, though collaboration with the main national associations, we captured a representative sample of the largest and the most active Italian philanthropic players. The main results are reported in the following tables.

Number of board members and presence (%) of selected governing bodies

	FOB	**PF**	**CF**
Chair	1	1	1
Director	1	1	1
Average number of board member	5,9	7,1	14,1
Average number in the "control" board	14,8	-	-
Average number in the audit board	3,0	2,9	3,3
Average number of vice-presidents	1,6	0,9	1,3
Presence of vice-president	88,5%	65%	100%
Average number of shareholders	68,4	8,3	31,0
Presence of "shareholder meeting"	38,5%	17,1%	5,3%
Executive committee (presence)	0,0%	63,2%	17,1%
Scientific committee	11,5%	5,3%	31,7%
Ethic committee	5,8%	0,0%	7,3%

Investment committee	36,5%	52,6%	9,8%
Project evaluation committee	40,4%	57,9%	19,5%
Nomination committee	7,7%	21,1%	2,4%
Remuneration committee	0,0%	5,3%	0,0%

How do you select board members? (%)			
	FOB	**PF**	**CF**
Professional quality in the CV	**36,5**	**39,0**	26,3
Informal appraisal of competences	28,8	17,1	**26,3**
Formalization of preferred competences before looking at received CV	15,4	9,8	5,3
Formalization of researched competences before calling for a new board member	13,5	7,3	15,8
Other	5,8	22,0	26,3
No answer	0,0	4,9	0,0
Tot.	100	100	100

Which competences are now represented in your board? (%)			
	FOB	**PF**	**CF**
Management	**19,6**	**30,2**	**22,0**
Finance	15,6	**19,8**	**20,3**
Law	**17,6**	16,4	**20,3**
Politics	11,1	6,0	10,2
Art	10,1	7,8	5,1
Social or Environmental	12,1	9,5	11,9
Other technical	14,1	10,3	10,2
Tot.	100	100	100

How operational and planning data are transferred to board members? (%)			
	FOB	**PF**	**CF**
During the meeting	**47,1**	31,7	36,8
Written communication shortly before the meeting	45,1	**63,4**	**57,9**
Regular updates (at least every 15 days)	3,9	2,4	5,3
They have continuous access to a dedicated website	3,9	0,0	0,0
Other	0,0	2,4	0,0
Tot.	100	100	100

Which are the most discussed topics? (%, multiple choices possible)			
	FOB	**PF**	**CF**
Grant policy over the short and medium term	**84,6**	**90,2**	**78,9**
Grantees' screening	55,8	34,1	36,8
Internal organization	75,0	53,7	42,1
HR need and competencies	42,3	22,0	26,3

How external bodies and stakeholders are engaged for the decision making?			
	FOB	**PF**	**CF**
Board members collect information and bring it in during discussion	**63,5**	**46,3**	**57,9**
Result of formal meetings are discussed in the board	7,7	19,5	**21,1**
Board members formally organize meeting with the supervision of the board	**17,3**	**22,0**	0,0
External bodies and stakeholders are invited for board meetings	11,5	4,9	10,5

Which of the following analysis are discussed in the board?			
	FOB	**PF**	**CF**
Responsibilities Maps	50,0	19,5	15,8
Grant policies	**51,9**	12,2	**42,1**
Budget	**86,5**	**82,9**	**84,2**
Cost analysis	46,2	**36,6**	21,1
Benchmarking with other foundations	44,2	22,0	42,1
Indexes (satisfaction, timing, productivity, etc.)	**51,9**	17,1	10,5

While the above mentioned data describe how foundations' governance is organized, little is known about how governance can contribute to a more effective philanthropy. Accordingly a second survey was envisioned.

RESEARCH QUESTION AND METHOD FOR THE SECOND SURVEY

Although several European foundations networks (e.g., European Foundations Centre, Donors and Foundations' Network in Europe, European Venture Philanthropy Association) operate on an international level, little research has been done on foundations' governance and its role in separating successful and proactive foundations from passive organizations and those that have little impact. The importance of filling this gap in the literature is increased by the relatively recent explosion in the number of foundations and their increasing role as social players that integrate and complement the decreasing governmental social spending. In short, as a result of shortcomings in the national and European regulations on these kinds of organizations and the absence of international harmonization, the generous funders of these foundations could often dictate their own rules in term of governance policy and strategic implementation. The outcome has been a high risk of foundations created and managed only to please the private interests of their founders, rather than a genuine public interest. The followed methodology has been designed in order to test the following proposition: Does articulated governance enhance strategic philanthropy? And if so, how the different governance's characteristics (trustees' roles, boards' processes and planning, managerial control activities) contribute to a general shift from occasional charitable grant-giving to a more strategic approach?

ADOPTED THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Non-profit foundations' managers face the complexity of spending money that, because of tax privileges, belongs, in a sense, to the whole community. In doing so, only effective governance systems can mediate between the conflicting goals of the principals who are interested in creating social value (donors, beneficiaries, and the community) and those of the foundation's agents (founders, president, directors, etc.) who might be more self-interested (career planning, short-termism, consolidation of personal networks, consolidation of scope and power, financial return, etc.). In addition to that, agents' actions and the pursuit of foundations' broad community missions should be undertaken in the interest of all major stakeholders (including: employees, the state, suppliers, partners, etc.), not only the principals (Hendry, 2001).The theoretical framework deployed by this research project is grounded in stewardship theory (Muth and Donaldson, 1998), which emphasizes the strategic role of boards. In this vein, Low (2006) argues that, as organizations evolve from cultural patronage and charitable spending to more complex grant-making strategies, the board needs richer and more diverse expertise in order to perform its strategic roles. The project is also grounded in the resource-based perspective (Pfeffer, 1972),which envisions boards as boundary-spanners who link organizations with their external environments. These two theories are used to link appropriate non-profit board characteristics with more satisfactory grant-making strategies by analyzing whether boards' composition (diversity), size, structures, effectiveness, processes, philanthropic cultures, and forms of leadership are associated with sound philanthropic strategies. As De Andres et al. (2010) state, in the non-profit sector the board of trustees demonstrates its level of commitment in strategic planning and decision processes based on whether they limit themselves to monitoring the managerial team or also play an active role in decision-making, defining the organizational mission, and allocating resources. For this reason, the function and composition of the board has to be studied from a perspective that encompasses not only its monitoring activity but also whether it uses the knowledge that is critical to constructive decision-making. Accordingly, the proposed survey aims to help in investigating the association between good non-profit governance practices (mainly board capital, board activities, and leadership as measured at board membership level) and the most successful philanthropic strategies in order to formulate appropriate governance and accountability guidelines and best practices that can enhance the social value created by increasingly relevant philanthropic spending.

METHODOLOGY

Using a second detailed on-line survey (annex 1: 20 questions and more than 35 items) addressed to presidents and trustees of private foundations, the research team aim to collected governance data from the largest Italian foundations already investigated a first time in 2011. The items analyzed so far proved to be suitable for an explorative statistical study of the relationship between selected governance items and the philanthropic strategies of private foundations (Boesso et al. 2014a and 2014b). Italian foundations are an ideal research environment for a pilot study, considering the significant reduction in governmental social spending because of the financial crisis and the simultaneous increase in the importance of private foundations in supporting social causes. This second survey will build on this pilot work and further extends its results by investigating the strategic approach to governance of a selected sample of board members in order to understand how familiar they are with the topic of strategic philanthropy. After having interviewed the presidents of the Italian foundations, it is a natural developing to enlarge the analysis to the board members in order to better investigate if and when each board member shares the perception of the president in term of effectiveness, efficiency and procedures of their decision making during governing meetings. Preliminary versions of the questionnaire were presented to the main foundations' professional associations (ACRI and ASSIFERO) and tested on a focus group of selected pilot foundations in order to validate terms and information. The second survey is currently under submission to an Italian sample of *hundreds* of board members. Structured interviews to selected presidents and board members could also be adopted as relevant *ex-post* methodology. These numbers are appropriate in order to have a first representative sample of at least 30 to 50 percent of all major Italian Foundations. Smaller and micro foundations, in fact, face more difficulties in organizing articulated governing bodies and do not represent a suitable research environment yet. Before launching the on-line survey, an updated database of foundations' presidents and board members was created by compiling a list from the Italian foundation associations and by independently analyzing numerous foundation's website. The largest decile in term of foundations' asset size is the starting point for composing our sample. After the launch of the online survey, the data collected will be also partially validated by means of content analysis of institutional documents like annual reports, sustainability or social reports, and websites.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: The quality of the philanthropic strategy.

The pilot methodology measured the quality of foundations' philanthropic strategies by adapting the Porter and Kramer's (1999) four-tier hierarchy for the ideal philanthropic strategy. One of the main decisions the board should make concerns their strategy definition. CEP (2009, p. 2) defines foundation strategy and boards' commitment as "a framework for decision making that is 1) focused on the external context in which the foundation works and 2) includes a hypothesized causal connection between use of foundation resources and goal achievement. "Porter and Kramer (1999) inspired these recommendations and explained how to formulate an effective strategy by proposing a clear hierarchy of four ascending behaviors that can increase the social impact of foundations' grants:

1. selecting the best grantees
2. signalling other funders
3. improving the performance of grant recipients
4. advancing the state of knowledge and practice

The creation of social value in any of these four ways is conditioned by the presence of a comprehensive strategy. In this typology the underlying logic of strategy in business and in philanthropy is the same: the goal is superior performance in a chosen arena, the strategy depends on choosing a unique positioning and rests on unique activities, and every positioning requires trade-offs. In pursuing its strategy, a foundation must measure its performance over time in order to identify the fields in which it can operate at an optimal level and collect resources that are in line with its purpose. The potential of the strategic classification proposed by Porter and Kramer derives from its having been studied specifically for foundations. Only more recently, theorists and practitioners have called for more flexible and less predictive models for large US foundations with the goal of helping them take advantage of a more nuanced model of emergent strategies (Kania, Kramer and Russel 2014; Kasper and Clohesy 2008). Such an approach, they argued, would be a better fit with unpredictable social changes. However, in the Italian context foundations' activism is still a young phenomenon that is largely led by former banks and family businesses, so it calls for greater transparency, more professional behavior, and better tailored social initiatives as important alternatives to emerging cases of undisclosed decision-making, localized interest, and selfish patronage (Boesso et al. 2014). Accordingly, Porter and Kramer's model (1999) recommendations still represent valuable theoretical frameworks with which to test empirically the difference between basic charitable foundations and more strategically oriented ones. Following this theoretical typology, a first empirical method (Boesso et al., 2014a) might associate proxy items like intense screening activities, additional fundraising, promotion of complex and multi-partner projects, and continuous assessment of social impact with a more evolved strategic approach that differentiates foundations' proactive role from that of basic charitable activities. These items can be measured with the questionnaires, validated by appropriate statistical tests, and then aggregated in a comprehensive quantitative index of philanthropic strategy's quality. A second, more complex method (Boesso et al., 2014b) uses two aggregative dimensions—project funding priorities and project development activities—to illustrate how foundations implement philanthropic strategies. First, the project-funding dimension is related to the priorities given to various types of financed projects, and it gives a picture of a one kind of strategic approach:

- Seed capital for projects that are characterized by a large degree of self-government (e.g., innovative solutions for providing timely health assistance to aged people through social venturing)
- Complex and long-term projects (e.g., the development of local infrastructure or social housing)
- Projects proposed by the foundations themselves (e.g., exhibitions or events)
- Research grants (e.g., doctoral or post-doctoral positions)
- Unconditional grant-giving (e.g., financing external proposals like restorations of works of art)

While the first three typologies refer to operating foundations that act as social merchant banks, the last two refer to grant-making foundations that are more interested in giving financial support to activities proposed by third-sector players (e.g., associations, groups, other beneficiaries). Second, the project development dimension refers to how foundations' boards allocate their time for project development into three phases: ex-ante, which is related to project selection; in progress; and ex-post, which is focused on determining the effectiveness of the financed project. Foundations follow various practices in allocating their time across these three phases. We will consider two extreme practices: focused control, where the foundation's board concentrates its activities on one of the three phases, and balanced control, where the foundation's board balances control activities among all three phases (Anthony and Govindarajan, 1998). Finally, by combining the two dimensions of project funding priorities and project development activities, one could distinguish among four philanthropic strategies: expressive, receptive, proactive, and collaborative. This classification is based on two assumptions: that engaging in complex projects is a more sophisticated strategic approach than being "unfocused and piecemeal" (Jaskyte, 2012) because unfocused grant-giving makes it difficult to distinguish the activity of a foundation from the activity of a single individual donor, and that complex projects need an accurate control process that involves screening the projects as well as in-progress and ex-post control (Ebrahim, 2003). Through ex-post control in particular, a foundation improves the effectiveness of its grants, thus creating social value. Overall, moving from the role of capital provider (expressive strategy) to a fully committed partnership that leverages foundations' expertise and governance processes, implies a shift in thefocus of activity "from the individual recipient to the overall social sector" (Porter and Kramer, 1999, p. 123). We acknowledge that all these classifications are partially subjective and that there is some potential for overlaps in the above mentioned approaches. However, after reviewing previous literature and analyzing anecdotal evidence, we believe that these classifications captures key differences in foundations' strategies, thereby helping to shed light on the active role played by the boards in foundations. The problem of finding an optimal classification that can capture every aspect of foundations' strategy has been addressed in the literature. For example, Stone et al. (1999) conclude that the lack of uniform consideration of strategic factors has led to confusion and contradictory results. Brown and Iverson (2004) adopt a largely accepted "for profit" strategic typology (Miles and Snow typology). Their results associate tighter and more focused boards with non-profit organizations that are have a more defensive strategic approach and broader and more inclusive boards and organizations that are more open to product and service innovation. Accordingly, the potential of the classifications proposed in this project proposal derive from their extending and customizing previous research on foundations' needs by associating the degree of complexity (Porter and Kramer, 1999) and the innovativeness of the funded project (Brown and Iverson, 2004) with the project development activities run by the foundations (De Andrés-Alonso et al., 2010). However, after a more detailed and complete literature review, the research team will test additional methods and metrics for measuring the quality of the strategic process (quality of the output) and the social outcome of each euro spent on philanthropic projects. This literature analysis helped the research team in composing question # 3 to 6 in the annexed questionnaire.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: The governance features and characteristics.

Building on the corporate literature and enriched by the non-profit studies on boards' effectiveness, we will observe at least eight governance variables associated with strategic philanthropy—board diversity, board process, board networks, board philanthropic culture, organizational culture and stakeholder salience — as well as other variables the updated literature review will recommends. Initial results published by the research team show that board processes and diversity are related to more articulated philanthropic strategies and that, as the power of the CEO and the board process dynamic improve, the philanthropic strategies evolve from charitable spending and cultural patronage to strategic philanthropy under some specific conditions. In mapping the governance variables we will ask all board members how familiar they are with the main governance topic and how relevant they are in the decision making process they take part during their governance meetings. These literature analysis helped the research team in composing question # 13 to 20 in the annexed questionnaire.

CONTROL VARIABLES AND MODELS

In addition to the classical descriptive statistics on the depended and independent variables, further control variables will be added, such as: foundation assets size, number of employees, the local GDP, country, foundation typology, political pressure, etc.

– ANNEX 1: THE QUESTIONAIRE –

CONCLUSION

As several detailed academic studies about how the corporate governance of leading listed companies has helped to increase the creation of financial value for all shareholders and stakeholders, it is time for a better academic understanding of how foundations' governance can do the same for the creation of social value. Accordingly, the survey presented in this paper and currently under dissemination will lead to the formulation of guidelines and recommendations for professional players and regulators who are interested in enhancing the social value foundations can create when financing social projects about such social ills as: low education levels, premature mortality, aging societies; unemployment; poverty; cultural and environmental threats, etc. Given the growing size and impact of foundations' social spending in Italy and other OCSE countries, this second national survey has two major objectives. First, improved non-profit governance and accountability practices' review can help to better understand and increase the contribution foundations can make to social welfare systems.

Governance in non-profit foundations is peculiar in itself; in a theoretical paper Porter and Kramer (1999) contend that good governance can improve foundations' philanthropic strategies if good governance practices take into consideration the peculiarity of non-profit players and do not simply replicate corporations' good governance practices. The empirical evidence on non-profit benchmarks is scant, but anecdotal evidence portrays several foundations that are managed according to the sole preferences of their generous funders, rather than according to managerial criteria designed to increase the social outcome of the social projects that are approved and financed. Therefore, a detailed review of current governance practices, as measurable at board members' perception level, will be conducted in order to determine the level of professionalism reached by these relevant social players. Second, the study will build on the observations about governance and philanthropic practices, as developed in pursuit of the first objective, by highlighting the role that effective governance plays in driving the strategies of successful grant-giving foundations in terms of supporting charitable and philanthropic activities of public interest. In targeting this second objective, the research team will isolate and study the effect of elements like: trustee profiles, long-term strategy, how eligible grantees and projects are selected, monitoring of activities, form of leadership, philanthropic culture, meetings' rules, routines and procedures, and other relevant governance issues that may help to optimize the social outcome related to the financial resources foundations deploy. Associations between good governance, as perceived at board membership level, and effective philanthropic strategy will be investigate because it is worthwhile to show empirically that one euro invested by a foundation that uses an appropriate governing process can generate more social value than the same euro invested by a charitable foundation that is poorly governed or a coin donated by a single generous individual can create. Finally, dissemination of the study's resulting guidelines and recommendations among practitioners and the education of non-profit leaders will be an important part of this research project, which will include significant contacts with national and international foundation associations.

REFERENCES

Anthony, R.N., & Govindarajan, V. 1998. Management Control Systems, 9th edition, Boston: Mc Graw Hill.

Boesso, G., Cerbioni, F., Menini, A and A. Parbonetti, (2014b, forthcoming). The Role of Board's Competences and Processes in Shaping an Effective Grant-MakingStrategy. Proceeding of the 2014 EIASM Conference.

Boesso, G., Cerbioni, F., Menini, A and A. Parbonetti, (2014a, forthcoming). Philanthropy by Decree: exploring the governance and philanthropic strategies offoundations of banking origin. Nonprofit Management and Leadership.

Brown, W. A , & Iverson J. O. 2004. Exploring Strategy and Board Structure in Nonprofit Organizations. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33: 377-400.

Brown, W.A. 2007. Board Development Practices and Competent Board Members: Implications for Performance. Nonprofit Management and Leadership,17:301-317.

Center for Effective Philanthropy. 2009. Foundation Governance: the CEO Viewpoint.

Cornforth, C. 2003. The Governance of Public and Nonprofit Organizations. What Do Boards Do? London: Routledge.

De Andrés-Alonso, P., Azofra-Palenzuela, V., & Romero-Merino, M. E. 2010. Beyond the Disciplinary Role of Governance: How Boards Add Value to Spanish Foundations. British Journal of Management, 21: 100-114.

Du Bois, C., Caers, R., Jegers, M., Schepers, C., De Gieter, S., & Pepermans R. 2007. The non-profit board: a concise review of the empirical literature. Journal forPublic and Nonprofit Services, 1: 78-88.

Ebrahim, A. 2003. Making Sense of Accountability: Conceptual Perspectives for Northern and Southern Nonprofits. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 14:191-212.

European Commission. 2005. Giving More for Research in Europe: the role of foundations and the non- profit Sector in boosting R & D investment. Luxembourg.

European Foundation Center. 2007. Governance and Accountability, Foundation's Toolbox,

EFC.Fredette, C., & Bradshaw, P. 2012. Social Capital and Nonprofit Governance Effectiveness. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 22: 391-409.

Frumkin, P. 2010. The Essence of Strategic Giving. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Green, J. C., & Griesinger, D. W. 1996. Board Performance and Organizational Effectiveness in Nonprofit Social Service Organizations. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 6: 381-402.

Hendry, J. 2001. Missing the Target: Normative Stakeholder Theory and The Corporate Governance Debate. Business Ethic Quarterly, 11: 159-176.

Kania, J., Kramer M., Russel P. (2014). Strategic Philanthropy for a Complex Word, Stanford Social Innovation Review, Summer, 26-37.

Kasper, G., Clohesy, S. (2008). Intentional Innovation: How Getting More Systematic About Innovation Could Improve Philanthropy and Increase Social Impact, Kellog Foundation Reports.

Jaskyte, K. 2012. Boards of Directors and Innovation in Nonprofit Organizations. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 22: 439-459.

Low, C. 2006. A framework for the governance of social enterprise. International Journal of Social Economics, 33: 376-385.

Muth, M. M., & Donaldson, L. 1998. Stewardship Theory and Board Structure: a Contingency Approach. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 6: 5-28.

Ostrower, F., & Stone M. M. 2006. Governance: Research trends, gaps, and future prospects, in W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), The nonprofit sector: A researchhandbook (2nd ed.). : New Haven, CT. Yale University Press.

Pfeffer, J. 1972. Size and Composition of Corporate Boards of Directors: the Organization and its Environment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 218-228.

Porter, M., & Kramer, M. 1999. Philanthropys New Agenda: Creating Value. Harvard Business Review, 12: 121-130.

Stone, M.M., Bigelow, B., & Crittenden, W. 1999. Research on strategic management in nonprofit organizations. Administration and Society, 31: 378 - 423.

U.S. Senate Finance Committee. 2004. Charity Oversight and Reform: Keeping Bad Things from Happening to Good Charities, 108th Congress, second session (June22).

ANNEX 1 (*The questionare)*

INDAGINE SULL'AZIONE DI GOVERNO E LE ATTIVITA' DI SUPPORTO ALLA FILANTROPIA STRATEGICA

La *filantropia strategica* è un modello teorico proposto dalla letteratura anglosassone che propone alle Fondazioni di farsi attori proattivi in grado di pianificare interventi sociali attivando reti complesse con altri soggetti del terzo settore. Queste reti di *welfare* privato dovrebbero essere alimentate da frequenti interazioni tra Fondazioni di erogazione, beneficiari operativi, soggetti istituzionali, imprese sociali e *policy maker*. Si vuole favorire, nel concreto, la capacità delle Fondazioni di stendere piani d'azione, individuare i migliori strumenti di intervento, selezionare gli opportuni *partner* di progetto, monitorare ed analizzare le ricadute sociali ottenute. Il risultato atteso è una maggiore capacità delle Fondazioni di sperimentare e valutare diverse linee di intervento, alla ricerca dei migliori impatti sociali possibili. L'applicabilità delle *filantropia strategica* nel contesto italiano risente, inevitabilmente, delle tipicità del nostro paese. **Con il presente questionario si vuole favorire la conoscenza del modello teorico e analizzarne possibili migliorie** o integrazioni locali. Pochi minuti del vostro tempo saranno un importante contributo in questa direzione. Le risposte ai quesiti riflettono **l'opinione soggettiva del singolo rispondete anonimo,** non dati istituzionali.

SCHEDA ANAGRAFICA DEL RISPONDENTE

1) Qual è il suo ruolo in Fondazione

□ Presidente, VicePresidente, □ Segretario Generale, Direttore; □ Consigliere Organo di Indirizzo;
□ Consigliere Organo di Amministrazione; □ Dipendente, □ Staff; □ Altro_________________

2) Quali sono le principali competenze (massimo 3) che apporta alla Fondazione?

□ Manageriali; □ Finanziarie; □ Giuridiche; □ Artistiche-Umanistiche; □ Politico-istituzionali;

□ Scientifiche-tecnologiche; □ Specialistiche relativamente alle aree di intervento; □ Comunicazione

□ Altro__________________________

POSTULATI DELLA FILANTROPIA STRATEGICA

3) La sua Fondazione, nell'ambito della definizione dei requisiti per la partecipazione alle assegnazioni delle risorse, prevede criteri di selezione dei beneficiari che consentano di valutarli *comparativamente* alla ricerca del soggetto che meglio di altri possa realizzare le finalità perseguite?

0 non so 1 non rilevante 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

4) Investendo in progetti sociali la sua Fondazione riesce a *mobilitare attori e risorse* del territorio indirizzandoli verso le proprie linee strategiche di intervento o linee di intervento comuni?

0 non so 1 per nulla (o scarsa disponibilità dei partner) 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

5) Ritiene possibile che la Fondazione possa favorire/promuovere la diffusione fra *i soggetti beneficiari* di metodologie e pratiche operative che ne accrescano la capacità di gestire e rendicontare progetti?

0 non so 1 per nulla (eccessivamente complesso o costoso) 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

6) La sua Fondazione nella scelta dei progetti si propone di individuare soluzioni innovative e/o autosostenibili che possano rappresentare un *esempio di modello di intervento per il policy-maker*?

0 non so 1 non possibile (per scelta progetti locali e specifici) 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

Altri commenti:

____

____

IDONEITA' PERCEPITA RISPETTO ALLA FILANTROPIA STRATEGICA

7) Si ritiene soddisfatto del contributo che riesce personalmente ad apportare nel selezionare, durante la fase valutativa *ex-ante,* i progetti meritevoli di finanziamento.

0 non so 1 non di competenza 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

8) Ritiene sia possibile durante la valutazione *ex-post* esprimere in maniera oggettiva il valore sociale creato da un progetto finanziato.

0 non so 1 non realizzabile 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

9) Valuta con favore percorsi di *aggiornamento* della Fondazione in merito a modelli di intervento adottati da altre fondazioni ed enti nonprofit per valutarne l'applicabilità al proprio contesto?

0 non so 1 tema oramai ridondante 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

Altri commenti:

____

____

____

____

VALORIZZAZIONE DEL PROCESSO DI PIANIFICAZIONE E CONTROLLO

10) L'attuale orizzonte programmatico pluriennale offre *opportunità concrete* di utilizzare le erogazioni come un finanziamento "seme" in grado di germogliare e generare o attrarre ulteriore risorse?

0 non so 1 poco 2 3 4 5 6 molto

11) Quali dei seguenti strumenti di controllo favoriscono la disamina critica delle linee d'intervento filantropico *al fine di migliorarle*?

Lo stato di avanzamento dei progetti finanziati: 0 non so 1 poco (o non effettuato) 2 3 4 5 6 molto

La predisposizione di un budget di progetto: 0 non so 1 poco (o non effettuato) 2 3 4 5 6 molto

L'analisi di scostamenti tra piani e risultati: 0 non so 1 poco (o non effettuato) 2 3 4 5 6 molto

Sessioni di confronto diretto con i beneficiari: 0 non so 1 poco (o non effettuato) 2 3 4 5 6 molto

L'analisi di indicatori di risultato operativi: 0 non so 1 poco (o non effettuato) 2 3 4 5 6 molto

L'analisi di indicatori d'impatto sociale: 0 non so 1 poco (o non effettuato) 2 3 4 5 6 molto

12) Ritiene che gli *strumenti classici di pianificazione e controllo* (piani, budget, analisi di performance) possano *stimolare* un processo d'apprendimento o, al contrario, favorire, se esasperati, il proliferare di pratiche burocratiche sino al rischio di nascondere la valenza sociale dell'intervento?

0 non so 1 rischio concreto di soffocamento 2 3 4 5 6 grande stimolo

Altri commenti:

____

____

____

____

ATTIVITA' DI SUPPORTO AI CLASSICI COMPITI DI GOVERNO

13) Quanto ritiene utili le seguenti *attività dei membri degli organi di governo* che la letteratura, a vario titolo, propone come possibili integrazioni alle classiche funzioni di indirizzo e controllo.

"Raccontare" l'azione della Fondazione all'esterno:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Riportare le istanze delle comunità in Fondazione:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Garantire risorse ad enti meritevoli e sotto-finanziati:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Affiancare il presidente nella creazione di reti d'attori:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Accompagnare i beneficiari nella realizzazione dei progetti:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Sviluppare e aggiornare i processi operativi:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Ampliare al massimo il numero di beneficiari:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Comparare i risultati dei progetti finanziati:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Discutere fallimenti e successi nei progetti sociali:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Assumere rischi in progetti innovativi:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Autovalutare l'efficacia del consiglio:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Analizzare il *feedback* da parte dei "beneficiari":	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Individuare manager o "project leader" professionisti:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Promuovere una forte dialettica nel valutare i progetti:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Finanziare l'erogazione di servizi di welfare privato:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto
Supportare la partecipazione civile e l'associazionismo sociale:	1 poco	2	3	4	5	6 molto

Altri commenti:

____

____

____

DEFINIZIONE DEL PROFILO STRATEGICO

14) In base ai progetti finanziati nell'ultimo triennio (o sua frazione a cui ha partecipato), come valuta l'azione della sua Fondazione tra un estremo maggiormente *erogativo* (finanziamento a terzi) ed uno maggiormente *operativo* (progetti propri della fondazione)?

0 non so 1 puramente erogativo 2 3 4 5 6 puramente operativo (progetti propri)

15) Fatto 100 il tempo dedicato dagli organi della Fondazione all'attività istituzionale, qual è la quota destinata all'analisi *ex-ante* (bandi, istruttorie, piani programmatici) delle aree sociali potenzialmente oggetto di finanziamento/erogazione?

0 non so 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

16) Qual è invece la quota di tempo destinata alla verifica *ex-post* (rendiconti, analisi d'impatto, bilanci sociali) dei progetti finanziati?

0 non so 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Altri commenti:

____

____

____

PERFORMANCE

17) Gli organi di governo sono riusciti nell'ultimo triennio (o frazione) a suo avviso a conseguire risultati allineati o coerenti con la *strategia di lungo periodo*?

0 non so 1 non definita la strategia di lungo periodo 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

18) L'azione di governo riesce a qualificare gli interventi sociali della sua Fondazioni come più articolati e apparentemente maggiormente idonei alla risoluzione dei problemi sociali *rispetto a* donazioni effettuate da *singoli benefattori privati*?

0 non so 1 no sovente i singoli benefattori sono più agili 2 poco 3 4 5 6 molto

19) Quanto ritiene soddisfacenti i *risultati economico-finanziari* realizzati, alla luce degli andamenti di mercato, nell'ultimo triennio (o frazione) rispetto agli obiettivi posti:

0 non so 1 (molto negativi) 2 (negativi) 3 (in media) 4 (migliori) 5 (molto migliori) 6 (leader)

20) Quanto invece ritiene soddisfacenti i *risultati sociali* ottenuti dell'ultimo triennio (o frazione):

0 non so 1 (molto negativi) 2 (negativi) 3 (in media) 4 (migliori) 5 (molto migliori) 6 (leader)

Altri commenti:

____

____

____

____

LA SUA FONDAZIONE

Quale Fondazione Rappresenta:____

(i dati saranno SEMPRE presentati in forma *ANONIMA ED AGGREGATA*, l'indicazione della Fondazione viene solo utilizzata per recuperare altri dati d'archivio, come i dati di bilancio, da utilizzare nell'analisi aggregata ed **elaborare un report specifico e riservato per la Fondazione con l'analisi personalizzata dei principali risultati di questa indagine**)

IN ALTERNATIVA **(se si preferisce 100% anonimato)** *Come possiamo classificare la sua fondazione:*

□ piccola (patrimonio < 50 milioni di €) □ medio-piccola (patr. 51-150) □ media (patr. 151 – 350)
□ medio-grande (patr. 351- 600) □ grande (patr. > 600 milioni)

□ di origine bancaria □ di comunità □ di famiglia □ d'impresa □ pubblica □ altro_________________

Nell'ultimo triennio le nostre erogazioni si sono concentrate principalmente (max. 2 risposte):

□ Nord Italia; □ Centro; □ Sud e Isole; □ Estero Nord del Mondo; □ Estero Sud del Mondo;

Nell'ultimo triennio le nostre principali aree di intervento sono state (max. 5 risposte):

□ Famiglia; □ Giovani; □ Istruzione; □ Beneficienza; □ Religione; □ Anziani; □ Diritti Civili;
□ Sicurezza; □ Alimentare; □ Edilizia sociale; □ Protezione Consumatori; □ Protezione Civile;
□ Salute; □ Sport; □ Tossicodipendenza; □ Ricerca Scientifica; □ Ambiente; □ Arte; □ Altro:
____