



MONTREAL RESEARCH LABORATORY ON CANADIAN PHILANTHROPY

May 2015

# ***Public Information Sharing and Transparency among Grantmaking Foundations***

A preliminary discussion in a Canadian context

---

**Juniper Glass**

SCSE-CSES / Carleton University

**François Brouard**

SCSE-CSES / Sprott School of Business, Carleton University



The authors gratefully acknowledge the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) funding under the Partnership Development Grant "Philanthropic action of Canadian grant-making foundations: Investigating their social innovation and catalytic role in social change". *The authors have benefitted from comments by Hilary Pearson, Philanthropic Foundations of Canada and members of this research cluster.*



Social Sciences and Humanities  
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en  
sciences humaines du Canada



Canadian Grantmaking Foundations Project  
Cluster 2 - Governance and Policy

# Public Information Sharing and Transparency among Grantmaking Foundations

**Juniper Glass**  
SCSE/CSES / Carleton University

**François Brouard**  
SCSE/CSES / Sprott School of Business, Carleton University

SCSE-CSES Discussion Paper  
May 2015

**Juniper Glass**, BA, is a nonprofit management consultant and Master in Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership candidate at Carleton University.  
juniperglass@gmail.com

**François Brouard**, DBA, FCPA, FCA is an Associate Professor in the Sprott School of Business, Carleton University and Founding director of the Sprott Centre for Social Enterprises / Centre Sprott pour les entreprises sociales (SCSE/CSES).  
Francois.brouard@carleton.ca

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	4
RÉSUMÉ .....	4
INTRODUCTION .....	5
WHY TRANSPARENCY? .....	5
Opportunities of Increased Public Information Sharing .....	6
Be proactive in response to increasing accountability demands .....	7
Improve understanding of how foundations contribute to the public good.....	7
Strengthen relations with grantees, donors and partners .....	8
Learning and improving the work .....	8
Challenges of Increased Public Information Sharing.....	9
Limitations in capacity and human resources.....	9
Need for new information systems and tools.....	9
Desire to maintain discretion and flexibility .....	10
WHAT INFORMATION TO SHARE? .....	11
STATE OF TRANSPARENCY AMONG CANADIAN FOUNDATIONS.....	13
FUTURE RESEARCH AND ACTION TO ENHANCE PUBLIC INFORMATION SHARING .....	15
Questions for Future Research and Discussion.....	15
Potential Future Courses of Action.....	15
REFERENCES .....	16
APPENDIX A: “WHO HAS GLASS POCKETS?” INDICATORS ©THE FOUNDATION CENTER.....	19
APPENDIX B: PATHS TO TRANSPARENCY, ©GRANTCRAFT, THE FOUNDATION CENTRE .....	21

## ABSTRACT

Transparency and information sharing issues are more present than ever in a context of increasing expectation of nonprofit accountability and good governance. Grantmaking foundations in Canada are part of the development of better practices for the Third Sector. There appears to be growing interest among Canadian foundations to increase public information sharing and transparency. The purpose of this paper is to provide background information that will support discussion in the foundation sector about transparency practices. The paper examines the opportunities and challenges of increased transparency and provides a brief view of the state of foundation transparency in Canada. This paper is based on a review of secondary sources.

## RÉSUMÉ

La problématique de l'information et de sa divulgation est de plus en plus présente dans un contexte de responsabilisation et de gouvernance. Les fondations subventionnaires canadiennes font partie du développement des meilleures pratiques dans le secteur. Il y a un intérêt grandissant parmi les fondations canadiennes pour un meilleur partage de l'information et de la transparence. L'objectif de ce rapport est de fournir certains renseignements pour contribuer à la discussion sur les pratiques de transparence. Basé sur des données secondaires, ce rapport examine les occasions et les défis d'une plus grande transparence et fournit un bref survol de l'état de la situation de la transparence au Canada.

Citation suggestion:

Glass, J., Brouard, F. (2015). *Public Information Sharing and Transparency among Grantmaking Foundations – A preliminary discussion in a Canadian context*, Discussion Paper, Laboratoire Montréalais de Recherche sur la Philanthropie Canadienne / Montreal Research Laboratory on Canadian Philanthropy (LMRPC/MRLCP) and Sprott Centre for Social Enterprises / Centre Sprott pour les entreprises sociales (SCSE/CSES), May, 21p.

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to provide background information that will support discussion in the foundation sector about transparency practices. Foundations have certain mandatory reporting requirements as registered charities. This paper, however, looks at voluntary public information sharing. There is a wide range of information that foundations can share with stakeholders about their operations and philanthropic work that could benefit stakeholders and improve impacts.

The paper examines the opportunities and challenges of increased transparency and provides a brief view of the state of foundation transparency in Canada. Types of information that foundations may share, considerations for how to best share and examples of relevant initiatives from the US and Canada are also briefly covered. This paper is based on a review of secondary sources. Primary research would be of benefit to better understand foundation transparency in Canada. A list of suggested research questions for future investigation is included as well as potential action strategies for foundations and stakeholders.

## WHY TRANSPARENCY?

*“Transparency is, in a word, openness. A foundation that operates transparently is one that shares what it does, how it does it, and the difference that it makes in a frank, easily accessible, and timely way... It is a means to greater accountability, and to building relationships between a foundation and other key groups such as grantees, applicants, partners, and other funders” (GrantCraft, 2014, p.3).*

Public information about what grantmaking foundations do and achieve appears to have been quite limited until recently (Frumkin, 2006), leading certain scholars on philanthropy to describe foundations as “sometimes stupidly modest” (Hammack and Anheier, 2010, p.401).

There appears to be growing interest among Canadian foundations to increase public information sharing, although formal studies have yet to be conducted. Northcott and Uytterhagen (2002) undertook an informal review of foundation practice in Canada and noted that transparency is part of a larger issue of accountability, which is gaining importance to many foundations:

*“Professionalization, strategic philanthropy, the quest for innovation, and concerns over civic duty all drive an expectation of accountability – from both grantmakers and grant recipients. According to our respondents, foundations are increasingly emphasizing the importance of monitoring and evaluating the work they support. They are also opening their own policies and practices to greater public scrutiny” (Northcott and Uytterhagen, 2002, p.6).*

Certain transparency practices are mandatory by charity regulators, particularly the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), to whom all foundations must report financial summaries, board lists and basic information about mission. CRA in turn makes much of this information publicly available.

In this discussion paper, the focus is on non-mandatory transparency practices. Another discussion paper (Brouard and Glass, 2015) presents perspectives on the broader issues related to foundation information and reporting. Table 1 illustrates some common information sharing mechanisms for Canadian grantmaking foundations, along two dimensions: whether the sharing is mandatory or voluntary, and whether the information is widely available to the public or kept private to certain stakeholders.

Table 1 – Examples of Information Shared by Grantmaking Foundations

		Type of Information Exchange	
		<i>Mandatory</i>	<i>Voluntary</i>
<b>Audience /User</b>	<b>Public</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T3010 return for Canada Revenue Agency</li> <li>• List of Board members</li> <li>• Annual Information Return for Industry Canada or provincial incorporating body</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundation website</li> <li>• Granting policies and procedures</li> <li>• Other policies (e.g. investment)</li> <li>• Annual report</li> <li>• Past and current grants disbursed (amount, recipient, purpose)</li> <li>• Descriptions of grantee initiatives, outcomes and impact (<i>may be private</i>)</li> <li>• Information sharing by foundation networks (e.g. best practices; collaborations) (<i>may be private</i>)</li> <li>• Adhesion to standards programs (e.g. Imagine Canada)</li> </ul>
	<b>Private</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Audited financial statements</li> <li>• Information about officers</li> <li>• Corporate records (Board meeting minutes and resolutions, By-Laws, etc)</li> <li>• Grantee reports to foundation</li> <li>• Foundation reports to donors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-evaluation by foundation of its processes or results (<i>may be public</i>)</li> <li>• Evaluation of grantee initiatives (<i>may be public</i>)</li> <li>• Information sharing among foundations (e.g. improving practice; investment policies; policy templates; salary scales)</li> </ul>

### Opportunities of Increased Public Information Sharing

There are many reasons why nonprofit organizations voluntarily share information. The following are the dominant reasons, each related to a key dimension on nonprofit accountability (Koppel, 2005, 2011; Williams and Taylor, 2013).

- To make information about its activities accessible to stakeholders;
- To demonstrate that progress has been made on the organization’s stated goals;
- To demonstrate that any applicable rules, regulations, accounting principles, codes of conduct and laws have been followed;
- To ensure dialogue with and responsiveness to constituents and beneficiaries;
- To learn from one’s own or other organizations in order to improve practice.

Below is a brief analysis of key opportunities that transparency practices may offer to Canadian foundations, such as responding to increasing accountability demands, increasing understanding of what foundations do, improving relationships with stakeholders, and learning.

*Be proactive in response to increasing accountability demands*

There is a call for greater accountability and transparency being made to the charitable sector by a variety of stakeholders (Cordery and Morgan, 2013; Hind, 2011; Yasmin, Haniffa and Hudaib, 2014). In Canada, cases of tax shelter abuses via charities has increased the volume of this call (Phillips, 2013). Foundations are necessarily affected by expectations of transparency in the broader charitable sector context:

“Canadian philanthropy is receiving more public attention from the media, from fundraisers, and from public policy makers. With this increasing attention will come increased scrutiny of foundations, presenting both opportunities and challenges... Canadian foundations in the future will face demands to be more open and accountable to the public” (Johnston, 2012, p.1).

For some foundations, making information about their activities available to the public is a proactive way to undertake “self-regulation through greater transparency” (Hammack and Anheier, 2013, p.155) rather than waiting for increased regulation by external bodies. As Johnston (2012, p.36) recommends to Canadian foundations: “If a foundation doesn’t define itself in today’s ‘open source’ world of hyper information, it will be defined by others. So it is good practice to take the initiative and to make key information available in the form that you choose.”

*Improve understanding of how foundations contribute to the public good*

A common critique of foundations is that, while their purpose is to benefit the public good, they do not always operate with democratic or public participation; furthermore, since donors and foundations receive tax advantages, citizens can claim a legitimate stake in knowing their activities and results (Chamberland, Gazzoli, Dumais, Jetté and Vaillancourt, 2012; Johnston, 2012). While many Canadian foundations are clear about and dedicated to their public benefit duty (Northcott and Uytterhagen, 2002), many simultaneously conduct their activities out of public view.

Therefore, “private foundations have an extra impetus for being accountable in that doing so will help broaden public understanding of the social value of private foundations” (Northcott and Uytterhagen, 2002, p.6). Frumkin (2006, p. 82) notes that American foundations’ effort to be more transparent “has produced greater understanding of the field of philanthropy among the general public.”

*Strengthen relations with grantees, donors and partners*

Transparency practices allow for greater exchange of information and clarity with a foundation's many stakeholders (GrantCraft, 2014). Grantees and grantseekers are better able to direct appropriate requests to foundations if guidelines and decision-making processes are shared (Johnston, 2012; CFC, 2005). For foundations that engage in fundraising, such as community foundations, communicating their work to the public raises profile, establishes credibility and invites further donations (CFC, 2005).

Collaboration and philanthropic strategy are also favoured when foundations effectively exchange information about their activities (GrantCraft, 2014). For example, there is growing consensus that pooling information about grants made to whom, by whom and for what purpose would increase knowledge and impact in the Canadian nonprofit sector, particularly when it is done via digital mechanisms (VanYmeren, 2015; CEGN, 2014):

“By using digital data, funders have opportunities to improve their analysis and their decision making. Connected datasets allow funders to address a wide range of questions: the impact of their grants, how they fit into the funding landscape of a locale, or how best to leverage other funders... Easily accessible data on who is funding what in a city or region might provide the impetus to advance the formation of regional networks and collaboration among funders that has been talked about for the last decade or so.” (Lenczner and Phillips, 2012, p.14)

*Learning and improving the work*

Foundations often have a privileged vantage point: through their relationships with grantees and other stakeholders, they are able to see the progress and challenges of many organizations and projects at once, often within specific fields. However, a US study found that “only 27 percent of grantmakers reported that they share information about challenges and lessons learned with others in their field. Other aspects of reporting, such as information about a project's progress, future plans, collaborations, and assessment, are shared less frequently” (Bearman, 2008, p.14).

Increasingly, however, Canadian foundations appear to be realizing the value of this knowledge and seek to share it for the advancement of the field as a whole. For example, “community foundations are paying more attention to dissemination and utilization strategies, so that good projects may serve as models to other organizations” (CFC, 2005, p.60-61). One of the ten key principles for community foundations expressed by Community Foundations of Canada (CFC, 2005, p.9) is that “we will evaluate our activities to improve our skills and knowledge and we will share key findings with others”.

Both Philanthropic Foundations of Canada and Community Foundations of Canada, the leading foundation networks, regularly host conferences and knowledge building initiatives as well as publish reports and partner with researchers to increase information



relevant to the foundation sector. These activities seem to increase the visibility as well as the transparency of grantmaking foundations at the same time as they support foundations to improve their work.

### **Challenges of Increased Public Information Sharing**

Some of the hurdles facing grantmaking foundations that wish to increase transparency and information exchange are the same as those for all nonprofits. Others, however, are particular to foundations because of their history and role in the sector. The following are some of the main challenges identified in the literature, namely capacity, information systems and tools, discretion and flexibility.

#### *Limitations in capacity and human resources*

Most foundations in Canada operate without staff, lead by board directors who may or may not have the skills or volunteer time to implement and maintain transparent communication and information systems. It is important to realize that foundations “formulate grant-making policies and priorities in a situation in which demand for funds far outstrips supply” (Leat, 2007, p.33). Many Canadian foundations do not have a web presence or publish even basic information about how they award grants, likely in part because public application processes solicit requests that may be beyond the capacity of a foundation to manage let alone fulfill with grant funds (Bearman, 2008).

Not surprisingly, foundations that have larger endowments or more staff are more likely to participate in information sharing in their field (Coffman, Beer, Patrizi and Thompson, 2013). The number of professional employees likely also has an effect on how much and by what mechanisms information is shared with the public, as smaller foundations often dedicate fewer human resources to managing their activities and communications.

The amount of funds a foundation disburses may also impact stakeholder’s expectation of what and how much information should be provided to the public: “For individual donors who operate quietly or who give only modest amounts of money, there are rarely groups complaining about access, transparency, and fairness. For large institutional donors, including private, corporate, and community foundations, the accountability issue is far more pressing” (Frumkin, 2006, p.56). With professionalization of Canadian foundations on the rise (Northcott and Uytterhagen, 2002), there may be more capacity to develop and maintain transparency practices in the future.

#### *Need for new information systems and tools*

A key capacity that needs to be improved in the foundation sector, as in the nonprofit sector as a whole, is the ability to create and keep up-to-date systems for efficient data collect and sharing (Ajah, 2015; VanYmeren, 2015; Lenczner and Phillips, 2012). Many foundations likely operate with manual information tracking systems or with systems that do not speak to each other.

There is a growing call for “producers of data about the nonprofit sector to collect and publish their data in ways that facilitate reuse” (Lenczner and Phillips, 2012, p.15). “Governments and granting organizations need to develop common standards for how we share data, such as common tagging, keywords and systems to deliver data” (Blair Dimock, personal communication, February 20, 2015).

Anil Patel points out that common applications and reporting systems are not likely a realistic goal, as no other sector or industry uses such a “one only” solution. Instead, digital tools are now available that give foundations the opportunity to develop their own systems that are but tailored and interoperable, that is, allowing data to be easily shared and distinct parts of information systems to speak to each other (Anil Patel, personal communication, March 25, 2015). GrantBook is one new player in the field that aims to close the capacity gap by assisting Canadian foundations to use cloud-based technologies to increase transparency and “liberate” grantmaking data so it can be more easily shared with stakeholders.

#### *Desire to maintain discretion and flexibility*

“Transparency, as principle and practice, should not be assumed to be a neutral tool” (Phillips, 2013, p. 22). That is, there may be ideologically or politically motivated reasons for calls for increased transparency by foundations and for the way increased information is used. In addition, transparency practices might actually hamper an organization’s work if those consuming the information have partial or incorrect understanding, which can happen given the complexity and general lack of knowledge about nonprofit sector work (Impact Coalition, 2013; Leat, 2012). “An unfortunate mix of openness combined with lack of understanding on the part of some observers” can lead to “more, not less, misguided criticism” of foundations (Leat, 2012, p. 24).

For these reasons, it is not surprising that so many foundations in Canada are hardly visible. In addition, many foundations seek to maintain the privacy of their board members and donors (Johnston, 2012), and not just those registered as “private” foundations. The “open-by-default mindset” encouraged by proponents of increased accountability and data sharing (VanYmeren, 2015, p.12; GrantCraft, 2014) likely goes against the grain of foundations used to working discretely to contribute to the public good.

Many foundations also desire to maintain flexibility in their grantmaking. Concretizing selection criteria and rendering them public, for example, may make it more difficult for foundations to develop new philanthropic strategy and respond to newly emerging priorities (Leat, 2007). It is also common practice for Canadian foundations to “provide direct grantmaking opportunities for trustees by allocating a specific portion of the global granting budget to grants made at the individual discretion of trustees” (Northcott and Uytterhagen, 2002, p. 2-3). Thus, a movement towards increased transparency practices may be uncomfortable in light of the tradition of many foundations to stay out of the spotlight even while they support the public good.

## WHAT INFORMATION TO SHARE?

Each foundation chooses the type and extent of information they share, beyond its mandatory reporting to regulators. On its Charities Listings site, the CRA already publishes data from foundations' annual T3010 Information Returns (CRA, 2014b). Thus, the public is able to verify if a foundation is a registered charity in good standing as well as view contact information, list of board members, charitable purpose and financial data for each foundation. CRA form T3010 and other related information provided to CRA by charities are in a redesign process to modernize the requirements and how it is submitted and disseminated (Brouard, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c).

Philanthropic Foundations of Canada (PFC) suggests in its grantmaking guide that “an open and transparent foundation” is one that maintains a website and makes certain information public, including:

- mission and goals of the foundation
- list of staff members
- grantmaking priorities and procedures
- database of previous grants (Johnston, 2012, p.36).

Community Foundations of Canada (CFC) similarly encourages community foundations to publish grant guidelines not just to inform organizations seeking funds but also to help foundations “make grantmaking decisions that are consistent, inclusive and fair” (CFC, 2005, p.27).

Beyond basic information about a foundation's mission and grantmaking focus and process, there are more advanced types of information that are far less commonly made public. GlassPockets, an initiative of the Foundation Center that aims to increase transparency among American foundations, has developed a set of 23 indicators divided into the following categories (see Appendix A for full list of indicators):

- Basic Information (contact information and mission);
- Grantmaking (priorities, procedures, etc);
- Governance (bylaws, codes of conduct, conflict of interest policy, board list);
- Human resources/Staffing (executive compensation process, staff list, diversity practices, etc);
- Financial (audited statements, investment policies, etc);
- Performance Measurement (overall foundation performance, evaluations and lessons learned, grantee feedback, etc) (Foundation Center, 2015b),

Several American foundations have signed on to the GlassPockets initiative in order to support the general principle of foundation transparency and to demonstrate their own organization's accountability efforts. To date, a similar initiative is not yet underway in Canada.

## HOW TO SHARE?

Foundations have more tools at their disposal than ever to exchange information about their work. Websites and digital information systems can facilitate transparency. At the same time, there is growing awareness in the Canadian nonprofit sector that, rather than assuming more information exchange is inherently better, “it is especially important to be clear about whom data is for and what purpose it serves” (VanYmeren, 2015, p.7). Thus, the design of information sharing mechanisms is vital to ensuring usefulness.

Blair Dimock of Ontario Trillium Foundation points out that foundations and funders need to pay attention to making their data “meaningful, searchable and usable” (personal communication, Feb 20, 2015). There are a range of new initiatives and actors who are working to both make more data available and render that data useful to foundations and others in the Canadian nonprofit sector.

For example, GrantBook supports foundations to develop internal digital information systems that are able to “talk” to each other, thereby increasing shareability of data across multiple foundations and other stakeholders. Improving systems to share information about grants made is one key area of interest to the nonprofit sector, however, “currently, the terms to describe funding areas are not comparable across foundations” (Hilary Pearson, personal communication, February 19, 2015). The Canadian Environmental Grantmakers’ Network has developed perhaps the most comprehensive collaborative effort of foundations to use the same typology to code their grants (CEGN, 2014). The CEGN’s searchable grants database contains a considerable level of detail and may be a good example for other grantmakers’ networks to follow.

An example of a Canadian initiative to improve the searchability and usability of such information is PoweredbyData. The Sector Landscape tool was launched in 2014 containing grants and contributions data from certain federal departments, the Ontario Trillium Foundation, and one participating private foundation. The initiative aims to “show funders the importance and value of their grantmaking data—this information is manually gathered from multiple sources, and it only becomes truly useful when it can be gathered and presented together,” positing that “if funders can share their grant-making data in a standard way, then tools like this can be easily built and the sector as a whole benefits” (PoweredbyData, 2014).

There are a number of other initiatives internationally to codify grantmaking for information sharing. In the UK, the 360 Giving Data Standard “allows grants to be compared more easily, and can help visualize and tell stories about granting over time” (360Giving Standard, 2014, cited by Van Ymeren, 2015, p.10). In 2012, The Foundation Center in the US “announced the Reporting Commitment to open, shareable, commonly-coded grants. This commitment by 15 of the nation’s largest foundations marks a breakthrough in gathering grants data in a shared and rapidly available form” (Bernholz, 2012, p.5). Recently, the same organization launched the Foundation Directory Online, a grantmaker and grants database for the US (Foundation Center, 2015a).

Thus, the move towards greater transparency of grantmaking foundations aligns within a much broader trend towards open data in the nonprofit sector: “Open data is likely to be a game changer for charity transparency, and the challenge for the third sector lies in developing the skills, particularly data analytic skills, to be both better consumers and producers of such data” (Phillips, 2013, p.901).

## STATE OF TRANSPARENCY AMONG CANADIAN FOUNDATIONS

*“Philanthropy and foundations will be playing an increasingly active role in shaping Canadian society over the next few years. Inevitably, this means that foundations will be subject to more public scrutiny of their impact and effectiveness.”* (Johnston, 2012, p.47)

Primary research is needed to more clearly determine the state of transparency practice among Canadian foundations. However, this review of secondary sources has revealed two key points:

- Transparency is fairly limited, with larger or staffed foundations likely faring better due to greater capacity and resources. As Johnston (2012, p.1) has noted: “while many Canadian foundations have been operating for decades, most have remained largely invisible”.
- There has been a clear movement in recent years towards greater transparency in the foundation sector (Hammack and Anheier, 2013), in Canada as in other jurisdictions.

There are over 10,000 registered foundations and it appears that many continue to follow a tradition of working under the radar and avoiding self-promotion. For example, “a majority of Canadian foundations still have no web presence” (Johnston, 2012, p.35).

Many current trends in the philanthropic sector favor increased information sharing: the trends towards funder collaboration (Pearson, 2010), evaluation and learning (Coffman et al, 2013), and the use of open data in the nonprofit sector (VanYmeren, 2015).

An important lever for increased transparency may be the work of alliances and networks of foundations, which often explicitly promote transparency. For example, one of CFC’s *10 Principles* for community foundations is that they are “committed to being accountable, responsive and transparent. We are open and accessible, fair and objective, flexible and timely as we work with grant seekers, donors, volunteers and others in the community” (CFC, n.d.). Similarly, Philanthropic Foundations of Canada’s values and ethical principles to which members adhere include points related to public information sharing:

- “Communicating effectively and clearly about the foundation’s mission, objectives and governance;
- Disseminating and sharing knowledge developed in the course of the foundation’s work, for the benefit of the greater community” (PFC, n.d., p.1).

Of PFC's approximately 120 members, over half now have websites (H. Pearson, personal communication, April 29, 2015). Certain Canadian foundations are also becoming active on social media and publishing regular e-newsletters and blogs to give insight into their work. CFC, PFC, and other networks such as Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and the Canadian Environmental Grantmakers Network regularly host conferences and disseminate information relevant to the foundation sector.

The depth of the information shared may also be on the rise. A 2004 study found that "many funders collect data [from grantees] only for accountability purposes, rather than learning" to improve their work in their field (cited in Lenczner and Phillips, 2012, p.14). Recently, however, "more foundations in Canada have shifted their approach to evaluation for learning versus just an accountability tool" (Blair Dimock, personal communication, February 20, 2015).

The Community Knowledge Exchange (CKX) spearheaded by Ontario Trillium Foundation and Community Foundations of Canada is a current effort to support foundations and other stakeholders to address questions including: "How can we turn existing data into knowledge to drive change?" and "How do we know we're making a difference, together?" which includes exploring how shared measurement across many funded initiatives could yield better results (CKX, 2014).

There is certainly momentum in Canada, as occurred in the US over the last decade, towards foundations becoming more public and visible as they work toward the public good. This requires a different way of thinking and acting on the part of foundation boards and staff (Hilary Pearson, personal communication, April 29, 2015). Marcel Lauzière, the former CEO of Imagine Canada, reflected on this shift among Canadian foundations during a recent interview:

"Foundations can't on the one hand say, 'We want to work differently, we want to work in partnership, we want to collaborate,' but not realize this will probably have some influence on how transparent they are, in terms of where their dollars are going and how they undertake their decision making process. I think that is a good thing. It's not transparency for transparency's sake, it's part of the new narrative that's necessary for foundations. As they talk to Canadians, they need to be more forceful about the role they play and the role of philanthropy. [B]ut that's going to be a challenge. That's a new way of thinking" (M. Lauzière, quoted in Anderson, 2014).

## **FUTURE RESEARCH AND ACTION TO ENHANCE PUBLIC INFORMATION SHARING**

### **Questions for Future Research and Discussion**

- What is the level of transparency of Canadian foundations?
- What are the perceptions of foundation boards and staff regarding the concept and practice of transparency?
- What are the challenges or barriers that foundations face in sharing information publicly?
- What supports, capacities or tools would assist foundations to improve information sharing with the public?
- What is the level of interest and feasibility to undertake collaborative transparency practices that involve multiple foundations?

### **Potential Future Courses of Action**

In addition to undertaking research to explore the above questions, the following action strategies could build on the current interest and momentum related to knowledge and information sharing in the nonprofit sector:

- Host opportunities for further dialogue, both within foundation staff and board as well as between foundations, on aspects of transparency: barriers and challenges, policies, approaches, positive case studies and innovative examples, information sharing mechanisms.
- Facilitate training and technical support to assist foundations to achieve their information sharing goals. For example, Philanthropic Foundations of Canada is currently offering a well-attended webinar series on related topics such as the power of digital data and efficient information tracking systems.
- Conduct grantee surveys or focus groups to assess the information needs of organizations from their foundation partners; this could be conducted by individual foundations or across many foundations. For example, the US Center for Effective Philanthropy created a survey, the Grantee Perception Report, the results of which more than 30 foundations have made public on their sites (CEP, 2014).
- Facilitate presentations or coaching by initiatives that foster greater transparency, such as the Foundation Center's GlassPockets initiative in the US.
- Implement pilot initiatives that test shareable information systems within and across multiple foundations. Technical partners such as PoweredByData and GrantBook could be leveraged.
- Explore the feasibility of developing grantmaking information platforms such as CEGN's Environmental Grants Database for other granting areas supported by Canadian foundations.
- Some of the above initiatives could interface with the Community Knowledge Exchange of Community Foundations of Canada, whose mandate is to support "fundamental shifts in how individuals, institutions and communities build and share community knowledge in the pursuit of social change".

## REFERENCES

- Ajah. (2015). *Fundtracker Pro*, online; <<http://fundtracker.ajah.ca>>.
- Anderson, P. (2014). *In Conversation with Marcel Lauzière: Canadian Philanthropy and the Future of Grantmaking*, Imagine Canada, April 25, online: <<http://www.imaginecanada.ca/blog/conversation-marcel-lauzi%C3%A8re-canadian-philanthropy-and-future-grantmaking>>.
- Bearman, J. (2008). *Drowning in Paperwork, Distracted from Purpose: Challenges and Opportunities in Grant Application and Reporting*, Grant Managers Network, online: <http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/drowninginpaperwork.pdf>.
- Bernholtz, L. (2012). *Philanthropy and the Social Economy: Blueprint 2013, The Annual Industry Forecast*.
- Brouard, F. (2014a). *T3010 Challenges for Research*, Sprott Centre for Social Enterprises / Centre Sprott pour les entreprises sociales (SCSE/CSES), May, 51p.
- Brouard, F. (2014b). *Suggestions to Improve the T3010 for Research*, Sprott Centre for Social Enterprises / Centre Sprott pour les entreprises sociales (SCSE/CSES), May, 12p.
- Brouard, F. (2014c). *Report on 2014 T3010 Users Research Day*, Sprott Centre for Social Enterprises / Centre Sprott pour les entreprises sociales (SCSE/CSES), August, 13p.
- Brouard, F., Glass, J. (2015). *Emerging Information and Reporting Issues for Grantmaking Foundations – A preliminary discussion in a Canadian context*, Discussion Paper, Laboratoire Montréalais de Recherche sur la Philanthropie Canadienne / Montreal Research Laboratory on Canadian Philanthropy (LMRPC/MRLCP) and Sprott Centre for Social Enterprises / Centre Sprott pour les entreprises sociales (SCSE/CSES), May, 48p.
- CRA - Canada Revenue Agency. (2014b). *Charities Listings*, September 15, online: <<http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/chrts-gvng/lstngs/menu-eng.html>>.
- CEGN - Canadian Environmental Grantmakers' Network. (2014). *A Profile of Environmental Grantmaking in Canada, 2011-2012*, CEGN, online: <<http://www.cegn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/database-final.pdf>>.
- CEP – The Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2014). *Grantee Perception Report (GPR) and Declined Applicant Perception Report (APR)*, online: <<http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org/assessment-tools/gpr-apr/>>.
- CFC - Community Foundations of Canada. (n.d.). *10 Principles*, online: <[http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/documents/CFC\\_10\\_Principles\\_Web\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/documents/CFC_10_Principles_Web_ENG.pdf)>.
- CFC - Community Foundations of Canada. (2005). *Grantmaking Tool Kit for Canadian Community Foundations*, Community Foundations of Canada.
- Chamberland, V., Gazzoli, P., Dumais, L., Jetté, C., Vaillancourt, Y. (2012). *Fondations et philanthropie au Canada et au Québec: influences, portraits et enjeux*. Laboratoire de recherche sur les pratiques et les politiques sociales (LAREPPS), Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), cahier fu LAREPPS no 12-02, juillet, 88p.
- CKX – Community Knowledge Exchange. (2014). *About CKX*, online: <<http://ckx.ictin.us/about/>>.



- Coffman, J., Beer, T., Patrizi, P., Thompson, E. H. (2013). Benchmarking Evaluation in Foundations: Do We Know What We Are Doing?, *The Foundation Review*, 5(2), 36-51.
- Cordery, C.J., Morgan, G.G. (2013). Special Issue on Charity Accounting, Reporting and Regulation, *Voluntas*, 24(3), 757-759.
- Foundation Center (2015a). *Foundation Directory Online*, online: <<https://fconline.foundationcenter.org>>.
- Foundation Center (2015b). “Who has Glass Pockets?” Indicators, online: <<http://glasspockets.org/glasspockets-gallery/who-has-glass-pockets/indicators>>.
- Frumkin, P. (2006). *Strategic Giving: The Art and Science of Philanthropy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- GrantCraft (2014). *Opening Up: Demystifying Funder Transparency*. New York: Foundation Center, online: <<http://www.grantcraft.org/assets/content/resources/transparency.pdf>>.
- Hammack, D.C., Anheier, H.K. (2010). Looking forward: American foundations between continuity and change. In D.C. Hammack & H.K. Anheier (Eds.) *American foundations: Their roles and contributions to society* (pp. 388–402). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Hammack, D.C., Anheier H.K. (2013). *A Versatile American Institution: The Changing Ideals and Realities of Philanthropic Foundations*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Hind, A. (2011). New development: Increasing public trust and confidence in charities: on the side of angels, *Public Money & Management*, 31(3), 201-205
- Impact Coalition. (2013). *Through a Glass Darkly: Accelerating the drive for accountability, clarity and transparency in the charity sector*. London: Impact Coalition.
- Johnston, P. (2012). *Good Grantmaking: A Guide for Canadian Foundations*. Philanthropic Foundations of Canada, September.
- Koppel, J. (2005). Pathologies of Accountability: ICANN and the Challenge of “Multiple Accountabilities Disorder.” *Public Administration Review*, 65(1), 94–108.
- Koppel, J. (2011). Accountability for global governance organizations. In *Accountable governance: Problems and promises* (pp. 55–77). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Leat, D. (2007). Information for a messy world: Making sense of pre-grant inquiry. *Third Sector Review*, 13(1), 33-55.
- Leat, D. (2012). *Letter to a Novice Trustee*. London: The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund.
- Lenczner, M., Phillips, S. (2012). From Stories To Evidence: How Mining Data Can Promote Innovation In The Nonprofit Sector. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 2(7): 10-15. Online: <<http://timreview.ca/article/575>>.
- Northcott, A., Uytterhagen, S. (2002). *Practices and Policies of Private Foundations in Canada*. online: [www.maxbell.org/sites/default/files/PolPrac.pdf](http://www.maxbell.org/sites/default/files/PolPrac.pdf)
- Pearson, H. (2010). Funder collaboratives: Trend or tool?, *The Philanthropist / Le Philanthrope*, 23(2), 120-125.
- PFC – Philanthropic Foundations of Canada. (n.d). Statement of Values and Ethical Principles, online: <<http://pfc.ca/wp-content/uploads/values-ethical-principles-en.pdf>>.

- Phillips, S.D. (2013). Shining light on charities or looking in the wrong place? Regulation-by-transparency in Canada. *Voluntas*, 24(3), 881-905.
- PoweredbyData (2014). *Sector Landscape: Launched! A new landscape tool to help the sector find out who is doing what*, online: <<http://poweredbydata.org/launched-a-new-landscape-tool-to-help-the-sector-find-out-who-is-doing-what/>>.
- PoweredbyData (2015). *Building the infrastructure for informed decision-making*, online: <<http://poweredbydata.org/>>
- Van Ymeren, J. (2015). *An Open Future: Data priorities for the not-for-profit sector*. Toronto: The Mowat Centre.
- Williams, A. P., & Taylor, J. A. (2013). Resolving Accountability Ambiguity in Nonprofit Organizations. *Voluntas*, 24(3), 559–580.
- Yasmin, S., Haniffa, R., Hudaib, M. (2014). Communicated Accountability by Faith-Based Charity Organisations, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122(1), 103-123.

**APPENDIX A: “WHO HAS GLASS POCKETS?” INDICATORS  
©THE FOUNDATION CENTER**

**BASIC INFORMATION**

**GENERAL CONTACT INFORMATION**

Are the following points of contact provided: telephone number, e-mail/online form, and mailing address?

**MISSION STATEMENT**

Is a mission or purpose statement available?

**GOVERNANCE POLICIES & INFORMATION**

**BYLAWS**

Are the foundation's governing bylaws available?

**COMMITTEE CHARTERS**

Are the foundation's committee charters available?

**CODE OF CONDUCT POLICIES**

Are policies guiding foundation staff conduct available, and do they include a procedure for reporting non-compliance?

**CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICIES**

Is the conflict of interest policy available?

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS LIST**

Is a list of Board members and their affiliations available?

**HR/STAFFING POLICIES & INFORMATION**

**WHISTLEBLOWER PROCEDURES**

Is a policy regarding the reporting of financial improprieties or other misconduct available?

**EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROCESS**

Is the process used to determine executive compensation described?

**DIVERSITY PRACTICES**

Is there information about the foundation's commitment to diversity or statistical information about the demographics of its workforce/Board Members?

**KEY STAFF LIST**

Are the names of executives and program staff available?

**KEY STAFF BIOGRAPHIES**

Are biographies of executives and program staff available?

## Cluster 2 – Public Information Sharing and Transparency among Grantmaking Foundations

---

### FINANCIAL INFORMATION

#### AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Are the most recent audited financial statements available?

#### FORM 990-PF

Is the most recent 990-PF available?

#### INVESTMENT POLICIES

Are policy statements about how the foundation invests its endowment provided?

### GRANTMAKING INFORMATION

#### GRANTMAKING PROCESS

Is there a description provided explaining how the foundation selects its grantees (application process or pre-selection)?

#### GRANTMAKING STRATEGY/PRIORITIES

Are the foundation's grantmaking priorities or strategy outlined?

#### SEARCHABLE DATABASE OF PAST GRANTS OR A CATEGORIZED GRANTS LIST

Is there a searchable database of past grants or a grants list categorized by program area? (Note: A grants list is accepted for foundations with fewer than 200 grants per year. A grants list should include recipient name, grant amount, and recipient location information.)

#### STATEMENT REGARDING HOW ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AFFECT THE FOUNDATION'S GRANTMAKING

Has the foundation provided information about how economic conditions affect its grantmaking?

### PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

#### ASSESSMENT OF OVERALL FOUNDATION PERFORMANCE

Is there a comprehensive assessment of overall foundation performance and effectiveness that measures progress toward institutional mission and goals?

#### KNOWLEDGE CENTER

Is there a centralized section of the foundation's web site that provides a collection of the foundation's program evaluations and lessons learned reports?

#### GRANTEE FEEDBACK MECHANISM

Is there an online mechanism in place so that grantees can regularly provide the foundation with feedback?

#### GRANTEE SURVEYS

Has the foundation conducted a periodic survey of its grantees and shared the results publicly?

Source: ©GrantCraft, The Foundation Center, <http://glasspockets.org>

**APPENDIX B: PATHS TO TRANSPARENCY,  
©GRANTCRAFT, THE FOUNDATION CENTER**



ALL OUR MATERIALS CAN BE DOWNLOADED FOR FREE AT  
WWW.GRANTCRAFT.ORG

**GRANTCRAFT** A service of the FOUNDATION CENTER GrantCraft is a service of the Foundation Center. For more information, please e-mail [info@grantcraft.org](mailto:info@grantcraft.org) or tweet @grantcraft.

Source: ©GrantCraft, The Foundation Center, <http://glasspockets.org>