

ANNE KATAHIRA
SENIOR ADVISOR, THE GIVING PRACTICE

Anne brings 20+ years of experience in foundation and nonprofit organizational management, development and governance, strategic communications, external affairs and philanthropic advising. She is effective at making connections between people, ideas and resources, particularly in arts and culture and civic engagement spaces. Prior to joining The Giving Practice, Anne helped multi-generational family foundations develop shared visions and strategies for impact at Arabella Advisors. In the banking sector, she managed a \$6.9 million charitable giving budget, served as lead corporate grantmaker for the arts education portfolio and relationship manager to key arts partner organizations including Seattle Art Museum, Pacific Northwest Ballet and ACT Theatre, while providing personalized grantmaking consultation and board training to the company's top 240 executives. She created the first board training program for senior executives including workshops on governance, fundraising and understanding nonprofit finances. As a program officer at Seattle Foundation, Anne worked to increase access to resources and transparency in the field for traditionally underserved communities and for a number of years, led the foundation's arts and culture grantmaking.

Anne served on the board and Writers in Residence Selection Committee of Hedgebrook, a literary arts organization that supports women writers and amplifies their voices into the world; Allocations Committee for Arts Fund; Communications Advisory Committee of Richard Hugo House; and as an Arts and Cultural Organizations Peer Review Panelist for the City of Seattle, Office of Arts & Culture. Anne was a founding member of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy's Pacific Northwest Chapter and DC-based Cherry Blossom Giving Circle. She spends the rest of her time as a constant learner navigating the daily adventures of parenting a teen and second grader and getting her hands dirty with natural dyes, traditional Japanese textile design and printmaking. A few years ago, Anne returned to her hometown of Seattle after seven years in Washington, D.C. and New York City. She holds a bachelor's degree from Oberlin College.



2020-21 Cultural Funding Grant Review Process

Key Dates

September

- **Monday, September 9 at 6:00 – 8:00pm (Council Chamber)**
Meeting 1: Committee Orientation – Review of City committees, Open Government Training (Deputy City Attorney) and Orientation to CFAC objectives and process (The Giving Practice)
- **Monday, September 30 at 4:00pm – DEADLINE for proposal submissions**

October

- **Tuesday October 1** – Proposal review begins
Proposals will be logged in and posted to the website as an initial batch for committee members' review
- **Monday, October 14 at 6:00 – 8:00pm (Council Conference Room)**
Meeting 2: Initial Proposal Review – Discuss proposals and develop any questions for applicants
- **Monday, October 28 at 6:00 – 9:00pm (City Council Chambers)**
Meeting 3: Applicant Presentations – Receive presentations from and hold Q&A with applicants

November

- **Monday, November 4 at 6:00 – 8:00pm (City Council Chambers)**
Meeting 4: Deliberations – Review proposals and develop funding recommendation to City Council
- **Wednesday, November 6 at 6:00 – 8:00pm (City Council Chambers)**
Meeting 5: Deliberations (if needed) – Review proposals and develop funding recommendation to City Council or feedback on process and committee wrap-up
- **Tuesday, November 26 (City Council Chambers)**
City Council Meeting: City Council considers and forwards funding recommendations to December 10 Consent Agenda

December

- **Tuesday, December 10 (City Council Chambers)**
City Council Meeting: City Council approves funding recommendations; City staff notifies applicants of award decisions

Key Links

The Committee:

<http://www.bainbridgewa.gov/926/Cultural-Funding-Ad-Hoc-Committee>

The City's Funded Cultural Activities:

<http://www.bainbridgewa.gov/948/City-Funded-Cultural-Activities>

Key Contacts

- Ellen Schroer, Deputy City Manager, City of Bainbridge Island
eschroer@bainbridgewa.gov or (206) 780-8619
- Anne Katahira, Senior Advisor, The Giving Practice (Consultant)
anne.katahira@philanthropy.org or (206) 861-5944

Committee Introductions

Round 1:

Share name and brief background (neighborhood, how long here, professional background, engagement in arts and cultural activities, other civic engagement, etc.)

Round 2:

Why did you volunteer for CFAC?

One thing you're hoping to learn; one thing you're hoping to offer

Meeting Goals

- CFAC members understand legal and public record considerations of citizen review committees
- CFAC members begin their service by creating shared agreement and understanding of proposed 2018-19 process
- Members agree to shared ground rules and discuss what will constitute “success” for committee by December
- CFAC members are oriented to key concepts in grantmaking and funding distribution recommendations
- CFAC members leave feeling energized and with a better understanding of committee roles and responsibilities

Committee Role(s), Ground Rules and Shared Vision for Success

1. Review committee charge

Ordinance No. 2017-18, Chapter 2.43 Cultural Funding Advisory Committee, Section 2.43.030 Duties and Responsibilities.

The cultural funding advisory committee, working in collaboration with the city, shall develop funding recommendations for consideration by the city council. The committee's recommendation should meet any requirements or guidance provided from the city council to the committee including, but not limited to: the total amount of available funds, identified goals and priorities for funding, eligibility requirements, specific parameters such as maximum or minimum award levels, and any other identified guidelines for funding

2. How will we feel successful at the end of the process in early December?
3. From our committee charge and our discussion of success by early December, are there any group ground rules or practices we would like to consider?
4. A couple of observations of group process in grantmaking groups

Grantmaking 101

Proposal Types

(Examples, not an exhaustive list—at least a dozen types of grants exist)

General operating support grants, or “gen op” grants, support the general expenses of operating an organization, rather than the expenses of a specific project or program. A general operating support grant, often referred to as unrestricted or core support means that the funder supports the nonprofit’s overall mission and trusts the organization to make good use of the funds.

Project or program grants support a specific project, program or activity of the organization, rather than its day-to-day activities. Project grants support specific activities with a beginning and end, clearly stated objectives and a specific budget. With this type of grant, the funder restricts the use of the funds to the designated project.

Summary: Project funding usually require a specific budget that recipients must follow. With operating grants, recipients may typically use funds at their discretion—wherever they need it most.

Key Financial Documents

1. IRS Form 990
2. Balance sheet (The balance sheet is a picture of the organization at a point in time.)
3. Budgets (The budget is the organization’s financial plan for income and expenditures for a defined period of time.)

Three Things to Look for in Financial Documents

1. Relevant new knowledge
(e.g., they spend 40% of the budget on equipment)
2. Relevant substantive questions to ask the nonprofit organization
(e.g., Why do you spend so much on equipment?)
3. “I don’t understand” questions to ask the nonprofit organization (or others, if about accounting)
(e.g., What is the difference between “equipment” and “furniture”?)

Sorting and Evaluating Proposals

Many grantmakers develop a system to place proposals into bins, or categories, prior to making a recommendation. This categorization provides the basis for treating similar proposals equitably and for clarification on how to proceed. Joel Orosz, who served as a program officer at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for many years, separated proposals into the following four categories:

Joel Orosz’s Four-Category Sorting System

1. Good idea/Good proposal
2. Good idea/Bad proposal
3. Bad idea/Good proposal
4. Bad idea/Bad proposal

1. Good Idea/Good Proposal and Bad Idea/Bad Proposal

These categories lead to easy decisions: fund in the first case, do not fund in the second case.

2. Bad Idea/Good Proposal

Making a sound decision about a bad idea/good proposal requires separating the beauty of the prose from the value of the proposal. Once this is done, the decision is quite simple: do not fund.

3. Good Idea/Bad Proposal

This is undoubtedly the most challenging. Proposals that fall into this category most commonly represent smaller, less sophisticated, and/or new organizations that have worthwhile ideas, but cannot afford to hire skilled grantwriters to present them in a compelling way. The risk that a grantmaker faces is making an automatic assumption that second-rate writing, spelling, and grammar reflects a second-rate project. This can be the case in some instances, but not in others. The challenge, therefore, is to conduct a careful analysis and make a clear and fair distinction. And this, in fact, is only the start of the challenge. It is extremely difficult to present poorly presented proposals to a board for consideration.

Large institutions have grantwriters who know how to put a proposal on paper. Small, community-based organizations often lack these resources, yet they still might be among the best partners for a funder and ones that might be in a strong position to create a significant social return on a grantmaker's investment.

Source: "Proposals: How to Separate the Good, Bad, and the Ugly," *The Insider's Guide to Grantmaking*, Joel Orosz

Initial Review

- Use the **reviewer worksheet** to consider the proposal against the evaluation criteria. Jot down notes and raise questions. Proposals will begin to blur after a while!
- Craft questions that seek clarity on elements in the proposal or about the organization; attempt to keep tone neutral.
- Review budget to seek alignment to proposed project goals and whether it's realistic to meet proposed timeline and outcomes.
- Understand how the proposal is addressing unmet need(s).
- Begin internal ranking prior to committee discussion. What falls in "strong" (Good Idea/Good Proposal) bucket?

Common Funding Recommendations

1. Do not fund.
2. Fully fund the project, with no stipulations.
3. Fully fund the project, with stipulations. This is a good option for proposals with a few correctable items that otherwise would prevent you from funding the proposal. For example, you may choose to fund a project as long as the grantee institutes a board process for evaluating the chief executive.
4. Partially fund the proposal. This occurs for different reasons and in different situations.