

The Partnership for Equity

Asset Mapping of
Greater Washington
Capacity Building Funders

September 2008 / Stage 1



The Partnership for Equity, 2008 Asset Mapping
Authors:

Danielle Reyes, the Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation

Lee Christian Parker, the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region

Nick Turner, the Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, *co-writer*

Luis F. Vivaldi, the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region, *co-writer*

I. Overview and Methodology

Overview

The Partnership for Equity of the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region (the Partnership) is an integral component of the Community Foundation's nonprofit sector capacity building strategy for the region. The Partnership, a coalition of philanthropic and public sector representatives, works collectively to develop organizations and community leaders that support marginalized people in becoming more fully involved in the economic, social, and civic life of the greater Washington region.

The Partnership is one of several capacity building strategies the Community Foundation utilizes to build the capacity of local nonprofits to work for our region's diverse communities. With this role in mind, the Partnership defines capacity building as *strengthening the ability of nonprofits to achieve greater performance and impact.*

To achieve the goals of the Partnership and the broader capacity building goals of The Community Foundation, both entities are committed to understanding the capacity building funding landscape in the region to ensure that their activities are addressing vital, unmet needs. Informal conversations with several capacity building funders throughout the region have identified a lack of information regarding the strategies and degree to which public and private funders are supporting nonprofit capacity building. These funders also expressed an interest in closing this knowledge gap, as it presents a significant barrier to collaboration, optimal decision making, and impact.

Capacity building is a part of Capital One's grantmaking strategy. In addition to program funding, supports may also include funding for capacity building, in-kind technology donations, pro-bono services, and strategic management through executive board placement..

— Kimberly Young, Capital One

In an effort to address the knowledge gap in the philanthropic sector, the Partnership embarked on a two-part learning process to determine "Who is doing what and where" in the field of nonprofit capacity building in the greater Washington region.

To begin this process, the Partnership chose first to collect data to assemble an asset map of funders focusing on capacity building throughout the region. Specifically, the asset map will provide a basis for answering questions in four areas:

- Who is funding nonprofit capacity building in the greater Washington region?
- What kinds of capacity building grants are available for nonprofits in the greater Washington region? Are there surpluses or voids in the types of capacity building funds currently available?
- How do Washington-area funders define capacity building work? Is it consistent?
- What filters or lenses do area grantmakers use when selecting organizations investing in nonprofit capacity? Are there specific issues, populations, or neighborhoods where funders are prioritizing their capacity building efforts?

The Partnership hopes that an awareness of the nature of local capacity building will facilitate more collaboration, information exchange, and asset sharing; ultimately resulting in more efficient and effective outcomes for the nonprofit sector. To this end, the asset map will inform a September 2008 convening called *Learn and Act: Bringing Strategic Clarity to Local Capacity Building Funding* where participants will discuss initial findings and suggest areas for further inquiry. This meeting ultimately will inform the collective and individual work of capacity building funders regionally and ultimately enhance philanthropy's impact on the nonprofit sector.

Methodology

Past surveys by the Community Foundation provided an expectation of the volume and scope of capacity building efforts taking place in the region. These documents were helpful in listing area funders that are doing or have done work of this kind. It was decided that a new survey would be the most effective approach for verifying, updating, and expanding this information.

A list of funders was compiled using input from Partnership and Community Foundation partners and through an online search of potential capacity building foundations. The final list totaled 55 organizations that were thought to be engaged in some form of capacity building grantmaking in the region.

A 19-question survey was written to gather basic information (name, contact information, etc.) and to prompt responses relevant to the four question areas outlined above.

The survey was conducted via Survey Monkey (surveymonkey.com), and funders were invited by e-mail to participate in late June 2008. The results of the survey were compiled and reviewed to identify broad patterns and key ideas. The accompanying summary of the survey results attempts to suggest:

- The degree to which funders are utilizing similar or different strategies in specific geographic areas.
- The degree to which funders are expecting similar or different outcomes.
- The degree to which funders are providing similar or different types of support in specific geographic areas.

These findings will inform the Partnership's September 2008 convening, a meeting that will provide guidance for the Partnership's ongoing work.

Capacity building is critical to our strategic grantmaking initiative. We fund organizations over time and also fund small and/or new and emerging organizations, so capacity building is a key element to strengthening these organizations and the nonprofit infrastructure in the region... Since we work with many of our grantee partners for several years, we get to know them well, so are able to offer assistance as needed and also respond to their requests.

— Julie Farkas, Consumer Health Foundation

Who are the capacity building funders?

Of the 55 funders invited to participate in the survey, a total of 31 (56%) responded. The responses of two were dropped from this cohort due to a lack of capacity building activities. Therefore, the final analysis includes the responses of 29 funders that are involved in capacity building in Greater Washington, DC.

The Arts & Humanities Council of Montgomery County includes capacity building in its 'three-pronged' approach to supporting mid-sized organizations. The three prongs are program support, capacity building, and facilities/equipment. We also offer professional development grants targeted to artists, scholars, and small unincorporated groups.

— Fran Abrams, The Arts & Humanities Council of Montgomery County

The majority of the funders are government agencies (8), followed by family foundations (7), independent foundations (3), community foundations (3), and a corporate giving program (1). Seven funders are described as “Other”, which includes a funding collaborative, a nonprofit affinity group, four nonprofit organizations providing capacity building support, and a nonprofit consulting firm.

The 29 organizations whose responses were used in this analysis are:

Alexandria Community Trust, an affiliate of
The Community Foundation
Arts & Humanities Council of Montgomery
County
Cafritz Foundation
Capital One
Carl M. Freeman Foundation
City of Alexandria
Commonweal Foundation
Community Development Support
Collaborative
Community Foundation for the National
Capital Region*
Consumer Health Foundation
DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities
England Family Foundation
Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.
Eugene and Agnes E Meyer Foundation

Fairfax County Department of Systems
Management for Human Services, Region 2
Hill Snowdon Foundation
Hispanics in Philanthropy
Jovid Foundation
Mayor's Office on Latino Affairs
Montgomery County (MD) Office of
Community Partnerships
Montgomery County Council
Montgomery County Government Executive
Branch Response
Office on Asian and Pacific Islander Affairs
RGK Foundation
The Schimel Lode
Venture Philanthropy Partners
Washington AIDS Partnership
Washington Area Women's Foundation

* The responses used in this report solely reflect the work of CFNCR's DC office.

To what degree do funders use similar or different strategies?

Types of strategies:

Funders rely on a combination of three broadly defined capacity building strategies:

- Individual capacity building: Building the capacity of individuals to contribute to society, of staff to be effective in their jobs, and/or of community residents to serve in leadership roles.
- Organizational capacity building: Building the capacity of individuals to lead organizations, of organizations to deliver upon their mission, and/or of organizations through the support of the sector's "infrastructure."
- Collective capacity building: Building the capacity of individuals to collaborate with others, of organizations to work together toward common goals, and/or of the community to work together toward common goals.

More than 85% (25) of the survey respondents reported engaging in organizational capacity building. Nearly 60% (17) work in collective capacity building, and 41.4% (12) promote individual capacity building.

From our perspective, capacity building is both operational support to maintain the organization's ability to achieve its vision as well as individualized interventions to address specific organizational development needs.

— Martin Mellett, Community Development Support Collaborative

Funders are willing to make a wide range of investments to help develop the capacity of their grantees, from leadership training program (58.6%) to technical assistance/consulting (79.3%). Management training (69.0%), technology improvements (62.1%), networking activities (48.3%), and convening opportunities (44.8%) are other popular methods for supporting capacity building.

No organization reported providing funding for sabbaticals or internships/field assessments.

Capacity building totals:

Funders were asked what percentage of their total giving is dedicated to capacity building. The amounts range from small percentages of less than 10% to 100% for organizations whose mission statements exclusively support the development of the nonprofit sector.

Organizations that fund only a few capacity building projects tended to report that requests were evaluated on a case-by-case basis and do not conform to an overarching strategy.

Groups that gave significantly for capacity building included the Community Development Support Collaborative, the Montgomery County Government, the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, Venture Philanthropy Partners, and others, who have undertaken dozens of capacity building projects over the past year.

To what degree do funders expect similar or different outcomes?

The outcomes expected by funders are largely revealed in their answers to how capacity building figures into their overall grantmaking strategy. These outcomes fall into three broad categories: better services, increased organizational sustainability, and a more robust nonprofit sector. Projects that focus on improving executive management, technology, and strategic planning/evaluation are integral to these goals.

Representative examples of these strategies include:

Capital One, a grantmaker in the greater DC region (Washington, DC and Northern VA), reported that “capacity building is a part of our strategy.” These efforts may include in-kind donations of technology, pro-bono services, or executive leadership on nonprofit boards.

The Consumer Health Foundation remarked that its capacity building work arose out of the needs of its grantees and represents the Foundation’s commitment to building long-term funding relationships, adding that “capacity building is a key element to strengthening these organizations and the nonprofit infrastructure in the region.”

The Arts & Humanities Council of Montgomery County includes capacity building in its approach to supporting arts and humanities organizations in the County. Its *Advancement Grants* serve a variety of purposes, including expanding programs, improving management, increasing community outreach, boosting fundraising initiatives, and stabilizing organizations. *Advancement Grants* target “specific projects or activities to meet specific needs identified by the applicant.”

Funders including the Weissberg Foundation and the Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation distinguish their capacity building grants from other giving by excluding expenses such as capital costs, salaries, overhead, and program support, in an effort to focus on long-term organizational development.

Nearly all of the funders surveyed agreed that capacity building is important to their grantees and were willing to fund these projects when possible—at times incorporating them into regular grant requests.

The England Family Foundation believes this is an excellent way to enhance the effectiveness of our grantees, increasing their ability to better serve DC youth. Together these organizations address a number of the Foundation’s interests by increasing internal capacity, enhancing policy expertise, strengthening coalition building, and expanding leadership development support to direct service providers working with DC Youth.

— Julia Baer-Cooper, England Family Foundation

To what degree do funders provide similar or different types of support?

Target areas:

Issue area: Funders support a wide range of program areas, of which education was the most represented (48.3%), followed by health/mental health (37.9%), community development (34.5%), and the arts (37.5%).

Population: Support targeted at racial and ethnic groups is divided among Hispanic/Latino (72.4%), Black/African American (65.5%), Asian/Pacific Islander (55.2%), and White/Caucasian (48.3%). Several funders noted that their grantmaking strategies do not specifically target particular racial or ethnic groups.

Age: The majority of funders target adults (82.6%) and children/youth (79.3%), while a slightly lower percentage looked to nonprofits working on behalf of infants (58.6%) and the elderly (55.2%).

Sustainability can only happen when organizations have developed their capacity to fundraise, evaluate, network, etc. thereby improving their ability to better serve their clients.

— Local government funder

Income level: Most funders (82.6%) direct grantmaking towards organizations working with low-income populations. About one-third (51.7%) include a focus on people with disabilities. People living with HIV-AIDS, the homeless, people with limited English proficiency, and other groups also are targeted.

Gender: Only one funder reported a funding preference based on gender or sex.

Geography: More than half of the funders surveyed (16) are based in Washington, DC. Eight are headquartered in Maryland, four in Virginia, and one in Texas.

Eighteen of the funders specified that they provide support to nonprofits in the District of Columbia, 13 to the City of Alexandria, 11 to the City of Falls Church, 10 to Arlington County, 9 to Fairfax County, 9 to Prince George's County, 5 to Loudoun County, 14 to Montgomery County, and 1 to the City of Baltimore.

Funding types:

A majority (76%) of funders reported that their capacity building grants amount to less than \$50,000. Most funders (82%) offered grants for single-year terms. Nine respondents (31%) provide multi-year support. A majority of the nonprofits that have received capacity building grants have annual budgets of less than \$1 million (90%).

For more detailed information about funders' responses, please see the attached survey summary .

Opportunities for Further Inquiry?

This preliminary asset map helps identify what capacity building means to area funders, in general terms. According to survey respondents, capacity building plays a role in nonprofit effectiveness and in preserving the well-being of the sector at large. To funders, capacity building means investing in a host of tools meant to develop skills, resources, and capital. Moreover, these tools can take many forms, from computer equipment to staff training.

Some important questions remain, however, that may help guide the philanthropic sector's work. By clarifying some of the concepts surrounding capacity building and by gauging their usefulness, the Partnership can better define its role in promoting these practices.

Our Capacity building program is a supplemental, rapid response grants program that responds to the self-identified needs of our grassroots partners.

— Michael Coffey, Hill-Snowdon Foundation

These questions include:

- Is this sample as complete as it could be? Are there more local and national funders to consider? How do we reach out them?
- How can we incorporate the need for capacity building into a long-term strategy for the development of the nonprofit sector generally and our grantees particularly?
- How does capacity building mesh with private funders' target issues and objectives? Where does it intersect with public funding objectives?
- Who are the professionals, consultants, or firms offering capacity building services to nonprofits? What services are provided and quality of services from the perspective of nonprofits?
- What research exists to prove that capacity building has a positive and measurable impact on a nonprofit's ability to deliver services or its sustainability?
- What types of capacity building projects are most appropriate for the organizations we are working with today?
- Who are the capacity building vanguards? What can they teach us?

Partnership for Equity

Asset Mapping of
Greater Washington
Capacity Building Funders

Appendix: Survey and Summary of Responses

CAPACITY BUILDING SURVEY

CAPACITY BUILDING MAPPING – A PROJECT OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR EQUITY OF THE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION (PFE) AND THE EUGENE AND AGNES E. MEYER FOUNDATION (MEYER).

The PFE and Meyer seek to enhance the broader philanthropic sector's knowledge of "who is doing what and where" in the field of non-profit capacity building funding in the Greater Washington region. We believe an Asset Map is the appropriate information and knowledge development tool to answer a widely expressed concern that not enough is known about the degree to which public/private funders are supporting non-profit capacity building and associated funding strategies. This knowledge "gap" is seen as a significant barrier to collaboration, optimal decision-making and impact. We invite you to share information about the capacity building work of your foundation. In exchange, PFE and Meyer will provide you with a document mapping the current capacity building funding across the Greater Washington region, including an analysis of opportunities and gaps as well as recommendations.

Please take 20-30 minutes of your time to provide us with information about your work. Receipt of response by June 18, 2008 would be much appreciated. If you have any questions or comments please contact Nick Turner at Nturner@meyerfdn.org or 202-483-8294; or Luis Vivaldi at Lvivaldi@cfncr.org or 202-263-4768

1. Please provide the following information for your organization:

Company: _____
Address: _____
Address 2: _____
City/Town: _____
State: _____ Zip: _____
Website: _____
Telephone: _____

2. Please provide your Organization's Mission Statement:

3. Your organization is best described as a:

Corporate Foundation
 Family Foundation
 Operating Foundation
 Independent Foundation
 Community Foundation
 Government Agency
 Other (specify) _____

4. Who is the person that administers your Capacity Building grants?

Name: _____ Title: _____
Telephone: _____ E-mail: _____

5. Please define your capacity building investment strategy (check all that apply)

Individual capacity building (*To build the capacity of individuals to contribute to society, of staff to be effective in their jobs, and/or of community residents to serve in leadership roles*)

Organizational capacity building (*To build the capacity of individuals to lead organizations, of organizations to deliver upon their mission, and/or of organizations by supporting the "infrastructure" of the sector*)

Collective capacity building (*To build the capacity of individuals to collaborate with others, of organizations to work together toward common goals, and/or of the community to work together toward common goals*)

6. Type of capacity building investments made by your organization (check all that apply)

- Sabbaticals
- Reward/Recognition programs
- Leadership training programs
- Field-based fellowships or training
- Pipeline programs (for minorities, young leaders, etc.)
- Grassroots/community organizer training
- Management training
- Coaching
- Peer exchanges/circles
- Internships/field assignments
- Organizational assessments
- Facility expansion/improvement
- Technical assistance/consulting services
- Technology improvements
- Leadership transitions
- Management support/service organizations
- Organizational standards
- Collaborative skills training
- Networking activities
- Team or group projects
- Seed money for joint projects as part of leadership program
- Convening opportunities
- Association membership
- Collective action/advocacy
- Community leadership/problem-solving programs
- Cross-sector collaborations/alliances

7. If your organization provides programmatic specific capacity building support, what type of programs does your organization fund? (check all that apply)

- Arts
- Community Development
- Health/Mental Health
- Education
- Homelessness
- Food
- Advocacy/Organizing
- Employment/Job Skills
- Legal Aid
- Other (specify) _____

Populations

8. Race/Ethnicity

- White/Caucasian
- Black/ African American
- Asian / Pacific Islander
- Hispanic/Latino
- Other

9. Age

- Infant (0 – 4)
- Children/Youth (5 – 20)
- Adult (21 – 65)
- Elderly (66 à)

10. Gender

- Male
- Female

11. Other Populations

- Low Income
- People with disabilities
- Other (specify) _____

12. What geographic areas do you serve through your capacity building funding? (check all that apply)

District of Columbia

Northern Virginia

- Arlington County
- Fairfax City
- City of Alexandria
- City of Falls Church
- Loudoun County

Maryland

- Prince George’s County
- Montgomery County
- Other (specify) _____

Grantmaking

13. What is the average size of the capacity-building grants you award?

- \$0 - \$10,000
- \$10,000 - \$25,000
- \$25,000 - \$50,000
- \$50,000 - \$100,000
- \$100,000 +

14. What options for duration of grant periods does your organization offer?

- Annual
- Multi-year

15. What is the average budget of your capacity-building grantees (based on annual budget)?

- \$0 - \$250,000
- \$250,000 – \$500,000
- \$500,000 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,000 +

16. Please provide information on your organizations grantmaking for the most recent fiscal year:

Most recent completed fiscal year (MM/DD/YYYY – MM/DD/YYYY) _____

- Number of capacity-building grant requests received.
- Number of capacity-building grants approved.

17. What percentage of your total grantmaking is dedicated to capacity building?

18. Describe the role that capacity building plays in your overall grantmaking strategy.

19. In gathering information for the asset mapping project, we may wish to contact you for additional information regarding your capacity building strategy. Please indicate whether or not you would be amenable. Thank you. _____

Summary of Survey Results

Question 1: Organization information / Redacted

Question 2: Mission statement / Redacted

Question 3: Your organization is best described as

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Corporate Foundation	3.4%	1
Family Foundation	24.1%	7
Operating Foundation	0.0%	0
Independent Foundation	10.3%	3
Community Foundation	10.3%	3
Government Agency	27.6%	8
Other	24.1%	7

Other = Nonprofit organization (2), Nonprofit intermediary (1), Nonprofit affinity group (1), Philanthropic investment organization (1), Funding collaborative (2), No description (1).

Question 5: Please describe your capacity building investment strategy

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Individual capacity building (To build the capacity of individuals to contribute to society, of staff to be effective in their jobs, and/or of community residents to serve in leadership roles).	41.4%	12
Organizational capacity building (To build the capacity of individuals to lead organizations, of organizations to deliver upon their mission, and/or of organizations by supporting the "infrastructure" of the sector).	86.2%	25
Collective capacity building (To build the capacity of individuals to collaborate with others, of organizations to work together toward common goals, and/or of the community to work together toward common goals).	58.6%	17

Question 6: Please describe the type of capacity building investments made by your organization (check all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Sabbaticals	0.0%	0
Reward/Recognition programs	13.8%	4
Leadership training programs	58.6%	17
Field-based fellowships or training	13.8%	4
Pipeline programs (for minorities, young leaders, etc.)	13.8%	4
Grassroots/community organizer training	24.1%	7
Management training	69.0%	20
Coaching	48.3%	14
Peer exchanges/circle	37.9%	11
Internships/field assessments	0.0%	0
Organizational assessments	51.7%	15
Facility expansion/improvement	20.7%	6
Technical assistance/consulting services	79.3%	23
Technology improvements	62.1%	18
Leadership transitions	48.3%	14
Management support/service organizations	44.8%	13
Organizational standards	31.0%	9
Networking activities	48.3%	14
Team or group projects	17.2%	5
Seed money for joint projects as part of a leadership program	13.8%	4
Convening opportunities	44.8%	13
Association membership	13.8%	4
Collective action/advocacy	20.7%	6
Community leadership/problem-solving programs	27.6%	8
Cross-sector collaborations/alliances	34.5%	10

Question 7: If your organization provides programmatic specific capacity building support, what type of program does your organization fund? (check all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Arts	34.5%	10
Community Development	34.5%	10
Health/Mental Health	37.9%	11
Education	48.3%	14
Homelessness	27.6%	8
Food	27.6%	8
Advocacy/Organizing	24.1%	7
Employment/Job Skills	31.0%	9
Legal Aid	27.6%	8
Other	24.1%	7

Other = Washington-area nonprofit organizations (1), Youth development and abuse prevention programs (1), Humanities (1), Early educational attainment, childhood education and youth transitions, Out of school time activities (1), Pro-bono volunteer services, executive board leadership (1), HIV/AIDS (1), Women and girls (1), Not described (2).

Question 8: Race/Ethnicity

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
White/Caucasian	48.3%	14
Black/African American	65.5%	19
Asian/Pacific Islander	55.2%	16
Hispanic/Latino	72.4%	21
Other	27.6%	8

Question 9: Age

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Infant (0-4)	58.6%	17
Children/Youth (5-20)	79.3%	23
Adult (21-65)	82.6%	24
Elderly (66 ->)	55.2%	16

Question 10: Gender

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Male	86.2%	25
Female	89.7%	26

Question 11: Other populations

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Low income	82.6%	24
People with disabilities	51.7%	15
Other	27.6%	8

Other = Arts/Artists (2), Individuals who are limited- and/or non-English proficient (2), Adults (2), Low-income (1), Homeless (1), Children and families (1), No description (1).

Question 12: What geographic areas do you serve through your capacity building funding? (check all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
District of Columbia	62.1%	18
Arlington County (VA)	34.5%	10
Fairfax City (VA)	31.0%	9
City of Alexandria (VA)	44.8%	13
City of Falls Church (VA)	37.9%	11
Loudon County (VA)	17.2%	5
Prince George's County (MD)	31.0%	9
Montgomery County (MD)	48.3%	14
Other	13.8%	4

Other = National (2), Baltimore City (1), Greater DC/National Capital region (3), Fairfax County (1), West Virginia/Delaware (1).

Question 13: What is the average size of the capacity-building grants you award?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
\$0 - \$10,000	24.1%	7
\$10,000 - \$25,000	27.6%	8
\$25,000 - \$50,000	24.1%	7
\$50,000 - \$100,000	10.3%	3
> \$100,000	6.9%	2

Question 14: What options for duration of grant periods does your organization offer? (check all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Annual	82.8%	24
Multi-year	31.0%	9

Question 15: What is the average budget of your capacity-building grantees (based on annual budget)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
\$0 - \$250,000	20.7%	6
\$250,000 - \$500,000	31.0%	9
\$500,000 - \$1,000,000	31.0%	9
> \$1,000,000	3.4%	1

Question 16: Please provide information on your organizations grantmaking for the most recent fiscal year.

a. Number of capacity-building grant requests received

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0-10	13.8%	4
11-25	10.3%	3
26-50	24.1%	7
> 50	10.3%	3

b. Number of capacity-building grants approved

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0-10	24.1%	7
11-25	24.1%	7
26-50	3.4%	1
> 50	6.9%	2

Question 17: What percentage of your total grantmaking is dedicated to capacity building?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0%	17.2%	5
1-50%	41.4%	12
51-99%	6.9%	2
100%	17.2%	5

Question 18: Please describe the role that capacity building plays in your overall grantmaking strategy. / Redacted

NOTES:

Thank you to all of the funders who took the time to respond to the asset mapping survey and for helping to shape our insight into the wide range of capacity building efforts being made in the greater Washington region. Thank you, also, to Rick Moyers, director of the Nonprofit Sector Fund at the Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, whose knowledge and expertise were integral to this project.

The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region

1201 15th Street, NW Suite 420
Washington, DC 20005
202-955-5890

www.thecommunityfoundation.org

The Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation

1400 16th Street, NW Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036
202-483-8294

www.meyerfoundation.org