Thank you very much for that very kind and hyperbolic introduction. Let me also thank Betsy Nelson and her staff and the lay leadership of ABAG for organizing this meeting and for all of the other things which ABAG does so well.

Let me begin by telling you why I am here. The genesis for this talk was a conversation I had with Betsy Nelson about a year ago. In that conversation, I told her that my current position at the Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Foundation was much more difficult than the work in which I had been engaged as an attorney, work which took me into some of the most complicated trials in Maryland, whether the famous school finance case where I was pitted against Bob Embry and Mark Joseph (and I won on appeal) after a four-month trial, or representing the State for over two years in the Old Court Savings & Loan debacle, or most recently, trying cases against the Islamic Republic of Iran for its involvement in the terrorist activities of Hezbollah. Now you may say, "Well, why weren't those cases much more complicated?"

Well, ladies and gentlemen, when any lawyer goes into court, he should know at least 95% of everything that is to be known about that case, both 95% of the law and 95% of the facts. There is always something that comes up unexpectedly during the course of a trial – some fact, or some obscure rule of law that you didn’t know about. But, I said to Betsy and to others, giving away money and dealing with all the competing organizations in many different substantive fields of endeavor – whether aid for the elderly, for workforce development, for the disabled, for hunger, for education, you name it – I must tell you that I do not have 50% of the information that I should have when I make the decisions that I and others have to make at the Weinberg Foundation. The purpose of my talk is to tell you why I have reached that conclusion, and why it is so difficult.

Now let me make two disclaimers right at the beginning of this talk. First, the views I am going to express are my personal views. They do not necessarily represent the views of the Board of the Weinberg Foundation or indeed of any other member of the Board or the staff. Second, I acknowledge that there are many people in this room today who know far more about this than I. Now let’s plunge ahead.

The responsibility of this job is enormous. The options are dizzying, and the results are difficult to evaluate. I became President of the Foundation two years and three months ago. In the beginning, a couple of other Board members and I made a national tour, visiting several large American foundations, asking them to share their experiences, their priorities, their challenges, and their best practices. There are so many people engaged in meaningful philanthropic work, I believed we could learn from...
their experiences. Of course, we also spoke with many leaders of philanthropy here in Baltimore. After all of these visits, more than a dozen in total, what I learned was not what I had expected. I did not hear, this is simple, this is easy. What I did hear and my experience has borne all this out, is that the work is challenging and demanding. Let me be more specific.

Choosing funding priorities

Let us look at some of the decisions that any foundation or any individual donor must make. Initially, one must decide which of the substantive areas of need should be funded: hunger, drug treatment, healthcare for the medically under-insured or uninsured, disabled kids and adults, education, workforce development, the elderly poor, universities, hospitals, churches and synagogues. How do you make that decision? Do you fund in only one area? If you fund in more than one area, what are the proportions? This is not like investing in securities, where the investment professionals will tell you that allocation to broad categories — i.e., -- small cap stocks, large cap stocks, international stocks, bonds, hedge funds — is much more important than the choices within the categories.

What knowledge must I have in order to make the decision as to whether to invest in workforce development, or elderly poor, or hunger? Do I have even 25% of the knowledge I should have in making this decision? Of course not. What criteria do I apply in making these decisions? Should I say: "I will fund according to need?" That statement means nothing. How does one determine which are the neediest areas? To what extent is that decision to be based on a donor's conclusion as to which area is the most under funded by government? How do you reach that answer? Take a year off to study incomprehensible government budgets? What do you do if you are a libertarian who believes that government has no business in any of these areas?

For every decision to fund a certain substantive area, I can give a good answer in rebuttal. For example, the Weinberg Foundation's main priority is funding for the elderly poor. We give about one-third of our gifts to this category. I have been roundly criticized by some who, quite callously, shout that our perspectives are skewed. They claim that because the elderly have only a few more years to live, why spend on the elderly when we could be spending that one-third on children who have 70 or 80 years to live, and who, with our contributions, could make enormous contributions to society? The elderly, the argument goes, are beyond the age of making any contribution to society.

The other 24 foundations in the list of the 25 largest foundations in America have not made funding for the elderly a priority.

We decided to be iconoclasts for several reasons. First, those of us who knew Harry Weinberg know that, as tough as he often could be, he was a "softie" when it came to elderly poor. Second, and here I speak for myself, I was very much persuaded by the comment of a man who I have considered to be the most far-sighted rabbi in America in the 20th Century. That was Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel, who many of you will remember as the giant who marched alongside of Martin Luther King in Selma, Alabama. Heschel wrote that the mark of a civilized society is how it treats its elderly. He pointed out that dictators and tyrants always have their pictures taken with children, never with elderly people. He also reminded us that the highest form of charity is to give to the needy with little expectation of reward, which on a longitudinal basis, is certainly true of giving to those with short life expectancies. A third reason we elected to give to the elderly is that, quite obviously, with better medications, large numbers of people, and an increasing volume of dementia and Alzheimer's, the problems of the elderly will increase exponentially.

We allocate 10% to disabled people — kids with cerebral palsy, autism, blindness, deafness, Downs' syndrome, paralysis, other major neurological problems, and so forth. Some make the same argument against funding for disabled kids and adults as those who argue against funding for the elderly. Disabled kids, they claim, should not be funded because, except in very rare cases, they will never make significant contributions to society. We don't agree with that argument. Just a few weeks ago, I listened to Sister Pascal, a remarkable lady who runs the St. Vincent de Paul Center for disabled kids in Haifa, Israel. These are kids with the worst imaginable problems. Unable to communicate, horribly disturbed and disfigured bodies, some both blind and deaf. I asked her for permission to ask a theological question. "If you believe, as I am sure you do, in a personal God, why would God create such terrible diseases and make such disfigured and helpless kids." She smiled, and she said: "Mr. Stiller, God created these children to give me and others the opportunity to help them and to 'make us better people.'" When I saw, both at St. Francis de Paul and at 10 other agencies which care for these kids, the passion, the dedication, the love with which the staffs of these beautiful agencies care for these kids, I understood what Sister Pascal meant.

So there you have help for elderly poor and disabled. Should
we give to anything else? Would we have more impact – more effect – if we gave all of our money just to those categories and didn't give anything to education, to workforce development, to help the medically uninsured? How do I answer that question? Do I have 95% of the information I need to answer that question, like I had when I used to go into court? Of course not. That's why, this job is so much more difficult than trying even the most complex lawsuits.

**Investing within specific program areas**

Now let me shift to decisions that must be made within each substantive area. Let's assume you want to give $500,000 to help with the problems of hunger. Let's also assume you receive requests from 10 Baltimore organizations that deal with hunger, each for $150,000, or a total of $1,500,000, but you can only give away $500,000. Do you spread it around by giving each of the 10 organizations 1/3 of what it requested – i.e., $500,000? That is not a good way to give away money. You obviously have to compare all 10 organizations. How do you obtain the evidence to compare these organizations? Do you read their literature and stop there?

A major trap for the unwary is the public relations apparatus that many NGOs have. You must penetrate beneath all the self-serving statements that many NGOs make. You must have a healthy skepticism. The P.R. apparatus that affects politics – that causes all of us to be skeptical of most things that most politicians say – has infected even some of the best NGOs.

There are a lot of soup kitchens around. The Weinberg Foundation has funded a lot of them because we do direct service work. We are not an advocacy organization. Let’s assume that there is a soup kitchen that produces meals for a cheaper cost per person than all the other soup kitchens in town, and therefore for the same dollar they can feed more people and indeed even give them better food. Do you give all your money to that soup kitchen? Do you encourage that soup kitchen to expand and put the other soup kitchens out of business? Or, do you continue to fund all of them? Do you encourage the one who is best to force all the others out of business? What about food banks? Do you give to soup kitchens or to food banks? If to both, in what proportions? What if you decide only to give money to soup kitchens? One of them has a $2,000,000 endowment fund; the others have no endowments. Do you penalize the wealthy one because it already has money, or do you favor the wealthy one because it has been so well run that other funders have thought so highly of it that they have given it lots of money? If one of the soup kitchens has a special program for giving food to infants between the ages of 0 and 2, do you favor that one? Should you favor a soup kitchen that does more than give food, but also gives counseling? What if the counselors are only mediocre?

Let me deal with autism. We spend a lot of energy funding programs for disabled kids. Social services fields, as all of you know, are plagued by dogmatism. For every diagnosis, there is a war over the most effective model of care, there are usually competing schools of thought, and usually key intellectual figures who disagree vehemently in public. In the debate over autism, one issue is whether the rising incidence results from new labeling and disease names, or because of toxins in our environment, or because of the need to create a funding stream and an entitlement by giving a disease label to an individual. Surely before we had the term autism spectrum disorder, there were children in the system that had these signs and symptoms, but they were often called learning disabled or developmentally delayed or mentally retarded. To this day, some places will not use the frightening word autism and will tap dance around it by saying “Pervasive developmental delays or disabilities.”

With autism itself, there is disagreement over models of care. One provider will use only the intensive behavior modification called “Applied Behavioral Analysis.” Yet others refuse to use this model and insist on using Dr. Greenspan’s Floortime or various other play therapies. The believers fight against the recusants on each method and model, and foundations usually cannot enter this debate. We have insufficient knowledge and it is not helpful to take sides. One of the Weinberg program directors was recently asked which model of treatment for autistic children our foundation supports. His response was that the Weinberg Foundation is the Thomas Paine of foundations. A social worker, not a student of American history and perhaps not a student of much else, then asked him “What does that mean.” He said the Weinberg Foundation follows a model called "Common Sense" based on a variety of experiences, a variety of individuals, and no one size fits all. In other words, we don’t have a sole model or ideology in any of our allocations. We fund those direct service providers that can change the lives of the participants for the better.
better. We make site visits, and we try to gauge if the clients are happy. Don’t dismiss that word "happy" because it is an indicator of a good life. It is possible to detect human happiness even in those who are non-verbal. Yet, we can be charged with being amateurs if we don’t get into the substantive debates about how best to treat autism.

Another issue in dealing with disabilities is whether to concentrate on one disability only – to become expert in it, or to fund many of them. How do you decide that issue?

Take drug treatment. This is an issue that makes my blood boil and I suspect that many of you feel this way also. For the last 50 years in this country, we have had a policy about the use of drugs that an alien from Mars would say is the craziest thing he has ever heard of. We now have – this is mainly because of drugs – more people in jail than any other country in the world. China is much bigger than we are, India is much bigger than we are. We have more people in jail than are in the jails in China and India. We also have more people in jail on a percentage basis. One out of every 125 people in the United States is in jail. There is an enormous cost to us. About 80% of the crimes are motivated by drugs and the need for drugs. What is the point of putting all these people in jail? When I went to law school many years ago, I learned that one of the purposes of criminal punishment was rehabilitation. Does anyone seriously think that anyone gets rehabilitated in jail? Of course not. Exactly the opposite occurs. People get worse in jail, not only from some of the horrible associates, but also from the incredible availability of drugs in the prisons.

So, what are our choices. Advocate for better laws. Many of you do that, and you must be disillusioned by the Governor’s recent veto of a bill that would relax the parole rules for non-violent users. Harry Weinberg didn’t want us to spend his foundation’s money on advocacy or promoting systemic changes. So what do we do? Education of young kids? That has been a major failure in a society where drugs are the only escape from crushing and grinding poverty, where there is no hope, where, in the minds of these kids, to steal the title of one of Sartre’s books, there is "No Exit." We do fund treatment centers, but even with all of our money, it is just a drop in the bucket. Yet, when you try to have the diversion and treatment programs that can help these young kids, 17, 18, 19, instead of sending them into the terrible atmosphere in jail, you find that there are very few of these programs.

How about medical care for the uninsured? Everyone in this room knows that we have a national health insurance crisis here in the United States. National health care programs have been blocked by insurance and medical lobbies for 75 years. Our result is 47 million uninsured people and millions more who are underinsured. A person without insurance is less likely to have diseases diagnosed early and less likely to get routine preventive care. He statistically faces a 25% greater chance of dying early. A child in Costa Rica has a greater life expectancy than a child born in the United States. We spend more per capita on medical care than any other country. Steve Burd, CEO of Safeway, recently said that by next year, the average Fortune 500 Company will spend more on health care than it earns in net income, yet our maternal mortality rate, our infant mortality rate, and our longevity are among the worst in the industrialized world. So how do we, or you, help this problem. Do you give more money to hospitals? Do you give to smaller clinics that take care of uninsured people? Do you give to help poor people get better dental care, the lack of which can affect the entire body, not just the teeth and gums? Do I have even 50% of the information I should have to make these decisions?

To evaluate or not to evaluate

The big noise these days is evaluation. How do you determine whether you gift is going to be an effective gift? About a year and a half ago, I was asked to be on a committee in Washington to try to produce a paper that would enable me to measure, in concrete terms, the effectiveness of a grant, or of a grantee organization. I must confess that after a year and a half of work, I believe the project hasn’t accomplished very much. Nevertheless, we are adjoined by many people, such as Joel Fleischman, who just wrote a brilliant book on foundations, probably the best book that has ever been written on the topic, that one must insist on evaluating one’s grants. I have been cajoling my colleagues to evaluate all of the larger grants. Yet I wonder sometimes whether all of this evaluation works, whether for big organizations like ours or for smaller ones, accomplishes very much. There was an article by Alana Snibbe in the Stanford Social Innovation Review a few months ago that has caused me to have some grave doubts about spending large amounts of money on evaluation. I handed it out to every one of our program directors. And yet, without evaluation, how do you know whether you have accomplished anything? The Stanford article talks about a wonderful NGO in San Francisco which employs and aids people living in poverty. It has a powerful data collection system that streamlines evaluation and reporting for its 100 funders. Before it installed this data system, it faced a struggle familiar to many non-profits. Each funder would demand different data.
reported on different forms. The result was that the staffs of many NGOs spent large chunks of their time generating different types of data. Despite all the time and money that this NGO invested in creating these reports, the reports contributed little to improving the effectiveness of the program.

Funders seldom asked the company to explore ways that it could improve its services. Instead they only wanted to know how the NGO spent its money. These reports added zero value to the decision making and didn’t help the NGO improve its services. But in the meantime, the NGO has developed a wonderful evaluation system with the aid of computers. It can deliver data to its myriad funders in all kinds of permutations. But ironically the system has uncovered a new problem: most funders don’t actually care about the data. The executive director of the organization says, “Everyone says they want to be data driven in their decision making. But now we have all of this robust data and it doesn’t seem to have any effect on funders’ decisions. From the viewpoint of financial sustainability, we are no better off than before.” The evaluations also fell short on another front. For all their sophistication, they cannot prove that they are making an impact – a requirement that we often demand and many of you in this room often demand, although few of us really understand what impact evaluations entail and even fewer of us bankroll them. The only surefire way to show that a program is helping people more than they could have helped themselves is to conduct very expensive and lengthy longitudinal studies involving control groups randomly selected. Because so many people underestimate the difficulty and the cost of demonstrating impact, non-profits often collect reams of data that are not only useless but also misleading.

Of course, many NGOs don’t have enough time for evaluation, many feel they don’t have enough staff for evaluation, and many feel they don’t have enough funding for evaluation. Many grantees are reluctant to complain when they are dependent on funders for their survival. But this demand for evaluation shows no sign of slowing. In one sense this is probably for the best. When you are holding other people’s money and you are absolved of taxation, non-profits should evaluate themselves and their programs to reassure the paying public that the money really is making a difference.

Conducting evaluations that are truly useful is much easier said than done. First of all, what is an evaluation? How many of you in this room know that there is something called the Encyclopedia of Evaluation. Yes, there is. I don’t own a copy of it and frankly I don’t think I want to own one. I saw it once and it’s very big. Then there are the hallowed professional evaluation organizations. There really is such a thing as the American Evaluation Association. There is also the American Educational Research Association and the American Public Health Association, all of which have evaluation criteria. These organizations, according to the former president of the American Evaluation Association, “Fight like cats and dogs over small things.”

Now, what type of an evaluation do you want? Do you want an evaluation that judges whether the program worked or made an impact? Or, do you want an evaluation that will help the organization itself improve? Should the methods of evaluation be more quantitative or qualitative? Should the evaluators come from within the organization or without? What should be evaluated? Individual programs? The entire organizations? There is a lot of jargon which everybody must understand, and added to this gobbledygook is the fact that there are no consistent definitions for the jargon and everybody is bewildered. Even the largest foundations such as the Gates Foundation and the Kellogg Foundation differ on what they mean by evaluations.

For all their sophistication, they [nonprofits] cannot prove that they are making an impact – a requirement that we often demand and many of you in this room often demand, although few of us really understand what impact evaluations entail and even fewer of us bankroll them. The only surefire way to show that a program is helping people more than they could have helped themselves is to conduct very expensive and lengthy longitudinal studies involving control groups randomly selected.

At bottom, the problem can be described in another way, as it was by Bill Bowen, the former President of both the Mellon Foundation and Princeton University. He wrote a book about 10 to 15 years ago in which he stated that at the end of the year, the president of a profit-making company has a very easy job when he looks in the mirror and asks himself whether he has done a good job for the year. If the earnings per share have gone up, he can say that he has had a good year. When I look in the mirror at the end of each year and ask myself the same question, how do I know whether I have had a good year? It certainly isn’t sufficient to say that I have caused the Foundation to comply with the Internal Revenue Service requirement that the Foundation give away 5% of the value of its assets. Surely any damn fool can do that. I look at the programs that we fund, and I am very happy with them but if I am going to feel that I have had a good year, I want to feel that I have
done my very best. I want to know that I haven’t just done good (or well). I also am not content with saying that I have done better than the past year. I want to say that I have done the best I could possibly do. But my friends, I don’t think I can say that. Even most business men can't say that. The next time a businessman on one of your Boards talks about evaluation, ask him about the return on his company's investment in its R&D unit or from its advertising expenses. He won’t be able to tell you, and yet outcomes in the corporate world, which measures itself by profits, are much easier to measure than those that non-profits are routinely asked to measure.

Many of you know about the High/Scope Perry Preschool Intervention Program in Ypsilanti, Michigan in 1962. This program was not faring much better than its control group counterparts for several years, but 40 years later, these High/Scope Perry graduates are much more likely to have earned college degrees, have a job, own a home, own a car, have a savings account, be married, and raise their own kids according to David Kirp in the New York Times magazine. They are also less likely to be on welfare, to have been arrested, or to have been sentenced to jail. Based on the early data, funders might have decided to pull the plug on that program, which many today estimate has yielded over $12 on every $1 invested.

Control groups also involve serious ethical problems. Many social workers and non-profit practitioners won’t go along with strict use of control groups and random assignments because they think it is morally wrong. If you think that your program is the best thing for a drug addict or an endangered stream, why would you knowingly consign half of your funds to a control group that offers what you think is second-best treatment? But not using a control group could lead funders and policymakers astray. The only way, accordingly to some economists, to determine whether a program is working is to have a randomized control trial. That’s the gold standard and any departure from it opens doors for ambiguous results. But those types of programs are enormously expensive.

So, my friends, what does one do? To paraphrase Hamlet, to evaluate or not to evaluate? This is a constant struggle. If you don’t evaluate, are you doing a good job? If you do evaluate and you don’t have the most professionally done evaluation, what do you have? And then you look at some of the evaluation results for the Head Start Program over the last 40 years, you can find an evaluation report that will say virtually anything – whether it is that Head Start is the best thing since sliced bread or, when you look at longitudinal studies, that Head Start has done no good at all.

Last week, I attended a board meeting of the Charles Crane Family Foundation, for which I have been a board member since it was begun 15 years ago. A potential grantee was asking us to continue to fund an educational program Crane had been funding. I asked the grantee for data on the effectiveness of the earlier grants. There were none. But we decided to fund anyway because we thought the results were self-evident. About an hour later, another grantee was making a presentation and I then said to this grantee, “Look, we have been funding this for 10 years and I don’t see any reduction in violence in the city at all. I acknowledge that violence might have been even worse had your program not been instituted. But, tell me why I should continue to fund your program if there are no evaluations or if you can’t show me what the impact of our funding has been?” I then said to my colleagues on the Board, “I can talk out of both sides of my mouth. On the earlier request, I voted Yes without ‘effective data.’ Yet here, I am being more demanding.” So, in the same meeting, I was vacillating back and forth. Does that make me a good leader? I must tell you I have my doubts.

**Closing thoughts**

With all these difficulties, what should we do? What advice would I give in view of the lack of certainty?

1. There is no "one answer fits all." There is no absolute truth. Those of you who believe that there is an absolute truth, that the questions I have raised can be answered with certainty, should read any of Isaiah Berlin's books or Jonathan Sacks', The Dignity of Difference. Plato put us on the wrong course when he wrote that if we could only get out of the cave, we could reach absolute truth. Absolute truth is for fundamentalists and for many theologians, not for those trying to give away money intelligently.

2. Second, you must seek help in understanding the issues in each field. Our foundation insists on receiving confidential peer reviews for most major grants. We insist that our program directors know their substantive areas inside out, that they develop criteria for measuring grant applications in their areas of expertise, and that they apply these criteria in a consistent basis.

3. Those of you who control funds must ever be on guard against giving to organizations run by personal friends and must
ever be on guard against the twin devils of arrogance and smugness that ensnare too many funders. The attitude that "I've got the money; no one can challenge the way I give it away" may be an unconscious lure to too many funders. But if you want to do it right, beware. Very early on, an important client to my law firm came to me with a proposal. We rejected it. He then withdrew his business from the law firm. Shame on him. Hooray for the Weinberg Foundation.

4. Last, and perhaps most importantly. Each of you must – must – read more. Too many people I know had staggering quantities of intellectual curiosity while they were in college, but the older they became, they lost that intellectual curiosity. Far too many of the people who give away money today have stopped reading. And as to those who do read, generally they only read the authors with whom they agree. Those who lean toward the Democrats read only The New York Times and those who lean toward the Republicans read only The Wall Street Journal. A pox on both your houses. And a worse pox on those who read nothing but the sports pages. Every one of us who wants to give away money intelligently has a duty to read those whose positions may challenge our preconceptions. The way to stay young, the way to be more intelligent, the way to be more useful, the way to be better informed so that better funding decisions can be made is to immerse oneself in reading, especially "other" viewpoints – read both the Times and the Journal, read Commentary (whose editor-at-large drives me crazy), The New Yorker, The Claremont Review, The New York Review of Books, The National Review. I am saying nothing more than Learned Hand once wrote, when he said that a judge passing on a question of constitutional law should "have at least a bowing acquaintance with Thucydides, Carlyle, and Gibbon, with Homer, Dante, Shakespeare and Milton, with Machiavelli, Montaigne and Rabelais, with Plato, Bacon, Hume and Kant..." If you don't want to read everything, join a book club or take a course at one of the universities. The vigor and knowledge gained will make you a better funder.

What I am urging can best be summed up in a comment of Albert Einstein, referred to in one of the two great recent biographies of him (by Neffe and Walter Isaacson): "I have no special talent. I have only passionate curiosity." I hope that each of you will have that same drive – that same energy – that same passionate curiosity.

I hope I have explained why this job is much more difficult than trying cases.
Shale D. Stiller
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About The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation

The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Inc. is dedicated to assisting the poor, primarily through operating and capital grants to direct service organizations located in Baltimore, Hawaii, Northeastern Pennsylvania, New York, Israel and the Former Soviet Union. These grants are focused on meeting basic needs such as shelter, nutrition, health and socialization and on enhancing an individual’s ability to meet those needs. Within that focus, emphasis is placed on the elderly and Jewish communities.

About The Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers

The Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers is the Greater Baltimore region’s premier resource on philanthropy, dedicated to informing grantmakers and improving our community. ABAG was founded in 1983 to provide a forum in which colleagues could address common problems, approaches and interests. Over the years, ABAG has become a sophisticated network of corporate and foundation leaders. Our members now include representatives of over 135 private foundations and corporations with strategic, ongoing grantmaking programs.