

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: National Service

Series/Staff Member: Rick Allen

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 2148

FolderID:

Folder Title:

California Association of Non-Profits

Stack:

S

Row:

66

Section:

2

Shelf:

2

Position:

1



September 2, 1993

Dear conference participant,

I am extremely pleased with the tremendous response we have had from so many of our nations leading foundations, non-profits, government agencies and academic institutions who will be attending Creating Change Strategies For Program Replication and Transfer on September 10th and 11th at the Washington Vista Hotel. We have, in fact, had to turn down many exemplary organizations during the past week that wished to attend so that we could assure that the conference size encouraged networking.

As promised, we have included a short piece by Dr. Thomas Backer, who along with Michael Rubinger of The Pew Charitable Trust will be presenting the opening remarks on Friday morning. At the conference we will also provide additional reading materials for those interested in further study after the conference.

We have changed the lunch on Friday to have the entire session open for networking amongst participants. If you wish to request a vegetarian meal, please leave a message for me at (408) 458-1955.

The Washington Vista Hotel is located at 1400 M Street. The most convenient Metro stop is McPherson Square (blue line, 4 blocks away.) For those arriving on the evening of the 9th, there is an opportunity to meet early registrants in the hotel's Federal Bar from 6:30 to 8:30. For those arriving on the morning of the 10th, registration will be in Monticello West.

Once again, I look forward to seeing you at the conference.

Sincerely,

Alan Fox
Conference Coordinator

Foundations are an increasingly significant source of funding for health research and demonstrations in the United States, providing opportunities to encourage wider dissemination and utilization of innovations emerging from foundation-supported activities. A literature review and informal interviews with the communications and program officers for ten foundations suggest that foundations are increasingly engaged in dissemination and communications activities but less involved to date in active utilization programs. Moreover, they appear to have few strategies for developing utilization programs. The survey does indicate that many foundations may be interested in developing such strategies and the article includes suggestions for expanding knowledge utilization activities of foundations.

Knowledge Utilization and Foundations Supporting Health Research and Demonstrations

Initial Explorations

**THOMAS E. BACKER
JULIE SHAPERMAN**

Human Interaction Research Institute

Foundations currently support a significant amount of health research and demonstrations. In 1989, the 475 largest American foundations awarded \$563 million for health-related research and demonstrations, representing 17.3 percent of their total grant awards (Foundation Grants Index 1990). Extrapolated to the total of \$7.9 billion in grants awarded by all foundations, an estimated \$1.3 billion in private foundation funds supported health research and demonstrations in 1989.

Authors' Note: This study was supported in part by funding from the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, Maternal and Child Health Bureau.

Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, Vol. 14 No. 4, June 1993 386-400
© 1993 Sage Publications, Inc.

386

Constraints on government spending and political influences on the priorities of federal agencies make it less likely that certain health issues, especially those on the cutting edge, will be well explored without research or demonstration support from foundations. Rosenkrantz and Buck (1990) point to the essential role foundations play in assisting or initiating "programs that range from fundamental research on basic life processes to the evaluation of psychotherapy, from building hospitals in small towns to setting up county health departments, from professorships to training grants" (x).

There have only been limited efforts to assess empirically the impact of foundation-supported health research and demonstrations (Carter 1985). Some foundations—the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is a visible example—regularly evaluate individual grant projects or funding programs, sometimes with major investments in sophisticated evaluation research of both in-process and completed activities. However, as Carter (1985) notes, it is difficult to assemble even good evaluation data into aggregate assessments of impact. One important type of impact is the field application of information or innovations emerging from foundation-sponsored research, or wider replication of sponsored demonstrations. The current and possible future roles of knowledge utilization activities in encouraging such transfer are explored in this article.

Overview of Foundation Knowledge Utilization Activities

"Knowledge utilization" activities are defined here as covering a full spectrum from *dissemination* of information to more active strategies aimed at promoting the actual adoption or *utilization* of innovative programs or technologies in new settings (Backer 1991a). Foundations typically disseminate information about their grant activities through annual reports, and sometimes through conferences, press releases, and other more strategic dissemination or communications activities (Price 1985). However, little is known about efforts that foundations make to promote more active *utilization* through targeted interventions designed to overcome resistance to change, reward involvement with innovation adoption, use strategic planning to guide the adoption effort, and so forth.

Most American foundations include in their mission statements (and tax exempt status requests) some statement of responsibility for creating and promoting the use of information for the public good through research, education, or other processes. Yet a review of the literature on activities of Amer-

ican foundations, and telephone interviews conducted in late 1990 with the Foundation Center in New York, the California Community Foundation in Los Angeles, and several centers that study foundations in the health field (e.g., the New York-based Grantmakers in Health), yielded only a small knowledge base concerned with dissemination, and almost *no* literature concerned with utilization as defined here. The Kellogg Foundation report, *Increasing the Impact: 1980s* (Price 1985), and a previous Kellogg publication on related topics in 1978 are landmark documents about dissemination activities of foundations. The opportunity—and responsibility—to encourage dissemination of sponsored activities is well summarized by Kellogg Foundation Vice President James Richmond:

Don't reinvent the wheel! That's one of the most common cliches and cautions in American society. But the truth is we don't like to see money, effort, or energy expended unnecessarily or inefficiently. If a funded activity helps people in one neighborhood, community, or town, why not share it with others facing similar problems? (Richmond in the introduction to Price 1985, i)

Most foundations use the term *communications* in describing these activities. An array of approaches intended to enhance the "ripple effect" of successful projects are presented; but again, there is little discussion of the more active behavioral and management science-based strategies of knowledge utilization (Backer 1991a). However, the Kellogg efforts to bring together American foundations around communications issues did have significant impact. In 1978, only a handful of foundations had communications programs, but by the mid-1980s, an array of media was being used by foundations in more systematic ways (see descriptions below), often guided by a communications officer added to the foundation's staff. The largest foundations have entire communications offices or programs.

Other dissemination activities are occasionally reported in the foundation literature, such as the information clearinghouses proposed by Dolan (1989). Such strategies lack a key element for effective knowledge utilization, however, because they stop at information dissemination only, and do not help potential adopters sort through, select, modify, and adopt models that would best meet their needs.

One fairly comprehensive knowledge utilization program was created by the Exxon Education Foundation, under the following rationale:

"Build a better mousetrap and the world will beat a path to your door." This simple statement illustrates a theory of diffusion which is apparently widely believed by most foundations and granting agencies (i.e., "we'll do our good thing and utilization will take care of itself"). In much of its granting over a number of years, the Exxon Education Foundation has been in the business of financing the development of mousetraps in the field of higher education. A

part of our rationale for funding the project of one institution while giving lower priority to another was the favored innovation appeared to meet more general needs, and if successful, would be widely usable by other institutions as well. Only in the early 1970s did we begin to realize that many fine mousetraps seemed to be lying on the shelf, with few other institutions "beating a path to the door" of the innovator we had supported. It was then that we began to question the mousetrap theory of diffusion. (Johnson 1980, 1)

The Exxon Foundation's IMPACT (Implementation of Materials and Procedures Affecting College Teaching) Program was conducted to disseminate and promote utilization of six educational innovations developed by foundation grantees. The targets for adoption of these six innovations were faculty in colleges and universities.

The Exxon Foundation mailed descriptions of the innovations to a broad audience, and directed inquiries to the author of each innovation. Each author produced a packet of materials to send on request. Individuals interested in adopting an innovation submitted a brief proposal to the foundation; potential adopters were invited to a foundation-sponsored workshop where each developer presented information about their innovations. Successful grant recipients were notified following the workshop, and began carrying out their implementation plan. Awards were modest, covering only such costs as purchase and transfer of materials, and consultation with the original innovator. The IMPACT Program was evaluated by Rogers, Rogers, and Lee (1975), using questionnaires and telephone interviews with requestors of information, adopters, and secondary and tertiary receivers of information on the innovations. Findings showed considerable impact in terms of actual adoption of innovations in academic settings. The evaluation identified 178 "spontaneous" adopters of the IMPACT innovations, in addition to the 574 adopters who applied for foundation support to adopt one of the IMPACT innovations. The Exxon Education Foundation later expanded the IMPACT Program to high schools and elementary schools, promoting wider utilization of innovative teacher-initiated programs to enhance learning (Johnson 1983). More recently, the foundation also supported a utilization-oriented forum for educators throughout the country, highlighting the works of educator John Goodlad, and featuring grantee innovations available for wider use (Johnson, personal communication, 1990).

The Knowledge Base on Knowledge Utilization

Federal agencies in the health field have developed a number of strategies for promoting use of new knowledge emerging from research and demon-

strations (Backer 1991b). For example, best practices in medical care fields such as cataract surgery are being identified and promoted for wider use by the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (Backer 1991a). The National Cancer Institute is continually evaluating and improving a variety of knowledge utilization strategies related to cancer prevention and wider use of treatment innovations (U.S. General Accounting Office 1989). The National Institutes of Health has sponsored "consensus development conferences" to promote wider adoption of validated medical practices since the 1970s (Backer and O'Hara 1989). The National Institute on Drug Abuse has launched a program which includes "technology transfer" conferences and preparation of multimedia learning packages based on research (Backer 1991b). The Maternal and Child Health Bureau provides technical assistance on knowledge utilization to grantees in their Emergency Medical Services for Children National Demonstration Program (Backer and O'Hara 1989).

Some of these agencies also sponsor research on the effectiveness of knowledge utilization strategies. A large body of work, including many empirical studies, is now available concerning the ways in which new knowledge is transferred, adopted, and utilized (e.g., Backer 1991a, 1991b; Dunn 1983; Glaser, Abelson, and Garrison 1983; Greer 1988; Rogers 1983; Yin 1978). Methods for promoting utilization through continuing medical education (Kanouse and Jacoby 1988), strategies for adoption of innovations by physicians in practice (Institute of Medicine 1985), and use of innovative communications technology and marketing approaches to reach health professionals in institutional settings (Sechrest, Backer, and Rogers forthcoming) are among the topics specific to health care that have been studied intensively. Taken together, this programmatic and research knowledge base offers a valuable resource for developing more active knowledge utilization efforts by foundations.

Context for Knowledge Utilization Activities in Foundations

In the past twenty years, foundations have evolved from family-run, board-controlled organizations toward professional management (Joseph 1989). Foundation leaders often see themselves as agents of social change (Van Til 1988), able to use their funding priorities aggressively to manage the change process in given areas of societal need (Langfitt 1989). Ultimately, the work they sponsor competes with other public and private sources of innovation and policy direction (Pifer 1984).

Foundations today are especially active in the health policy arena (Rosenkrantz and Buck 1990). Following World War II, foundation leaders were concerned that activities in the public policy arena might be confused with legislative influence attempts, but more recently foundations are increasingly seen as sources of important policy guidance. For example, before government gave significant support to research on health, foundations supported considerable research in this area, such as the Rockefeller Foundation's support of research on infectious diseases in the 1930s. After seeing the potential demonstrated by such foundation efforts, the federal government established the National Institutes of Health (Bowers 1975).

At the individual project level, foundations have long supported the same general goals as those underlying knowledge utilization. Rogers (1975) suggested that foundations often fund projects that provide visibility for a particular health or social issue, hoping that the very act of financial support will increase attention to this issue. For instance, some foundations have made heavy investments in developing and replicating health and educational programs in the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, where the foundation's funds have great "leverage effects" in improving health care and reducing mortality (Sai 1975).

Foundations operate with only the broadest kinds of social controls, by comparison with federal government agencies that have to answer to Congress and to the voters (despite occasional efforts to restrict their actions through tax legislation; see, for instance, Morrison 1975). Such freedom may encourage foundations to take on "riskier" cutting edge research and demonstration activities.

At the same time, foundations exist in a conservative, low-risk-taking culture in which caution and a low profile are regarded as desirable (Van Til 1988). Slow movement and an active desire to avoid public scrutiny are characteristic of this culture, reflecting the values of the wealthy individuals who initiated the foundations to begin with.

Thus, increasing professional management, desire for policy influence, use of foundation funds to leverage visibility for selected issues, and freedom to operate flexibly are all factors that ought to provide a nourishing context for knowledge utilization activities by U.S. foundations. Yet our preliminary literature review and contacts with institutions that study foundations revealed little evidence of activity in this area in terms of strategic applications of knowledge utilization approaches. The conservative, low-profile culture of the foundation world seems a likely factor in this finding. To learn more, some telephone interviews were conducted with foundation officers.

Interviews with Foundation Officers

A telephone interview procedure was designed to learn about dissemination and utilization activities of ten foundations, selected informally on the basis of the authors' personal knowledge and nominations by two expert informants (Charles M. Lewis, M.D., UCLA Medical School, who has advised foundations for thirty years; and Everett M. Rogers, Ph.D., University of Southern California, Annenberg School for Communication, a knowledge utilization scholar). Small, medium, and large foundations concentrating on providing support for health research and demonstration were included. All are grant-making foundations; no corporate or community foundations were included in the sample.

One person was interviewed at each of the ten foundations; five were *communications* officers and five were *program* officers responsible for health-related grant portfolios of the foundation. The telephone interview content was based on concepts from the knowledge utilization literature (Backer 1991a; Dunn 1983; Muthard and Felice 1982).

All interviews were conducted by the second author during a one-month period. Most interviewees also sent reports, newsletters, or other informational material to supplement the interview.

Theme analysis of interview protocols was conducted by both authors independently to achieve consensus on themes in three broad categories: (1) characteristics of the foundations and programs the foundations support, (2) foundation dissemination and utilization activities, and (3) future plans related to knowledge utilization.

Interview Findings

Characteristics of Foundations and Programs Supported

Of the ten foundations surveyed, four focus solely on health; six provide support in other areas as well. All foundations included in the study had been supporting work in the health field for at least fifteen years (average age of the foundations selected was fifty-four years). The foundations studied represented a range of sizes in terms of total assets (\$32 million to \$3 billion) and amounts awarded to grantees in the previous year (\$6 million to \$135 million). The foundations were located in various areas of the country.

The surveyed foundations support a wide variety of programs ranging from local services and demonstration projects to theoretical and basic

research. A broad range of health issues—access to health care, training of primary providers, AIDS, care for the elderly, and so forth—are included. Many of the foundations studied see their work as being on the “cutting edge,” and define utilization of grant project findings in part as whether social consciousness is raised or new laws are passed.

Dissemination and Utilization Activities

Four principal types of dissemination activities were reported by foundations.

Press Releases

One foundation has a 4,000-name mailing list, and may issue press releases to all or to a subset of that group. Another foundation plans press releases and briefings to coincide with other public events or professional conferences to gain maximum exposure. Both foundations gauge interest in their work by the number of telephone calls received following press releases.

Networking

Grantees conducting research in the same area of study for one foundation meet periodically to assess implications of their work and to share information and recommendations. Another foundation supports large multisite trials and demonstrations. These sites develop communication networks with each other, and sometimes represent such a large segment of the nation's efforts in their area of study that they can set new national standards and research agendas. Then others, outside of the network, must become familiar with the work to remain up-to-date.

Another foundation establishes networks and invites key researchers working in a given field to share ideas and research findings within the networks. Network members may individually implement aspects of the network's studies in their own institutions, and they may informally discuss the ideas developed within the network with colleagues at professional conferences. Because professional researchers hesitate to publish their work prior to the completion of the studies, networking is particularly important in disseminating ideas in early stages of the work.

Publications

Foundation annual reports typically include descriptions of funded research and demonstration programs. Three of the foundations surveyed also

publish newsletters that describe studies and findings of grantees, or highlight a particular topic.

Reports on major programs included in foundations' annual reports are sometimes reprinted as separate booklets for targeted distribution. Two of the foundations interviewed supported local scholars who produce books about research topics, and one foundation regularly informs publishers of grantees who will have works ready for publication in the near future. All of the foundations interviewed have at one time or another published booklets and information brochures for distribution to the public and interested agencies. These are all in addition to book or journal article publication conducted directly by grantees.

Meetings and Conferences

Five of the foundations interviewed convene special meetings of groups interested in the areas of their research as dissemination vehicles. One foundation supported development of entire training modules to disseminate programs. Two foundations have large programs for training advanced students in the health policy and research field, and these students develop skills in professional publication as part of their training programs.

The term *knowledge utilization* was not familiar to any interviewees. Most of the larger foundations have a staff member in charge of communications or publications, but their emphasis is on dissemination, not on utilization. There is an assumption that information presented will be used, if the recipients choose to do so. Foundations also have not taken an active role in teaching their grantees the principles of knowledge utilization, such as overcoming resistance among potential information users, helping information recipients adapt or incorporate new knowledge to meet their own needs, establishing linkages and identifying idea champions among target audiences for their information.

Among foundations supporting demonstration projects, new models, and other service programs, there was some knowledge utilization activity, but it was not so labeled. For instance, grantees are asked to develop local sources of support for continuation of those programs after the period of grant funding, and many grantees worked with community agencies who wished to replicate their programs.

One foundation does consider dissemination an important topic for their grantees to learn about, and sends a booklet on dissemination and a brochure on media relations to each grantee at the end of the first year of work. This foundation will also award dissemination grants, which enable grantees at the end of a successful project to undertake targeted dissemination activities.

Another foundation specifically develops programs to disseminate information and recommendations from grantee activities, and yet another requires each grantee to have a dissemination plan as part of the grant application. Again, these activities do not encourage more active utilization strategies.

All interviewees indicated that the dissemination of information was important, but there was a range of responses concerning foundation *board* satisfaction with the current level of dissemination activity. Program officers interviewed tended to see dissemination activity as a lower priority for their board members than did communication officers.

Future Plans

Five of the foundations studied already have communications officers who have professional backgrounds in communications or related fields, and these interviewees expressed interest in learning more about knowledge utilization strategies and about ongoing professional work in this area. The program officers interviewed seemed less interested in learning about knowledge utilization. Yet program officers must actively support knowledge utilization activities if these strategies are to be effective, so their lack of interest may constitute a barrier to such activities. Unlike dissemination, knowledge utilization cannot be totally delegated to a communications officer. The knowledge utilization process must begin early in the grantee's work, and needs encouragement and support from program officers throughout the grant period.

Future Directions

Results from this initial exploration suggest that foundations and their grantees may be increasingly active in disseminating research and demonstration products through publications, press releases, networking, meetings, and conferences. However, foundations do not seem to be significantly involved in promoting targeted knowledge utilization of the output of their sponsored projects, nor do they tend to encourage such activities among their grantees. Because this was an exploratory study, no generalizations can be made about foundations outside the health fields, and even within the health research and demonstration area these findings are still preliminary.

Overall, there is considerable similarity between responses of those interviewed for this exploratory study in late 1990 and statements found in the report of the Kellogg Conference (Price 1985). Generally, foundation representatives in both time periods assume that disseminated information will be

used, even though there is some awareness of the need for more active interventions if institutional change and/or public policy change is to result (Boggs 1985; Piasente 1985). Communications staff note that replication may follow dissemination activities (Smith and Warren 1985), but they usually leave such replication to chance.

Despite lack of attention to the "utilization side" of knowledge utilization in the foundation literature and in the current activities of the small sample of foundations interviewed, there are some positive signs from this exploratory study. From the literature, we learn that the Council on Foundations has recently attempted to persuade foundations that it is in their self-interest to communicate more effectively with the multiple publics having a stake in the work that foundations sponsor, and to place more emphasis on communications in annual reports (Joseph 1989). The Council on Foundations has an active special interest group, the Communications Network in Philanthropy, whose members are communications staff of major foundations (Joseph 1989).

This emphasis on communications or dissemination can set the stage for more receptiveness to learning about and incorporating more active utilization strategies. And the communications officers interviewed in this study *did* express interest in learning more about knowledge utilization.

Several events which have occurred since this exploratory work was undertaken are also encouraging. The authors were invited to present findings from this study to the October 1991 meeting of the Communications Network in Philanthropy, because of this group's increasing interest in knowledge utilization. The study findings also were presented in January 1992 to the staff of the E. M. Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City, which is now developing a major program of dissemination and utilization activities to support their operating programs in the areas of youth development, substance abuse prevention, and entrepreneurial leadership. The Kauffman Foundation also has expressed an interest in sharing what they learn with other foundations, to encourage further growth and exploration.

Williams (1991) reports that the Pew Charitable Trust, one of the largest foundations, has recently undergone a "wrenching reorganization" and is now on a "broader, more open and progressive path." Interest in knowledge utilization activities is one aspect of this new direction, as the first writer learned during a February 1992 consultation with this foundation; already one survey study of possible approaches to knowledge utilization has been commissioned by this foundation.

What could be done to stimulate further exploration and action by foundations to promote active utilization of results from their sponsored health

research and demonstrations? The authors would like to suggest some possibilities:

1. Perhaps the most obvious suggestion would be to conduct an expanded and more rigorously designed *study of knowledge utilization activities* of U.S. foundations in the health area, including attention to developing interests and priorities of boards, program officers, communications officers, and grantees. Special attention could be given in such a study to the distinctive culture of foundations and how this might necessitate adaptation of knowledge utilization approaches. The findings from this exploratory study could contribute to the development of such a study. For instance, the Exxon IMPACT Program was effective despite giving only very small grants, which seemed to serve as incentives for leveraging other resources—a strategy other foundations might be most interested to learn more about, given the lean economic times of the 1990s.
2. *Articles* could be written about principles and practices of knowledge utilization for the two key publications in the foundation world, *Foundation News* and *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Case examples based on developing initiatives such as those of the Kauffman Foundation and the Pew Trust, as mentioned above, could form a central segment of such articles.
3. A *conference* could be convened to explore current and future directions that foundations might wish to take in adapting knowledge utilization principles and practices to their own activities and those of their grantees. The 1978 and 1985 Kellogg conferences on communications/dissemination activities could provide a useful model for such a conference, which might include as speakers experts on knowledge utilization activities sponsored by the federal government, experts from the commercial technology transfer field, and those in the foundation world already experimenting with such approaches. Alternatively, conference events could be scheduled as part of major meetings in the world of philanthropy, such as the annual Council on Foundations conference.
4. A *training program for foundation staff* could be created, perhaps through an appropriate organization such as the Council on Foundations, Indiana University Center for Philanthropy, Grantmakers in Health, or the Aspen Institute.
5. *Technical assistance to foundation staff and grantees* could be provided through an independent organization, a university, or a foundation-related entity such as the Council on Foundations; or, more narrowly, an individual foundation could support a grantee technical assistance program.
6. *Evaluations* of foundation programs could provide supplemental support for dissemination of grantee project findings identified as worthwhile by the evaluation, or for replications of grantee programs in new settings. The experiences of the Exxon Education Foundation's IMPACT Program could guide such an effort (Johnson 1985). Foundation evaluation activities were discussed in relation to dissemination in the 1985 report of the Kellogg Conference (Butt 1985; Carter 1985).

At some point, it might be desirable to establish a *center for study of knowledge utilization in foundations* in a university or independent "think tank" setting. Such a center could conduct studies such as those mentioned above. It also could provide foundation staff with training and technical assistance consultation on knowledge utilization.

The foundation context issues discussed earlier will influence efforts to proceed with activities such as those suggested above. Operating flexibility and desire for public policy influence will be facilitators; the foundation culture of caution and desire for a low profile will be inhibitors. Low awareness about and very limited use of more active knowledge utilization strategies by foundations, as reported in the present study, will be an inhibitor, as will the disparity in valuing of such activities between communications and program officers. Even in the Exxon Education Foundation, where the IMPACT project's knowledge utilization activities have been systemic and quite successful, there has been an uphill battle to maintain this program (Johnson, personal communication, 1990).

Change is inherent in the knowledge utilization process, and the challenges of change will also affect progress in adapting knowledge utilization to the grant activities of foundations in health care. For instance, researchers supported by foundation grants may resist spending time contacting and helping others understand and adapt the new knowledge they have developed. Grantees may feel threatened if their work is subjected to the scrutiny of others to determine potential for utilization. And foundations themselves present barriers, as discussed above.

Planning and support for the process of introducing the full spectrum of knowledge utilization to the foundation world will be needed to overcome such barriers. Knowing where, when, and how to actively promote change based on research or demonstration outcomes is a challenge to all foundations supporting health research and demonstrations. Only a few of the many alternatives for meeting this challenge have been described here, and much further study and experimentation will be needed to determine how to best adapt knowledge utilization strategies to the activities and culture of foundations. Failure to meet this challenge can extract a heavy price, however: "A foundation supported program whose lessons are never detailed and communicated, whose successes are never duplicated, whose failures are never published as a cautionary tale—is this program's impact as equivocal as the unwitnessed crashing of the philosopher's tree?" (Weisfeld and Karel 1985, 21).

References

- Backer, T. E. 1991a. Knowledge utilization: The third wave. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 12 (3): 225-40.
- . 1991b. *Drug abuse technology transfer*. Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Backer, T. E., and K. B. O'Hara. 1989. *Knowledge transfer and utilization in health care: A review of the literature and digest for the emergency medical services for children projects*. Los Angeles, CA: Human Interaction Research Institute.
- Boggs, N. 1985. Neighborhood goes national through film. In *Increasing the impact*, edited by A. R. Price, 177-82. Battle Creek, MI: The Kellogg Foundation.
- Bowers, J. E. 1975. Foundations and their fields. In *The future of philanthropic foundations*, edited by CIBA Pharmaceuticals, 3-9. New York: Elsevier, Excerpta Medica.
- Butt, M. G. 1985. Investment for quality. In *Increasing the impact*, edited by A. R. Price, 221-28. Battle Creek, MI: The Kellogg Foundation.
- Carter, J. 1985. Is an unevaluated project a project worth doing? In *Increasing the impact*, edited by A. R. Price, 215-20. Battle Creek, MI: The Kellogg Foundation.
- Dolan, J. S. 1989. Ideas: Learn from the best. *Foundation News* 30 (3): 36-37.
- Dunn, W. N. 1983. Measuring knowledge use. *Knowledge: Creation and Diffusion* 5 (1): 120-33.
- Foundation Grants Index: 1990-1991*. 1990. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Glaser, E. M., H. H. Abelson, and K. N. Garrison. 1983. *Putting knowledge to use*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greer, A. L. 1988. The state of the art versus the state of the science. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 4:5-26.
- Institute of Medicine. 1985. *Assessing medical technologies*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Johnson, R. R. 1980. Toward improved mousetrap utilization: A case study in dissemination. Unpublished paper.
- . 1983. Investing in education's number one resource. *Foundation News* 24 (6): 59-61.
- . 1985. Can Japanese management help in moving a cemetery? In *Increasing the impact*, edited by A. R. Price, 29-34. Battle Creek, MI: The Kellogg Foundation.
- Joseph, J. J. 1989. *Annual report*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.
- Kanouse, D. E., and I. Jacoby. 1988. When does information change practitioners' behavior? *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 4:27-33.
- Langfitt, T. W. 1989. *Annual report*. Philadelphia: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Morrison, D. E. 1975. Philanthropic foundations and the production of knowledge: A case study. In *Determinants and controls of scientific knowledge*, edited by K. D. Knorr, H. Strasser, and H. G. Zillian, 367-406. Boston: Reidel.
- Muthard, J. E., and K. A. Felice. 1982. Assessing activities for utilization of rehabilitation research. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 4 (3): 309-28.
- Piasente, C. 1985. Community forum: A partnership. In *Increasing the impact*, edited by A. R. Price, 145-52. Battle Creek, MI: The Kellogg Foundation.
- Pifer, A. 1984. Foundations and public policy formation. In *Philanthropy in an age of transition: The essays of Alan Pifer*, 105-115. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Price, A. R., ed. 1985. *Increasing the impact: 1980s*. Battle Creek, MI: Kellogg Foundation.

- Rogers, D. E. 1975. On the selection of priorities for an emerging foundation of national scope. In *The future of philanthropic foundations*, edited by CIBA Pharmaceuticals, 99-110. New York: Elsevier, Excerpta Medica.
- Rogers, E. M. 1983. *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M., R. Rogers, and C. Lee. 1975. *Diffusion of IMPACT innovations to university professors: A final report to the Exxon Education Foundation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Journalism and Program in Mass Communication Research.
- Rosenkrantz, B. G., and P. Buck, eds. 1990. *Philanthropic foundations and resources for health: An anthology of sources*. New York: Garland.
- Sai, F. T. 1975. International foundations and the development of health services in underprivileged areas. In *The future of philanthropic foundations*, edited by CIBA Pharmaceuticals, 125-40. New York: Elsevier, Excerpta Medica.
- Sechrest, L., T. E. Backer, and E. M. Rogers. Forthcoming. *Proceedings of the Conference on Effective Dissemination of Health and Clinical Information*. Rockville, MD: Agency for Health Care Policy and Research.
- Smith, B. K., and C. Warren. 1985. In the desert hides a well. In *Increasing the impact*, edited by A. R. Price, 35-40. Battle Creek, MI: The Kellogg Foundation.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. 1989. *Cancer treatment: National Cancer Institute's role in encouraging the use of breakthroughs*. Publication No. GAO/PEMD-89-4BR. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.
- Van Til, J. 1988. *Mapping the third sector: Voluntarism in a changing social economy*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Weisfeld, V. D., and F. Karel. 1985. Who can hear a falling tree? In *Increasing the impact*, edited by A. R. Price, 21-28. Battle Creek, MI: Kellogg Foundation.
- Williams, R. M. 1991. From inside right to out front. *Foundation News* 32 (3): 20-25.
- Yin, K. R. 1978. *Changing urban bureaucracies: How new practices become routinized*. Report #R-2277-NSF. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

THOMAS E. BACKER is President and JULIE SHAPERMAN is a staff member at the Human Interaction Research Institute.



August 20, 1993

Susan Stroud
Senior Advisor to the Director
Office of National Service
White House
OEOP-Rm 145
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Ms. Stroud:

We are very pleased that you will be able to join us at the "Creating Change Strategies for Replication/Program Transfer" conference this September 10th and 11th in Washington, D.C. Based on the excellent response from those invited, we feel that this should be a very productive conference.

I am including an outline of the conference agenda and a questionnaire which will allow us to better understand what you hope to gain from the conference. The questionnaire will allow us to prepare a reference sheet on all conference participants to hand out at the conference. We would appreciate having the questionnaire faxed to us no later than September 1st.

Prior to the conference, we will be sending you some specially prepared reading materials which will not exceed 20 pages.

Once again, we look forward to seeing you at the conference.

Sincerely,

Alan Fox
Conference Coordinator

Conference:

**Creating Change Strategies for Program
Replication and Transfer**

Schedule:

September 9th:

7:00 to 8:30 p.m.
Social hour at Washington Vista
Hotel

September 10th:

8:00 to 9:00 a.m.
Registration and Continental
breakfast

9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Sessions

5:30 to 7:00 p.m.
Cocktail Reception

September 11th:

8:00 a.m.
Continental Breakfast

8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Sessions

1:00 p.m.
End of conference

Meals Included:

Complimentary Continental
breakfast 9/10, 9/11. Lunch 9/10.

Hotel Information:

Washington Vista Hotel
1400 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 429-1700

Hotel rate:

\$125.00 plus tax
for single/double occupancy

\$155.00 plus tax
for Executive floor

*Ask for California Association of
Nonprofits conference rate when
making reservations.*

Attention: Alan Fox,
C.A.N., P.O. Box 1478, Santa Cruz, CA 95061-1478
(408) 458-1955

Creating Change Strategies for Program Replication and Transfer

September 9, 10, and 11, 1993

Sponsored by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and C.S. Mott Foundation

PROPOSED AGENDA

Thursday, September 9, 1993

7:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m. **Social Hour.** An opportunity for those who have arrived early to meet with other conference participants. A conference staff member will be available to answer participants' questions and provide assistance.

DAY ONE

Friday, September 10, 1993

8:00 – 9:00 **Registration.** *Continental breakfast*

9:00 – 10:00 **Opening remarks** (1)

10:00 – 11:10 **Case Studies** (2A)

11:10 – 11:30 *Break*

11:30 – 12:30 **Case Studies** (2B)

12:30 – 2:00 **Lunch Presentation:** (3) *The Relative Advantage of Replication for Funders*

2:00 – 3:30 **Panel Discussions** – *Choice of three sessions* (4A, 4B, 4C)

3:30 – 4:00 *Coffee break*

4:00 – 5:30 **Panel Discussions** – *Choice of three sessions* (5A, 5B, 5C)

5:30 – 6:00 *Break*

6:00 – 7:00 **Cocktail party, networking.** *Arrangements can be made for groups to go to local restaurants.*

DAY TWO

Saturday, September 11, 1993

8:00 – 12:30 **Discussion:** (6) *Where Do We Go From Here?*
Continental breakfast provided

(10:15– 10:45 *Coffee break*)

12:30 – 1:00 **Summary of Conference.** *Wrapping up. Adjournment.*

Program Detail

(1) OPENING REMARKS

Presenters: **Tom Backer and Michael Rubinger**

Welcome and overview of conference.

- What the conference will cover and what it will not cover
- What we hope to achieve
- Hoped for outcomes of conference, including all products (a workbook on replication, handout materials to be disseminated to foundation world, etc.)
- Conference format
- Introductions
- A brief presentation on how replication is one of many approaches to dissemination of model programs and practices
- Defining Terms. Definitions of key terms we will be using during the conference

(2A) CASE STUDY: REPLICATION OF THE HOME BUILDERS PROGRAM

Moderator: **Gary Walker**

Panel participants will include Charlotte Booth of the Behavioral Science Institute, whose Homebuilders Program has been successfully replicated, Susan Notkin of the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation which has worked closely with B.S.I. to facilitate widespread replication of the Homebuilders Program, and Anne Stone of Family Services of Missouri which has adopted the Homebuilders model and provides for its long term funding. After a brief overview of the group's history, the moderator will explore with the panelists the dynamics of their relationship. *The discussion will explore:*

- The incentives and disincentives to promoting replication of one's model program from the perspective of the nonprofit and the foundation

- Outlining the importance of documenting what one does as a means of increasing transferability
- When do the goals of the foundation conflict with those of the nonprofit?
- Ways in which foundations can work with government to increase the likelihood of a program being adopted

One purpose of this session will be to familiarize participants with the inter-relationships which can be developed between the foundation, the nonprofit and the government, and some of the challenges in promoting replication.

Plenty of time will be devoted to questions from the audience and their own perspective on what has been said.

(2B) CASE STUDY: REPLICATION OF THE HEALTHY CHILDREN PROGRAM AND FROM THE WHOLESALE TO THE HUNGRY PROGRAM

Moderator: **Marc Zegans**

Panelists include Dr. Porter of the Healthy Children's Program and Dr. Peter Clarke of From the Wholesaler to the Hungry Program.

After a brief overview of the group's history, we will explore the role of the champion in promoting replication and dissemination. The role of marketing in the replication process. How do communities decide if they should replicate a program? Issues of sustainability.

Plenty of time will be devoted to questions from the audience and their own perspective on what has been said.

Sessions 2A and 2B will be designed to give an overview of some of the most pressing issues in the replication/program transfer field. Many of these issues will be discussed in greater detail in the six panel discussions. The different case studies will illustrate both a strict and loose adherence to the replication models.

(3) LUNCH PRESENTATION: THE RELATIVE ADVANTAGE OF REPLICATION FOR FUNDERS

Moderator: **To be announced**

Two major foundations will talk about their interest in replication and their collaborative relationship developing in this area. We will discuss what each foundation perceives as the relative advantage of using replication efforts in meeting their mission. Any resistance within the organization to replication? Why did each foundation choose to collaborate? What are the relative advantages and disadvantages for each foundation in collaborating?

(4A) LIMITED GOVERNMENT RESOURCES

Moderator: **Gary Walker**

We will address the effect that limited government resources will have on the ability to secure long term funding for replication of model programs. Will long term government funding for replication projects require that they demonstrate meeting social needs more effectively and efficiently than current government approaches to the problem? What is government's role in encouraging replication? What will future partnerships between government and foundations look like? What is the role of associations of municipal, county, and state entities in the transfer of model programs?

(4B) PLANNING FOR REPLICATION

Moderator: **Graham Finney**

Issues to be addressed:

- Why hasn't replication been greatly used as a strategy for funders wishing to promote replication of model programs?
- What are appropriate roles for funders wishing to promote replication of model programs?
- At what stage should funders be preparing for possible replication?

- Identifying an effective replication agent to work with
 - How can a grantmaker initially encourage sustainability of any replication efforts they are supporting?
-

(4C) EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE REPLICATION

Moderators: **Tom Reis/Tom Backer**

Successful model programs are often not adopted by others unless they are effectively marketed. We will explore effective techniques in promoting replication. We will look at the importance of:

- Developing effective marketing techniques
 - Identifying and sustaining a champion
 - Innovative uses of modern technology to disseminate information
 - Strategies to overcome resistance to change
-

(5A) EVALUATION

Moderator: **Elizabeth Boris**

Presentation followed by discussion with general audience. Topics to include:

- How do we measure what programs are effective?
- What instruments are available for cost-effective evaluation?
- Can we measure whether a program is likely to be transferable?
- Do we need to develop additional instruments?

This section, in addition to covering the importance of evaluation in the replication process, will also be an opportunity for members of the academic community and interested funders to see what new evaluation tools may need to be developed.

(5B) ENCOURAGING SUSTAINABILITY

Moderator: Marc Zegans

A common complaint of foundations is that some of the replication projects they have funded have not become self-sufficient. This workshop will explore ways to increase the likelihood of sustainability. We will examine collaborative efforts amongst funders, collaborative efforts between funders and government, how funding of technical assistance can assist nonprofits to raise needed funds, how a more equal sharing of funding between nonprofit and foundation will increase commitment to sustainability of project. We will also examine whether traditional grantmaker funding cycles are too short for many replication projects.

(5C) EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE REPLICATION

Moderator: To be announced

- Developing effective marketing techniques
- Innovative uses of modern technology to disseminate information
- Working with associations to identify and promote model programs to their membership

Will also examine marketing techniques unique for international replication.

(6) DISCUSSION: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Moderators: Tom Backer, Tom Reis, and Elizabeth Boris

At this most critical session we will come together to refine and complete development of all documents produced in the six panel discussions. These documents will be widely distributed through the media and several umbrella organizations reaching the greater foundation, government, nonprofit and academic communities.

Products we hope to develop include:

- Check list of questions to examine before embarking upon any replication effort

- List of training and consulting resources for marketing and dissemination techniques
- Statement emphasizing the importance of marketing function in the replication process
- List of innovative marketing techniques
- List of evaluation instruments that should be developed
- Future role for Council on Foundations affinity group on evaluation
- List of ways that foundations and nonprofits can increase the likelihood of sustainability for replicable projects
- List of possible ways foundations can assist government agencies desiring to implement model programs

Also, we will discuss what participants feel are needed next steps after this conference. *These will include:*

- What can the Council of Foundations do to arrange future forums of funders interested in topics of replication?
- Promote collaborative efforts among foundations
- What future research does the academic community need to do?
- Ideas for replication workbook and other materials that should be developed
- What type of technical assistance could foundations use to strengthen their ability to promote dissemination and replication of model programs?
- Interest in a Program Transfer Center

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE

Presenter: Graham Finney

Start out with a synthesis of what we have learned during the conference. All participants will complete an evaluation and will be alerted that they will be contacted after the conference to solicit their ideas for future actions to promote replication.

Questionnaire

In order to facilitate networking and allow our moderators to mold their sessions to your needs, we are requesting that all conference participants fill out the following questionnaire and fax it to us no later than September 1st. From the responses we can then compile an information list to hand out to all conference participants, which will enable everyone to identify others they may wish to speak with, either during or after the conference. Your response will allow us to expand the body of knowledge regarding what you and others are doing in the field of replication. Your cooperation in this effort is greatly appreciated.

Check off any of the following which applies to you or your organization in terms of replication:

- _____ Evaluated program(s) for their replicability.
- _____ Have done research in the replication field.
- _____ Exploring the concept of replication.
- _____ Considering promoting replication of one's program.
- _____ Seeking funding for the replication of a program
- _____ Funded replication of a program.
- _____ Provided technical or funding assistance to an organization to explore the feasibility of adopting a replicable program.
- _____ Provided funding assistance to an organization who has adopted a replicable program.

Circle two of the six areas of replication you are most interested in exploring at the conference.

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Evaluation | 2. Planning Process | 3. Foundation/Gov't Collaboration |
| 4. Marketing Strategies | 5. Sustainability | |

Which of the following conference outcomes would you most like to see accomplished?

- _____ Check list of questions to examine before embarking upon any replication effort.
 - _____ List of training and consulting resources for marketing and dissemination techniques.
 - _____ Statement emphasizing the importance of marketing function in the replication process.
 - _____ List of innovative marketing techniques.
 - _____ List of evaluation instruments that should be developed.
 - _____ Future role for Council on Foundations affinity group on evaluation.
 - _____ List of ways that foundation and nonprofits can increase the likelihood of sustainability for replicable projects.
 - _____ List of possible ways foundation can assist government agencies desiring to implement model programs.
 - _____ Development of ideas for replicaton workbook.
 - _____ Ideas regarding what the Council on Foundations can do to arrange future forums of funders intereseted in topics of replication
-

Please indicate which panel discussion you intend to sign up for Friday afternoon.

Circle one : 2:00-3:30: 4A 4B 4C

Circle one: 4:00-5:30: 5A 5B 5C

Briefly descibe your interest in replication



July 28, 1993

Susan Stroud
Senior Officer to the Director
Office of National Service
White House, OEOB - Rm 145
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Ms. Stroud;

It is with great pleasure that we invite you to join us in our upcoming conference, "Creating Change Strategies for Program Replication and Transfer," which takes place on September 10th and 11th in Washington D.C.

This two-day event will be the first national meeting to bring together the leadership of the foundation community to work with nonprofit practitioners, academics, and government leaders at the forefront of advancing the practice of replication in the U.S. As a government leader, your participation will be a vital part of this important gathering.

Through conference presentations and small panel discussions, you will learn:

- how successful replication programs can increase the impact of your grant programs and other activities;
- the pros and cons of promoting replication programs within the foundation community;
- how foundations can assist nonprofits interested in replication; and
- how to measure the effectiveness of these programs.

The event is designed to serve as a springboard for future activity regarding replication. In this interest, the agenda will include a session in which participants will review and shape preliminary drafts of resource materials for those agencies considering replication. The conference will also feature a session to address the formation of one or more task forces to assist agencies in the replication process.

Judging from the enthusiastic response we've received from others we've contacted, we are confident that this conference will result in significant advances in the area of replication. We are also pleased with the media attention generated by the conference. The *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *Foundation News* and *Governing Magazine* will all be covering the event. *Time* and *Fortune* magazines and the *Washington Post* have also expressed interest.

The conference will take place at the Washington Vista hotel, which is highly recommended by a number of our associates. Please see the enclosed fact sheet for additional information on the hotel's many amenities.

There will be no conference fees, due to the generosity of the sponsoring foundations who have underwritten the costs of the event. However, fees for travel and hotel accommodations are the responsibility of the participants. We do have a limited budget to pay the travel and hotel expenses for small nonprofit agencies. Please contact me at (408) 458-1955 if you need assistance.

We have chosen to keep the conference small, with a capacity of 60 participants, in order to encourage networking and productive dialogue on replication. Due to the very strong interest in attending, we strongly request that you FAX or mail us the RSVP by Aug. 19. Upon receiving your RSVP, we will send you a detailed conference agenda and brief overview of the replication issues to be covered at the conference. We will also include a brief questionnaire designed to help us understand your goals in attending the conference.

We hope you will participate in this seminal event. Please call me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Alan Fox
Conference Coordinator

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Tom Backer
H.I.R.I./UCLA
2. Elizabeth Boris
Aspen Institute
3. Graham Finney
Conservation Co.
4. Ton Reis
W.K. Kellogg Foundation
5. Gary Walker
Public Private Ventures
6. Col Wilbur
Packard Foundation
7. Marc Zegans
Harvard University

FOUNDATIONS

1. Ford Foundation
Michael Lipsky
Jan Jaffe
2. Rockefeller Foundation
Frank Karrell
Marion Bass
3. Pew Charitable Trust
Mike Rubinger
Deirdra Lyngard
Pati Patrizi
4. Robert Wood Johnson
Foundation
Victoria Weisfeld
5. Kellogg Foundation
Tom Reis
Gail McClure
Karen Lake
6. JM Foundation
Joe Dolan
7. Edna McConnell Clark
Foundation
Susan Notkin
8. Lilly Endowment
Susan Wisley
9. Kaiser Family Foundation
Barbara Kehrler
Matt James
10. Mott Foundation
Carol Rugg
Suzanne Feurt
11. Zellerbach Family Fund
Ed Nathan
12. A.L. Mailma
Luba Lynch

13. Council on Foundations
Joanne Scanlan
Wendy Grishman
Jodi Curtis

14. Benton Foundation
Karen Menichelli

15. Packard Foundation
Col Wilbur

16. Boston Foundation
Melinda Marble

17. McCarthur Foundation
Woody Wickham
Paul Lingenfelter

18. Wilder Foundation
Gary Stern

19. Int'l Youth Foundation
Rick Little

20. Kauffman Foundation
Stacie Goffin

21. Eisenhower Foundation
Lynn Curtis

22. Annie Casey Foundation
Doug Nelson

23. Carnegie Foundation
David Hamburg

24. Irvine Foundation
Craig McGarvey
Nick Bollman

25. Dade Community
Foundation
Ruth Shack

26. New York Community
Trust
Joyce Bove

27. California Community
Foundation
Jack Shakely

28. New Winthrop
Rockefeller Foundation
Jackie Cox

29. Meadows Foundation
Sally Lancaster

30. Cafritz Foundation
Anne Allen

31. Mitsubishi Foundation
Rayna Aylward

32. Ashoka Foundation
William Drayton

33. Bruner Foundation
Janet Carter

34. Northwest Area
Foundation
Vicki Itzkowicz

35. The San Francisco
Foundation
Sylvia Yee

36. Saint Paul Foundation
Jean Hart

ACADEMIC

1. Tom Backer
H.I.R.I./UCLA

2. Elizabeth Boris
Aspen Institute

3. Marc Zegans
Harvard's Kennedy
School

4. Peter Clarke
U.S.C.

5. Eugene Grigsby
UCLA

6. Sharon Oster
Yale University

7. Dennis Young
Case Western Reserve

GOVERNMENT

1. Susan Klein
D.O.E.

2. Greg McDonald
G.A.O.

3. Joan Wills
Institute for Educational
Leadership

4. Ray Uhalde
Dept. of Labor

5. Peter Harkness
Governing Magazine

6. Sharon Lawrence
National Association of
Counties

7. One of the State
agencies that took on
Homebuilders Program

8. Susan Salasin
Center for Mental Health
Services

9. Susan Stroud
Tom Sander
National Service

10. William Davis
National League of Cities

11. Evelyn Ganzglass
National Governors
Association

12. Scott Fosler
National Academy of
Public Administration

NONPROFIT

1. Homebuilders

2. Ethel Ciderman
PSP

3. Allison Fine
Infonet

4. Graham Finney
The Conservation
Company

5. Gary Walker
Public/Private Ventures

6. Dr. Porter
RWJ Healthy Children's
Program

7. Gerry Osborne
Girl Scouts

8. Flo Green
Florence Green &
Associates

9. Mildred Winters
Parents as Teachers

10. Janice Perlman
Mega Cities

11. Ron Howard
OIC International

12. Mark Langseth
National Youth
Leadership

13. Bill Ayers
World Hunger

14. Lauren Dutton
City Life

15. Chuck Bean
Eureka Communities

16. Geneva Johnson
Family Service America

17. Kenneth Johnson
Virginia Schiaffino
Interfaith Volunteer
Caregivers

18. Wendy Kopp
Teach for America

Conference:

Creating Change Strategies for Program Replication and Transfer

Schedule:

September 9th: 7:00 to 8:30 p.m.
Social hour at Vista Hotel

September 10th: 8:00 to 9:00 a.m.
Registration and
Continental breakfast

9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Sessions

5:30 to 7:00 p.m.
Cocktail Reception

September 11th: 7:15 to 8:00 a.m.
Continental Breakfast

8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Sessions

1:00 p.m.
End of conference

Meals Included::

Complimentary Continental breakfast 9/10, 9/11.
Lunch 9/10.

Hotel Information:

Washington Vista Hotel
1400 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 429-1700

Hotel rate:

\$125.00 plus tax for single/double occupancy
\$155.00 plus tax for Executive floor

*Ask for California Association of Nonprofits conference
rate when making reservations.*

R.S.V.P.

_____ I will be attending the conference

_____ I will **not** be attending the conference

Name _____ Title _____

Organization Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

Please send or fax to: C.A.N., Attn: Alan Fox, P.O. Box 1478, Santa Cruz, CA 95061-1478
Fax: (408) 458-9486



May 26, 1993

Susan Stroud
Senior Advisor to the Director
Office of National Service
White House
OEOB-Rm 145
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Ms. Stroud:

Jim Kielsmeier, President of the National Youth Leadership Foundation, suggested that I contact you and that you might have an interest in a national conference entitled "Creating Change Strategies for Program Replication" to be held in Washington, D.C. on September 10 and 11, 1993.

The conference will bring together 40-50 knowledgeable individuals from a variety of fields who are interested in further exploring the issues of replication and program transfer. There has been tremendous enthusiasm from the foundation, academic, government and nonprofit communities over such a meeting.

At the conference we would hope to focus on how the proposed national service plan is based on several model programs. We also hope to cover how, in today's climate of limited government resources, foundations must collaborate more closely with government in providing technical assistance to help government to identify, evaluate and implement model programs.

We will be receiving a tremendous amount of press coverage on our conference and the subject of program transfer in both the Chronicle of Philanthropy and Foundation News. I feel that there is also a good deal of interest in the national press if presented from the proper angle.

I have recently completed a concept paper dealing with the topic of replication/program transfer, which I have enclosed. In the paper, I interviewed approximately 60 individuals from the foundation, academic, nonprofit, and government worlds who have studied or been involved with replication efforts.

In the course of my survey, many of those interviewed expressed a keen interest in meeting with their peers to discuss the replication process. Two desired outcomes of such a meeting would be to develop a body of knowledge regarding replication and to establish a network of individuals who could call upon each others' experience.

Since circulating the Concept Paper, we have had a very positive response to the idea of convening a meeting of experts to further explore the issues involved in replication/program transfer. We have commitments to serve on a Conference Advisory Committee from Dr. Marc Zegans, Associate Director for Research at the Kennedy School's Innovation Program at Harvard; Dr. Thomas Backer of UCLA, President of the Human Interaction Research Institute; Gary Walker, Executive Vice President of

Public/Private Ventures; Col Wilbur, Executive Director of the Packard Foundation; Elizabeth Boris, Program Director at the Aspen Institute; Tom Reis, Manager of Marketing/Dissemination at Kellogg; Rick Little, President of the International Youth Foundation; and Graham Finney, President and C.E.O. of the Conservation Company.

I have included a tentative list of participants, the majority of whom have confirmed, and a tentative list of some possible outcomes of such a conference, for your perusal.

I would hope that you would be interested in attending this conference and I look forward to speaking with you very soon.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Alan Fox", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Alan Fox
Conference Coordinator

Replication Conference
September 9, 10, and 11, 1993

Proposed Agenda

Thursday, September 9, 1993, 7:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Social Hour. An opportunity for those who have arrived early to meet with other conference participants. A conference staff member will be available to answer participants questions and provide assistance.

DAY ONE

Friday, September 10, 1993

- 8:15 - 9:00 Registration. Continental breakfast.
- 9:00 - 10:30 Opening remarks.¹
- 10:15 - 12:45 Panel Discussion²
Approaching Replication from a Supply Side Perspective
- 12:45 - 2:15 Lunch
Keynote Speaker³ on Limited Government Resources
- 2:15 - 3:30 Panel Discussion⁴
Developing Strategies to Promote Replication
- 3:30 - 3:50 Coffee break
- 3:50 - 5:30 Group Task⁴
- 5:30 - 6:00 Break
- 6:00 - 7:00 Cocktail party, networking. Arrangements can be made for groups to go to local ethnic restaurants.

DAY TWO

Saturday, September 11, 1993

- 7:15 - 8:00 Continental breakfast.
- 8:00 - 9:00 Presentation on Evaluation⁵
- 9:00 - 10:45 Panel on Changing the Mindset⁶
- 10:30 - 10:45 Coffee Break
- 10:45 - 12:30 Discussion⁷ on Where Do We Go From Here?
- 12:30 - 1:00 Summary of Conference. Wrapping up.
- 1:00 Adjournment

Replication Conference
September 9, 10, and 11, 1993

Program Detail

¹Opening Remarks

Welcome and overview of conference.

- * What the conference will cover and what it will not
- * What we hope to achieve
- * Hoped for outcomes of conference, including all products (a workbook on replication, handout materials to be disseminated to foundation world, etc.)
- * Conference format
- * Introductions. (All participants will introduce themselves, their organization, and explain why they are attending.)

All conference participants will complete a very brief questionnaire prior to the conference to determine their experience with replication and what one thing they would most like to learn. An annotated list of participants' responses (abbreviated to no more than two sentences) will be given to all participants. This should encourage participants to be brief in their introductions since information is noted and will assist all panelists, presenters, and moderators to know what the interest of the audience is and allow them to tailor their presentations accordingly.

- * A brief discussion on how replication is only one of many approaches to dissemination of model programs and practices.
- * Defining Terms. (Definitions of key terms we will be using during the conference.)

²Panel Discussion: Approaching Replication from a Supply Side Perspective.

Panel participants would include a nonprofit that has successfully promoted replication of their program, a foundation which has worked closely with the nonprofit to facilitate the process, an organization that has adopted the program; and a government agency that has provided long term funding. Additionally, a business academic could compare franchising in the nonprofit world versus the for-profit world. After a brief overview of the groups' history, a moderator will explore with the panelists the dynamics of their inter-relationships. The discussion will explore:

- * the incentives and disincentives to promoting replication of one's model program
- * the role of the champion and marketing in promoting replication and dissemination of ideas and programs;
- * outlining the importance of documenting what one does as a means of increasing transferability;
- * incentives and disincentives within the foundation culture to promote replication/program transfer.

One purpose of this session will be to familiarize participants with the inter-relationships needed to be developed and some of the challenges in promoting replication.

Plenty of time will be devoted for questions from the audience and their own perspective on what has been said.

It is essential to have a panelist who will focus on the demand side of replication.

³Keynote Speaker on Limited Government Resources

Keynote speaker will address the effect that limited government resources will have on the ability to secure long term funding for replication of model programs. Will long term government funding for replication projects require that they demonstrate meeting social needs more effectively and efficiently than current government approaches to the problem?

4Panel Discussion: Developing Strategies to Promote Replication and Group Task

We will have representatives from organizations which will illustrate two successful model programs that desire to promote replication/program transfer of their programs. One program would desire to promote a "cookie cutter" approach to replication and the other more of a concept approach like Robert Wood Johnson Healthy Children's Program. One organization would be a nonprofit agency that wishes to promote replication while the other is a foundation.

Group Task: After a brief history from each group on their current efforts, challenges, and issues that they would like to resolve, and after questions from the audience, we will break individuals into 8 work groups of 6 or 7 people. Half of these groups will try to come up with a strategy on how they would promote "cookie cutter" replication and the other half the "concept" approach and what they saw as the greatest challenges to each. All strategies should address the concerns of all those organizations and communities who would consider adopting these programs. How communities would identify, evaluate, and implement model programs/practices should be addressed.

At the end of the session a discussion of what the findings of each group's strategy with members of the general audience who would challenge any plans they felt had problems. We would have representatives from the different organizations who wanted to promote replication to be available to answer the questions of any work groups about their situation.

A hands on approach to problem solving is an excellent adjunct to lectures to encourage participants to learn about replication.

5Evaluation.

Presentation followed by discussion with general audience. Topics to include:

- * How do we measure what programs are effective?
- * What instruments are available for cost-effective evaluation?
- * Can we measure whether a program is likely to be transferable?
- * Do we need to develop additional instruments?

The presenter(s) should be evaluator(s) who have had experience with replication and are practically minded.

This section, in addition to covering the importance of evaluation in the replication process, will also be an opportunity for members of the academic community and interested funders to see what new evaluation tools may need to be developed.

6Changing the Mindset.

A panel of foundation personnel will discuss why replication of model programs has not been used more by the foundation community as a strategy for addressing societal problems. We will look at replication/program transfer as an innovative and cutting edge approach to addressing these needs as well as a means to leverage resources--all of importance in the foundation culture. The panel would have a moderator with a social science background who would sum up common themes of the group and put it in a conceptual framework.

⁷Discussion. Where Do We Go From Here?

Start out with a synthesis of what we have learned during the conference. All participants will be alerted that they will be contacted after the conference to participate in a brief evaluation of the conference and to solicit their ideas for future actions to promote replication.

A discussion of what participants feel are needed next steps after this conference. These will be noted and sent to all participants and appropriate umbrella organizations.
Discussion of a Program Transfer Center to gauge level of interest among participants.

* What can the Council of Foundations do to arrange future forums of funders interested in topics of replication?

* Promote collaborative efforts among foundations.

* What future research does the academic community need to do?

* Ideas for replication workbook and other materials that should be developed.

* What type of technical assistance could foundations use to strengthen their ability to promote dissemination and replication of model programs.

California Association of Nonprofits
REPLICATION CONCEPT PAPER
by ALAN FOX
October, 1992

SUMMARY:

The California Association of Nonprofits became interested in replication through discussions between its Executive Director, Bob Kardon, and a volunteer, Alan Fox, whose background was in the for-profit sector. Mr. Fox, who had extensive experience as a Vice President of a large hotel syndication firm, was perplexed as to why more successful social programs were not used as models outside of their local jurisdiction. The business world had seen explosive growth in the area of franchising, but this same concept was barely a factor in the nonprofit sector. At approximately the same time as these internal discussions about replication were taking place, Col Wilbur, Executive Director of the Packard Foundation, questioned Bob Kardon as to whether CAN had any information on replication. Wilbur's timely inquiry further stimulated our interest in doing research on the topic.

In these days of less government involvement in promoting new programs and less funding for existing programs, nonprofits, foundations, and government are looking at how they can better use their limited resources to meet society's needs. An interest in finding cost-effective solutions to societal concerns could spur replication efforts of model programs. Organizations that can show through evaluation that their programs are cost-efficient and can solve problems more effectively than other programs are more likely to thrive.

In the private sector, replication is very much alive in the form of franchising. However, in the nonprofit sector in addition to a lack of incentives to replicate, there are many disincentives. Foundations have generally not made replication of model programs a top priority, so foundation funding for replication efforts has been limited. Foundation program officers are generally not as interested in requests to replicate programs since it is not as stimulating as being involved with a new project. Another challenge is that foundation funding of programs is often for no more than 3 - 5 years. Consequently, foundation funding has often run out by the time a replication effort has reached its potential. It is also difficult for model programs to get funding from foundations for technical assistance to promote replication because foundations are reluctant to pick up another foundation's original project. Another limitation is that model programs do not always see it as in their best interest to promote replication of their programs since this is costly in terms of time and financial resources. Lastly, "leader types" who typically initiate programs are often not enthusiastic about promoting someone else's concept.

Evaluation is an essential component of the replication process. It is unlikely that anyone would fund the replication of a program or want to replicate a program unless it had been determined to be desirable to do so. Also, it is valuable to determine why a program is successful and what components appear to be necessary for the replication to succeed.

Unfortunately, evaluation may substantiate that a program is effective but not determine which components within a program made a difference. Since many evaluations are costly to perform, a challenge in promoting replication of small programs will be to employ cost-effective means of evaluation, which, although less scientific, are valid. Another problem is that an agency may be eager to replicate what initially appears to be a successful program while the final evaluation of a program's effectiveness is still years in the future.

Why has there been so little research in the area of replication? In the past, government has determined what would be replicated by putting up monies for certain programs. There was a perception among nonprofits that if you had a good program that could be substantiated with a good evaluation, the program would get funded. Nonprofits were not generally familiar with the use of marketing techniques to promote their programs.

The lack of focus and research into the area of replication has resulted in a limited vocabulary that detracts from the ability of those interested in the field to communicate clearly and succinctly. There are many views on what constitutes replication. There are those who see replication as a strict adherence to the original model (cookie-cutter approach) with minimal deviation, while others feel a great deal of flexibility should be incorporated in the replication process.

In the course of CAN's informal survey, many leaders from foundations, academic institutions, nonprofits, and government agencies have expressed a keen interest in meeting with their peers to discuss the replication process. One desired outcome of such a meeting would be to develop a body of knowledge regarding replication and a network of individuals who could call upon each other's experiences.

INTRODUCTION:

There is a broad societal consensus that in these times of growing demand for social services and limited financial resources we must explore more cost-effective ways to meet the social needs of the local communities. There are undoubtedly many successful and cost-effective programs that could be replicated. The replication of model programs is in keeping with the public desire to see tax dollars going to programs that can be shown to be cost-effective.

Difficulties in defining replication arose when looking at the replication process because minimal research had been conducted and there was no clear consensus among those working in the field. Perhaps a good working definition of replication comes from the book "Replication: A Strategy to Improve the Delivery of Education and Job Training Programs" by Public Private Ventures, a Philadelphia-based research and demonstration firm:

"...a dynamic process that, in different instances, places and times, will include mixes of fidelity, adaptation and evolution of the original model. The right mix will depend on systematic and informed judgments about

what is essential to the integrity of the model, as well as confirmation from ongoing evaluation and documentation of results."

In the Spring of 1992, the California Association of Nonprofits decided to educate itself in the area of replication as a first step to seeing how it could play a role in assisting and promoting model nonprofit programs throughout the state. The most comprehensive research we saw in the area of replication was by Public Private Ventures in the publication previously cited.

CAN's information gathering consisted of conversations with fifty-two experts including representatives from foundations, evaluators, dissemination of information experts, academic institutions, government agencies and individuals from programs that have been replicated. Each person interviewed was also asked to supply names of colleagues who were knowledgeable in some aspect of the replication process and a list of suitable reading materials. What became apparent was that many of the experts were not aware of each other and there was less interaction among these leaders than one might expect. A common complaint concerned the very limited amount of research into the replication process.

Another organization actively looking into the replication process is the Conservation Company, a management consulting firm for the nonprofit and philanthropic community. The Robert Wood Johnson (RWJ), Pew, Edna McConnell Clark (Clark), Ford, Charles Stewart Mott (Mott) and Rockefeller foundations all had been involved with funding replications and have deep insights into the process. The federal government is very active in replication, especially the Department of Education whose PEP Program provides funding to disseminate information on effective programs. There were many experts in the evaluation and diffusion of knowledge field who have done much research and are well versed in the replication process. Lastly, some of the most revealing interviews were with individuals from model programs which had been replicated.

The California Association of Nonprofits proposes as a first step that a conference be developed to look at the replication process. CAN would also hope to eventually explore methods to assist nonprofits with replicable programs to better market themselves. CAN could provide assistance to bring to light innovative and effective programs and help these organizations secure the minimal resources and technical assistance needed to promote their programs.

DISINCENTIVES TO REPLICATION:

In the private sector, replication is very much alive in the form of franchising. According to Osborne and Gaebler, in their book "Reinventing Government," the private sector is far better at replicating successful experiments than nonprofits or government because the profit motive attracts investors and drives private companies to imitate their successful competitors. When there is little or no profit to be generated, the private sector is seldom interested or effective.

Quoting from Public Private Ventures' book on replication:

"It is certain that there are many more examples of effective program models scattered across the country (the potential "replicatees") than there are agencies with the capacity and incentive to replicate. But local government program operators have no mandate, time, funding or incentive to replicate elsewhere. Accordingly, it seems plausible that investment in organizations funded to identify and, as needed, research good programs -- and follow through with further development and replication -- could produce substantially more widespread use of replication as a strategy for the improvement of local practice."

Generally, foundations have not made replication a major priority. According to Frank Karrell, Vice President for Communications of the Rockefeller Foundation, program officers are not as interested in taking on existing programs and replicating them since it is not as stimulating as being involved with a new project. Foundations want to be on the "cutting edge" with an emphasis on innovative projects. Another challenge is that foundation funding of programs is often for a very limited time. Replication can take many years to reach its potential and funding often runs out in the meantime. Clifford Perlman, Vice President of the Conservation Company, spoke about how difficult it was to promote replication of a project when foundation monies for technical assistance had been depleted. An exception to short-term foundation funding is the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, which has been funding the replication efforts of the highly-praised Homebuilders program for more than a dozen years. However, this type of long-term commitment is rare.

Getting foundation funding for on-going replication projects can be difficult. Illene Coontz, an RWJ Foundation grantee, noted that it is difficult to get additional funding for technical assistance to promote replication from many foundations because foundations are reluctant to pick up another foundation's original project.

Model program's staff do not always see it as in their best interest to promote replication of their project. It is costly both in terms of time and financial resources to assist others to replicate. Peter Forsythe said the Clark Foundation had to initially put pressure on the Behavioral Science Institute, a Clark grantee, to replicate their Homebuilders program. The Clark Foundation hired a professional consultant to put together a plan on how to replicate the Homebuilders' program.

Limited resources often hamper promotion of model programs. Judy Lenthall had not, prior to receiving a \$100,000 Innovations Award from the Ford Foundation, tried to interest other jurisdictions in the San Diego Single Room Occupancy Housing Construction Program. She was constrained by the demands of her own work as well as city rules which made even long-distance calls difficult to initiate. Limited resources often hamper promotion of model programs.

Also, there are many personal issues that hinder the replication process. Dr. Tom Backer, of the Human Interaction Research Institute of UCLA, argues that most replication efforts

fail because of inadequate attention to human elements. For example, implementing someone else's ideas is often not as appealing as carrying out one's own project. Frank Karrell, of the Rockefeller Foundation, contends that the "leader type" who typically initiates programs will be less inclined to want to take on or promote someone else's project as their own. According to Dr. Jack Rothman of UCLA:

"The chief organizational officer is in a key position to legitimate and enforce new procedures and practices. The individual holding this position often has the authority to act. Because of concern for maintenance needs of the organization, however, and a multiplicity of cross pressures, one's concern is often with stability rather than change."

PROJECT CHAMPIONS & MARKETING:

Let us briefly look at the role of the project champion and marketing in the replication process. Professor Edward Beimborn, of the University of Wisconsin, contends that in the replication process a "champion is needed to build trust -- which takes a long time." This individual must understand the potential users and have credibility with them. Douglas Anglin of UCLA notes that finding a champion is far easier than getting them to sustain their efforts.

A wonderful example of a champion is Dr. Philip Porter of the Healthy Children's Program. He is knowledgeable and respected in his field and travels the country speaking to communities about how they can redirect their resources to improve health services in their community. Dr. Porter's message is one of hope. He brings together leaders in communities and provides them with the inspiration, encouragement and technical assistance to improve their communities. Dr. Porter acknowledges the importance of the role of the champion and the difficulty of finding people to perform this role.

Replication is most likely to succeed if pursued in an entrepreneurial market-driven style by an independent replicating agent (as opposed to top down or bureaucratic directives), according to Public Private Ventures, in their aforementioned study. Another example of attention to marketing strategies is the Healthy Children's Program which has been widely replicated by RWJ. In RWJ literature the program is described as being introduced into a community as carefully and systematically as if Madison Avenue were bringing a new consumer product to market. Healthy Children does not provide funds for programs, instead, it is based on the premise that the costs of new programs often can be covered by redirecting existing resources.

In promoting a program it is necessary to show why it is successful. Many replication efforts we have seen are successful because the host organization has not assumed that the excellence of the program assures that it will be easily replicated by others. Much effort has gone into defining why the program works and promoting the program.

Peter Forsythe, of the Clark Foundation, attributes much of Homebuilders success at replication to their excellence in documenting why and how they work and convincing

others of the desirability of adopting their program. RWJ's "No Place Like Home" program uses peer counselors from the original demonstration programs to go to new sites and explain the program.

When marketing a project, it is harder to persuade organizations to invest their own money to replicate a program than to replicate with the help of funding from some external source. In the long-run, however, according to the Public Private Ventures report, it is more likely that a program will be institutionalized -- that is, will not fade away when the external dollars to support it dry up -- if the organization has invested at least some of its own money in the project.

RWJ's "T.A. and Replication of Service Credit Banking Program" is trying to show HMO's that there is a cost benefit for them to sustain RWJ's program. Originally, RWJ tried to help the sites attain funding which was less secure when the funding ran out. RWJ's Onlok Approach for Care to the Dependent Elderly Program becomes self-sufficient once it is started but requires a good deal of capital. This program is trying to convince large institutions like hospitals and HMO's that it makes financial sense to take over the program.

All of these programs provide technical assistance with funding from RWJ but organizations who replicate these programs do so because the programs are sound and cost-effective. Organizations that want to promote replication should be able to document that programs are cost-effective.

DEFINITION OF TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE:

A key component in the replication process is the transfer of knowledge to individuals who choose whether or not to adopt/adapt this information to meet their needs. The federal government and the private sector, in particular, have been involved in doing research in transfer of knowledge.

According to Patricia Petrizzi, Director for Evaluation of the Pew Charitable Trust, there is a great deal of research in the transfer of knowledge area but most is not practicable. Frank Karrell, of the Rockefeller Foundation, agrees that theoreticians specializing in transfer of knowledge often design complicated processes to be followed that are not useful. Tom Backer of the Human Interaction Research Institute, one of the world's leading experts on transfer of knowledge, stated that the problem is that most implementing agencies either don't know about this body of work or don't take it seriously.

In developing strategies for promoting replication, we should keep in mind that there are many experts who stress that personal contact is the most effective means of disseminating information with printed materials being least effective. Therefore, although some procedures for disseminating information may be low cost, they may be ineffectual.

One of the fundamental rules is to use multiple channels of communication when promoting the adoption of an innovation. According to Ed Bierbaum, of the University of Wisconsin,

in "The Technology Transfer Primer," there is no easy or even clear pattern to successful technology transfer.

A proponent of the use of multiple channels of communication is Dr. Porter, of RWJ's Healthy Children Program, who uses a two-pronged approach to get information out to those who might be interested in their program. First, the program sends out printed materials (pamphlets, publications, video) and then Dr. Porter talks with individuals over the phone or meets with individuals and groups in person.

According to Dr. Anglin, of UCLA, people often do not have time to read. Therefore, conferences with a specific purpose are the most effective means of communication. The desirability of conferences as a means to disseminate information was highly regarded by almost everyone interviewed.

One method of getting out information on model programs is via awards programs. Susan Klein of the Office of Education Research and Improvement (U.S. Dept. of Education) described the Pep Program in which organizations that have been funded by the Dept. of Education can turn in a ten-page document arguing why it is effective. Then a panel of experts evaluates the papers. If the organization passes muster, they can apply for monies through the national diffusion network to promote their programs to the educational community.

Michael Lipsky, Program Officer of Governance and Policy of the Ford Foundation, described their innovations in state and local government programs which they have funded since 1986. This award program gets 2,000 applications and they choose ten winners who each get a \$100,000 grant, part of which is used to promote their programs. The program is very costly since experts are sent out to each site to inspect and evaluate the programs.

Marian Bass, of the Rockefeller Foundation, described their funding of the School Development Program. The program's origins can be traced to Dr. James R. Comer's development of a teaching method that many thought was very effective. The Rockefeller Foundation decided that it would have a mass dissemination effort of his method administered through Yale University. The Rockefeller Foundation has a three-pronged approach. The first step is to form an institute that teaches the Comer method. The second step is to fund creation of partnerships such as between the State Department of Education and twenty-one school districts. The third step is creation and dissemination of a video of the Comer method to all school districts.

Dr. Anglin, of UCLA, observed that funding for projects that strengthens the ability to disseminate information often lasts for only two or three years. There is often no long-term funding. One major challenge is a change of staff with the new director not necessarily committed to the dissemination of information. Anglin states that changes in political appointees often play havoc with such programs.

EVALUATION:

Evaluation is an essential component of the replication process. It is unlikely that anyone would promote the replication of a program or want to replicate a program unless it had first been evaluated and determined to be desirable to do so. Also, it is important to evaluate why a program is successful and what components appear to be necessary for the replication to succeed. In looking at the evaluation process, we spoke with professional evaluators and those who employ evaluators, as well as those who take a more informal approach to evaluation.

Many evaluations are costly to perform and therefore tend to be limited to large demonstration projects. Fran Jacobs, of Tufts University, Vicky Weisfeld, of RWJ Foundation, and Tom Backer, of UCLA, concur that although there are less scientific means of evaluation which are far less costly and useful for determining effectiveness, many researchers don't want to be involved with those types of evaluations because this diminishes their professional stature. In essence, evaluators are trained to conduct scientific and rigorous evaluations. A challenge in promoting replication of small projects will be to employ cost-effective means of evaluation which, although less scientific, are valid.

An observation of Peter Forsythe, of the Clark Foundation, was that evaluators often are not interested in the effectiveness of a project but more concerned with designing the most sophisticated evaluation models. This is how evaluators are judged by their peers and how they get approval and tenure.

An applied approach was described by Marian Bass, of the Rockefeller Foundation, who said that they often will hire "smart people" who can look at the whole process of a project and come up with a creative cost-effective evaluation. Ms. Bass stated that although this approach is not always popular with evaluators, it has worked well for the Rockefeller Foundation.

Patricia Petrizzi, of the Pew Charitable Trust, noted that often during the evaluation process foundations are not always able to find out as much as they might from their grantees due to a number of factors, not the least of which is their desire not to be too invasive. Peter Forsythe felt that the evaluation process often measured whether a program achieved its goals and not whether it changed people's lives. He also stressed that client outcome should be measured. On occasion, the Clark Foundation has used a journalist in conjunction with an expert in the field to probe into how well programs worked.

In promoting replication of a program it is important to quantify and document the successes of the program. Consider, for example, the One Church, One Child adoption program, replicated in Missouri and Kansas. This program was unable to produce hard evidence of the number of children placed as a direct result of their recruitment efforts. Consequently, they were unable to secure state funding after their initial federal grants had run out.

It has been noted by Marc Zegans, Associate Director for Research of the Kennedy School, that small programs which are candidates for replication but which have not been formally evaluated do not necessarily have problems with replication so long as they attempt replication gradually. If successful, these newly replicated programs can then be evaluated to see if they are worthy of large scale replication. Zegans states that one should be able to trust that those who are going to adopt a model for replication will evaluate if it is right for them. This is possibly more valuable for the replication than formal evaluation.

Robert Ivry, of Manpower Development Resource Corporation, is quoted in the Mott Annual Report as saying that while a rigorous design may substantiate that a program made a difference, "You don't know which components within a program made a difference."

There are those like Gordon Berlin, of MDRC, who are proponents of rigorous evaluation. Berlin is also quoted in the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation Annual Report citing programs aimed at at-risk youth:

"There's a difference between outcomes and impacts. I have seen a lot of programs I was sure worked. And when we did a rigorous evaluation, I found out I was wrong. It could be that some programs are serving kids who would have made it on their own."

A consensus among the evaluators interviewed is that it is important to consider what the most appropriate forms of evaluation are and how one can apply the results to make programs effective.

Another commonly identified problem is that the lack of focus and research into the area of replication has resulted in a limited vocabulary that detracts from our ability to communicate clearly and succinctly. The poverty of terms we have to work with lead us to narrowly define the replication process and then limit our ability to come up with creative working solutions. Many individuals have attempted to broaden the terminology to better define what they mean by replication.

MODELS OF REPLICATION:

What are some of the agreed upon notions and differences about the replication process. Our original definition borrowed from Public Private Venture is:

"A dynamic process that, in different instances, places and times, will include mixes of fidelity, adaptation and evolution of the original model."

There are many examples of very successful replications that adhere to a strict model of adaptation. In fact, there are those like Gordon Berlin, of MDRC, who feel the only way to do a replication is to follow the model exactly.

The Job Corps and HeadStart are two examples that adhere to a strict model of adaptation. According to Jan Gulich, the Job Corps has a standardized curricula and each of the sites looks very much alike. According to Gordon Berlin, Comprehensive Competency Program (CCP), a competency based, self-paced instructional system developed by

Remediation and Training Institute, is the best example of a replication that adheres to a strict working model. Under RTI's direction, sites were required to meet strict operating standards. By the late 1980s there were over 500 sites using the standardized model. RTI recognized the need for a separate, nonprofit entity to handle expansion, support and training at new sites. They formed the U.S. Basic Skills Investment Collaboration.

Peter Forsythe, of the Clark Foundation, states that replication is often a fuzzy process in which the replicator often does not know how to explain what they do and how they do it. Forsythe feels that much of Homebuilders' success is because they are very skilled at documenting why and how they work and convincing others of their successful approach to family services. Forsythe does not feel it makes sense for an organization to take on a model and change it as much as they like from the start. Changes should be made gradually as the need for them becomes obvious.

According to Marc Zegans, of the Kennedy School, in some cases it is good to have replication in which you insist that the program is followed exactly to prevent states and localities from watering down programs in order to save money. Governmental attempts to cut costs can affect the program's performance and cheapen the "brand name" of the program. Zegans gives the example of the Los Angeles police anti-drug "D.A.R.E. Program" which is so popular that the program insists that it be adopted in its entirety. This is seen as desirable by those who adopt the program since they are not getting a watered-down version of what is perceived as an effective program.

The D.A.R.E. Program forbade the city of Dallas to use a condensed version of the program and other municipalities to use nonpolice officers as instructors. D.A.R.E. insisted on full replication because it was unable to monitor every department that it either trained or that somehow acquired the D.A.R.E. curriculum.

Marian Bass, of the Rockefeller Foundation, described two of the foundation's replication efforts which take a different view towards how much the site replicating the model can modify the program. The INCLIN program is fairly rigid in its curriculum on epidemiology which is taught in Philadelphia to physicians from university medical clinics throughout the world. They are expected to follow the same curriculum in their own countries. This exacting science lends itself to a rigid model. In the School Development Program, the Rockefeller Foundation is very comfortable with the school districts making local adaptations so long as the general principles are adhered to.

Robert Wood Johnson's Onlok Approach to Care for the Dependent Elderly felt a major issue was identifying the elements that had to be present in the replication of their model. This required a good deal of thought and discussion and met with some resistance from the potential replicators. Onlok described a creative tension between sponsor and site. They recognized the need to be loose with the sites and the need for them to learn for themselves.

In some cases, innovative programs gain high visibility by being chosen as award winners by prestigious institutions. The aim is not necessarily to promote full-scale replication but to feature effective practices. The Ford Foundation's Innovations in State and Local

Government Program run by the Kennedy School is designed to find effective programs, give them national recognition and provide them with technical assistance and funds to disseminate their ideas. According to Marc Zegans, this process may or may not lead to major scale replication, but allows, at the very least, for the free flow of innovative ideas that may be picked up in some form. The Department of Education's PEP program previously mentioned also provides for funding to disseminate information on effective programs which may or may not be replicated in their entirety.

CAN's ROLE IN PROMOTING REPLICATION:

At present CAN brings together nonprofit organizations at forums, workshops, and conferences covering topics of interest to the nonprofit sector in California. Through its monthly newsletter and information helpline it disseminates information vital to the well-being of the sector. CAN is exploring how it might assist in fostering the dissemination of information on model programs and promoting replication in California.

CAN has begun to familiarize itself with the literature on transfer of knowledge. It has begun to acquaint itself with programs that have been successful at replication and see what has worked well and why.

CAN believes it is worthwhile to explore strategies to demonstrate to government and the philanthropic community how certain replicated programs could be cost-effective approaches to certain societal needs. CAN could explore methods to assist nonprofits with replicable programs to better market themselves, provide assistance to bring to light innovative and effective programs, and help these model organizations secure the minimal resources and technical assistance needed to promote their program. CAN would like to consider a partnership with a grantmaker to convene a forum of nonprofit organizations and philanthropists interested in pursuing replication programs. This forum might be of use to the foundation community as a way to leverage their limited resources in promoting cost-effective programs to be funded by government.

Eventually, CAN could work with other nonprofit associations to develop a system within their organizations to promote replication. Associations could develop award systems to bring out examples of excellence. Possibly, CAN would publish a consumer-type report on different programs, as suggested by Susan Klein of the Department of Education. The associations would then assist in locating funding and technical assistance for model programs. In essence, CAN would be replicating its own efforts. In its role as a founding member of the National Council of Nonprofit Associations, CAN would provide an excellent avenue to work with other state associations in promoting replication nationwide.

A LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON REPLICATION:

Our initial survey indicates there is limited communication between the many individuals and organizations which have been involved in the replication process. In conversations few interviewed were aware of the many efforts made at replication or the major thinkers

on this subject. Many of those interviewed stated they would like to know more about others' experiences in attempting replication efforts.

CAN, therefore, would like to bring together leaders in the following areas: evaluation, transfer of knowledge, and replication agents from foundation, government, nonprofits and private sector organizations. Such a gathering would provide an opportunity for a two- to three-day conference. Face-to-face communications would hopefully facilitate future collaborations and research into the area of replication.

Several of those we interviewed expressed enthusiasm about the possibility of a conference and offered advice for making such a conference successful. Marc Zegans, of the Kennedy School, felt there should be a committee of leaders in this field to assist with the design. Peter Forsythe, of the Clark Foundation, added that it would be useful to bring together foundations to explore the possibility of encouraging replication of their model programs and giving longer term funding to make this possible. A Council of Foundations meeting that explores the role of foundations in the replication process was suggested by Frank Karrell, of the Rockefeller Foundation. Carol Rugg, of the Mott Foundation, felt such a conference would certainly be a useful way to increase the knowledge in the area of replication. Many others from government, such as Susan Klein, of the Department of Education, were very interested.

It was suggested by several of those interviewed that written materials from all participants, as well as research materials prepared by CAN, be submitted beforehand. The hope would be that the potential major participants could develop strategies and combine resources to encourage replication. Conference findings would be developed and distributed to interested parties not able to attend. One desired outcome would be an understanding of the complexities of the replication process which have been touched upon in the body of this paper. CAN would develop training materials and provide technical assistance to teach model programs how to promote replication of their programs. CAN would seek partners for the conference from the grantmaking community, government agencies, academia, and nonprofits which have replication experience, to promote techniques that would encourage replication.

Statewide and regional associations are in a good position to bring together model nonprofits programs, funders, and community leaders to explore possible replication efforts. One such example of a way CAN might assist in promoting replication is through a possible relationship with a successful for-profit workfare program. This New York-based program has been successfully replicated in one other eastern state. The owner would like to have CAN convene a conference in which prospective nonprofits could replicate this program in a major California city. The workfare program would provide technical assistance as well as financial resources and the nonprofit would provide political connections and carry out the program. Both the workfare program and the nonprofit would benefit from any surplus revenues. This is an example of a way CAN might assist in promoting replication.

FUTURE EFFORTS:

CAN has contacted fifty-two individuals from foundations, nonprofit agencies, government agencies, and institutions of higher learning, discussing their insights into the replication process. CAN has a list of an additional two dozen individuals to contact over the next two months and would expect this number to increase with referrals from those interviewed. CAN hopes to increase its knowledge of the replication process by conducting in-depth, on-site interviews with organizations that have experience in the replication process as well as with foundations which have actively funded replication.

CAN would hope to work with a foundation and an academic institution to create a conference format that would address issues concerning the replication process. CAN would also work with its partners to promote such a conference. In the future, CAN, if called upon, would be well-placed in California to bring together foundations, government, and the nonprofit community to discuss the replication of model programs.

APPENDIX

SOME EXAMPLES OF REPLICATION EFFORTS:

FOUNDATIONS:

1) Robert Wood Johnson Foundation -- At least one dozen programs being replicated with in-depth interviews of seven for this concept paper. The Healthy Children's Program has been widely replicated by RWJ with a great deal of attention to marketing strategies. In RWJ's words, the program is introduced into a community as carefully and systematically as if Madison Avenue were bringing a new consumer product to market. Healthy Children does not provide funds for programs, instead, it is based on the premise that the costs of new programs often can be covered by redirecting existing resources.

Interview with Vicky Weisfeld -- Senior Communications Officer

2) Pew Charitable Trust -- They, along with the Rockefeller Foundation, funded Public Private Ventures in Philadelphia to do a study on replication. The most comprehensive work on the subject reviewed for this paper.

Interview with Patricia Petrizzi

3) Ford Foundation -- Funding innovations in state and local government programs since 1986. Administered by Harvard's Kennedy School. This award program chooses 10 winners and 15 finalists out of a field of 1,500 - 2,000 entries who are considered most innovative. These winners are expected to use some of their prize monies (\$100,000 winners, \$20,000 finalist) to transfer knowledge about their programs to others. They are brought together in a conference setting, given basic training in the replication process, and helped to explore their options for promoting the program.

Interview with Michael Litsky, Ford Foundation, Marc Zegans, Kennedy School

4) Rockefeller Foundation -- Funding of program to promote the Comer method of teaching -- three-pronged program: 1) an institute has been formed to teach the Comer method. Each school district must have a champion who attends the institute; 2) funding creation of partnerships (e.g. State Dept. of Education and 21 school districts); 3) creation and dissemination of a video that explains the Comer method which is available to school districts.

INCLIN, Rockefeller Foundation -- An approach for teaching clinical epidemiology for physicians located at University medical clinics all over the world. Physicians would come to Philadelphia and learn this highly specific approach and take it back to their countries to be

implemented there. Rockefeller will turn over central management to a physician from Columbia who will set up training sites in the Third World to teach the program.

Interview with Frank Karrell and Marian Bass

5) Charles Stewart Mott Foundation -- Produced a thirty page special report for their 1990 Annual Report on the subject of replication. They were surprised by the limited research done in this area. The Mott report did an excellent job discussing the importance of evaluation in the replication process and providing different models of replication.

Interview with Carol D. Rugg.

6) Edna McConnell, Clark Foundation -- Funds Behavioral Science Institute to replicate their Homebuilders program. The Homebuilders has a separate department for training and dissemination of their program and charges fees to states and localities who want to set up similar programs. The Clark Foundation often requires grantees to use Homebuilders as a consultant. Homebuilders provides a good deal of technical assistance and has grown to the point where they are training trainers to teach their programs throughout the country. The Clark Foundation persuaded Homebuilders to actively replicate their program and have been funding for a dozen years.

Interview with Peter Forsythe

7) Edward Nathan, Zellerbach Family Fund -- Small foundation described as being on the cutting edge of replication of their projects. Looks to promote projects from the start and does a good deal of collaboration with other foundations. Works with the San Francisco Study Center to produce documents that are attractive and readable.

NATIONAL NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS:

The Girl Scouts -- Encourages a good deal of communication between local chapters and the headquarters about innovations and practices that work. Disseminates information through newsletters and questionnaires. Have an Executive Director of Workshops and often bring people together to look at issues the organization faces. They feel that personal contact is most important in replication. They have a large staff of management consultants that deals with evaluation and management issues. They are innovative and are thinking of setting up an award program -- \$500 prize for the best project.

Interview with Gerry Osborne

American Red Cross -- Limited program in which a coordinator can refer chapters with replicable programs based on information updated in a data base. Individual chapters can develop products and services and market them to their chapters for money -- an incentive to develop and get out products.

Spoke with -- Patricia Horan

GOVERNMENT

The federal government has many replication efforts and has done a good deal of research on the transfer of technology.

The U.S. Dept. of Education -- Those who have received funding from the Department can turn in a ten page summary of their program's merits to the Program Effectiveness Panel (PEP), which provides funding to disseminate information on effective programs. If approved by PEP, Project staff may apply for Developer/Demonstrator Support from the department's national diffusion network. In 1991, PEP received thirty-one submissions and gave twenty approvals. Spoke with Susan Shurberg Klein.

The National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) did an excellent study on the transfer of knowledge and pointed out many government agencies which were doing work in this area.

CONTACT LIST REPLICATION PROPOSAL

- 1) Anglin, Douglas -- UCLA Medical School
- 2) Backer, Tom -- Human Interaction Research Institute, UCLA
- 3) Bardach, Eugene -- U.C. Berkeley
- 4) Bass, Marian -- Rockefeller Foundation
- 5) Berlin, Gordon -- MDRC
- 6) Bierbaum, Ed -- Center of Urban Transportation Studies -- University of Wisconsin
- 7) Bloom, Susan -- Consultant Public/Private Ventures
- 8) Callahan, James -- No Place Like Home
- 9) Casey, Dr. Marion -- Kellogg
- 10) Cohen, Martin -- Technical Assistance Collaboration
- 11) Coontz, Ilene -- Onlok Approach to Care for Dependent Elderly
- 12) Cope, Glen -- LBJ School
- 13) Dietel, Ron -- UCLA
- 14) Dolan, Joe -- JM Foundation
- 15) Feasley, Jill -- Technical Assistance and Replication of Service Credit -- Banking Program
- 16) Fisher, Mary -- Homebuilders
- 17) Fogal, Robert -- Director, Professional and Public Service Programs, Indiana Unit
- 18) Forsythe, Peter -- The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
- 19) Greene, Sarah -- National Head Start Association
- 20) Gulich, Jan -- Jobs Corps
- 21) Hollister, Robert -- Tufts University
- 22) Horan, Patricia -- American Red Cross Headquarters
- 23) Jacobs, Fran -- Tuft University
- 24) Johnston, Rob -- Drucker Foundation -- Award Program
- 25) Jones, Hilda -- Open Hands, San Francisco

- 26) Karrell, Frank -- Rockefeller Foundation
- 27) Kehrer, Barbara -- Kaiser Family Fund
- 28) Family Services
 - Kelly, Susan -- Michigan
 - Stievers, Terry -- Kentucky
 - Weatherford, Trudy -- Tennessee
- 29) Klein, Susan -- Dept. of Education
- 30) Levis, Bill -- Baruch College
- 31) Link, Jeff -- San Francisco Study Center
- 32) Lipsky, Michael -- Ford Foundation
- 33) Loeb, Mr. -- Allen/Loeb Associates
- 34) Love, Arnold
- 35) Nathan, Edward -- Zellerbach Family Fund
- 36) Nelson, Richard -- Columbia University
- 37) Osborne, Gerry -- Girl Scouts Headquarters
- 38) Perlman, Clifford -- Conservation Company
- 39) Petrizzi, Patricia -- Pew Charitable Trust
- 40) Pomeroy, Miles -- San Diego SRO
- 41) Porter, Philip -- Healthy Children's Program
- 42) Rothman, Dr. Jack -- Consultant
- 43) Rugg, Carol -- Mott Foundation
- 44) Schiaffino, Virginia -- Interfaith Volunteer Caregiver Program
- 45) Seuser, Steve -- Community Information Exchange
- 46) Taylor, Martha -- United Way of America
- 47) Walker, Gary -- Public/Private Venture
- 48) Weisfeld, Victoria -- Robert Wood -- Johnson Foundation
- 49) Williams, Harold -- Rensselaerville Institute
- 50) Wisley, Susan -- Lilly Endowment
- 51) Young, Dennis -- Mandal Center -- Case Western Reserve
- 52) Zegans, Marc -- Harvard's Kennnedy School