

---

**Grantsmanship:**  
Program  
Planning  
& Proposal  
Writing

---

Updated and expanded by Barbara Floersch

Edited by Cathleen E. Kiritz

**Norton J. Kiritz**

# Contents

**Acknowledgments ..... viii**  
**Foreword..... x**  
**Impact ..... xi**

**What is Grantsmanship? ..... 1**

**Getting Started ..... 2**  
 Using This Model for Planning ..... 5  
 Some Basics ..... 6  
 Private vs. Government Grantmakers ..... 9

**The Grantsmanship Center Model..... 13**  
 The Components ..... 14  
 A Logical Argument for Grant Support ..... 15

**Summary ..... 16**  
 Importance..... 18  
 Contents..... 19  
 Examples ..... 20  
 Checklist ..... 23

**Introduction to the Applicant Organization..... 24**  
 Customize Each Introduction ..... 26  
 Describe the Organization ..... 27  
 Establish Credibility ..... 28  
 Ideas to Stimulate Your Thinking..... 29  
 If Your Organization is New ..... 31  
 Other Important Points ..... 32  
 What’s in a Name? ..... 32  
 Examples ..... 33  
 Checklist ..... 39

**Problem..... 40**  
 Three Primary Questions..... 43  
 Five Guiding Principles ..... 44  
 Hard Data & Soft Data ..... 46

**Published by**  
 The Grantsmanship Center, 350 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017 USA

Library of Congress Cataloging-Publication Data  
 Kiritz, Norton J., 1935 – 2006  
 Floersch, Barbara, 1950 –  
 Grantsmanship: Program Planning & Proposal Writing / Norton J. Kiritz;  
 Updated and expanded by Barbara Floersch

Includes index.  
 1. Grantsmanship 2. Funding 3. Title

© 2014 The Grantsmanship Center. All rights reserved.

ISBN 978-1-930250-13-0

**Photo Credit**  
 John Carroll  
 Pages: 54, 73, 103, 127, 134,147

Marshall Clarke  
 Pages: 21, 22, 34, 46, 48, 74, 78, 97, 110, 131, 176, 216

Anna Kaufman Moon  
 Pages: 38, 58

Jonathan Moore  
 Page: 76

United American Indian Involvement (UAI)  
 Page: x

Western Education Association  
 Page: 12

**Designed by**  
 BravoCharlieTango & Brand Navigation

The people, places and situations used in the examples in this book are fictitious. They have been created to make specific points and any resemblance to actual people or organizations is coincidental.

Caution! Lack of the Method Is Not the Problem .....	50
Caution! The Cause of the Problem Is Not the Problem Itself .....	52
Examples .....	53
Checklist .....	59
<b>Outcomes .....</b>	<b>60</b>
Don't Confuse Outcomes With Methods .....	63
Answer Five Questions .....	65
SMART Outcomes .....	66
How Much Change? .....	67
Outcomes vs. Goals .....	68
Beware of Awareness .....	69
Prevention Programs & Delayed Outcomes .....	71
Examples .....	72
Checklist .....	79
<b>Methods .....</b>	<b>80</b>
Overview & Rationale .....	82
Elements of the Methods Section .....	82
A Proven Approach .....	83
Who Will Benefit? Who Will Participate? .....	83
Major Components of Activity .....	84
Quantify What the Program Will Deliver .....	84
Collaboration .....	85
Memoranda of Understanding & Letters of Commitment .....	86
Staffing .....	87
Volunteers .....	87
Facilities, Equipment & Supplies .....	88
Timeline .....	88
Aligning the Methods & the Budget .....	89
What's Plan B? .....	89
Pilot, Demonstration & Model Programs .....	89
Logic Models .....	90
Examples .....	92
Checklist .....	111

<b>Evaluation .....</b>	<b>112</b>
Why Evaluate? .....	114
The Two Parts of an Evaluation .....	115
Outcome Evaluation .....	115
Process Evaluation .....	116
Designing the Evaluation .....	116
Eight Essential Questions .....	117
Cost Benefit & Cost-Effectiveness? .....	120
Include Hard & Soft Data .....	120
Who Will Conduct the Evaluation? .....	121
No Money for Evaluation? Do It Anyway .....	123
Ethics & Confidentiality .....	124
Sensitivity to Participants .....	125
Examples .....	125
A Few Definitions .....	134
Checklist .....	135
<b>Future Support .....</b>	<b>136</b>
Ideas for Future Support .....	139
Grant Hopping .....	142
Documenting Commitments .....	142
Commitment of Leadership .....	143
Good Habits .....	143
Example .....	144
Checklist .....	147
<b>Budget .....</b>	<b>148</b>
Plan the Budget as You Plan the Program .....	150
Budgeting Basics .....	152
Follow the Rules .....	154
Budgets for Collaborative Programs .....	155
Anatomy of the Budget .....	156
Budget Summary .....	157
Detailed Line-Item Budget .....	157
Revenues and Resources .....	158

Be Sure to Use the Right Calculation for Match .....	160
Expenses .....	161
Direct Expenses.....	161
Indirect Expenses .....	164
Budget Justification .....	166
Example .....	167
Glossary of Budget Terms.....	176
Checklist .....	177
<b>The Send Off .....</b>	<b>178</b>
Tips on Formatting.....	180
No Instructions? Do This .....	180
Keep Packaging Simple .....	181
The Cover Letter .....	182
Attachments to the Proposal.....	184
Submitting the Proposal.....	186
Approval or Rejection—Now What?.....	188
Take Care of Yourself & Never Give Up.....	190
<b>Adapting The Grantsmanship Center Model.....</b>	<b>191</b>
Arts & Culture Proposals .....	191
Capacity-Building Proposals.....	192
Capital Projects Proposals .....	195
General Operating Proposals.....	198
Planning Proposals .....	200
Research Proposals .....	203
<b>Afterword.....</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>Index.....</b>	<b>209</b>
<b>About Norton J. Kiritz .....</b>	<b>213</b>

# Acknowledgements

This book is in your hands because we had help and support from many people.

It would never have been completed without the patience and steadfast commitment of Alex Kiritz and Larry Floersch.

Our heartfelt thanks also go to Jim Abernathy, Susan Andres, Sandy Banks, Christine Black, Ernest Black, Thomas R. Blackburn, Linda Boedeker, Tom Boyd, Gail Brauner, Bresee Foundation, Edna Brown, Susan Chandler, Marshall Clarke, Mary Ruth Cloudsley, Mark Eiduson, Pablo Eisenberg, Hadrian Floersch, Nick & Melissa Floersch, Henry Flood, Debra Gadsby, Bradley & Ida Gardner, Ella Gardner, Judy Gooch, Noel Greenwood, Patty Hasselbring, Tom Howard, Matt Keener, Sarah Kim, AJ King, Nicholas Kiritz, Dorothy Elliott Lasher, Christine Lavery, Leslie Memsic, M.D., Keith Monley, Ericka Novotny, Alvertha Penny, Claudia & William Perozzi, Chuck & Linda Putney, David Rambeau, Matthew Reichman, Angela Richardson, Dorothy Watson Smith, Roger Stephenson, Blake & Allison Tannery, Kevin Wiberg, and William Zinsser.

Thank you also to the more than a million people who have read, used, and cherished the original *Program Planning & Proposal Writing* and who have helped to inspire this work.

Additional support for this new edition of *Program Planning & Proposal Writing* was generously provided by the Annenberg Foundation and the California Community Foundation.

# Foreword

Norton Kiritz, founder of The Grantsmanship Center, was a passionate supporter of nonprofit organizations, a believer in their capacity to do good, and an astute critic of a philanthropic community that made life difficult for many charitable groups.

His work with social service organizations convinced him that nonprofits had to become more skilled in the art of grantsmanship. So Norton established The Grantsmanship Center to help nonprofits do just that—improve their program planning, write stronger proposals, and hone evaluation skills, all critical ingredients for securing foundation and government funds to support their missions and programs. His simply written, clear guide, *Program Planning & Proposal Writing*, changed how grantseekers and grantmakers approach their work.

In my view, this widely celebrated publication remains, after forty years, the best handbook about how to win grants. It is also a tool that brings focus to the essential elements of operating a successful organization. It neither preaches nor sets arbitrary standards. What it does is advise nonprofits to follow a logical approach in developing their goals, objectives, plans, and funding strategies.

This guide has had an enormous impact in the U.S. and is used in over forty countries throughout the world. It has positively changed the direction and effectiveness of countless organizations and has been translated into Chinese, Spanish, and Ukrainian.

To meet the needs of a changing nonprofit sector, The Grantsmanship Center has now issued an updated and expanded version of *Program Planning & Proposal Writing*. This expertly revised new edition retains the essence of Norton's work while adding new information, stories, and examples that make it more relevant to today's reader.

Now titled *Grantsmanship: Program Planning & Proposal Writing*, this publication is a worthy successor to the original guide. It is the most thorough, perceptive, and practical guide to grant proposal writing that we are likely to have for years to come.

**PABLO EISENBERG**

Senior Fellow, *McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University*  
Columnist, *Chronicle of Philanthropy*  
Columnist, *Huffington Post*

# Impact

United American Indian Involvement (UAI) got its start on Los Angeles' Skid Row almost 40 years ago. Now it's the largest urban Native American nonprofit in the United States, bringing medical care, mental health treatment, youth services, and education to thousands of Native Americans in Southern and Central California.

Its programs are effective and its positive impact on lives is concrete. A diabetic grandmother learns to exercise and cook healthy meals. A homeless veteran gets the counseling he needs to find stability. Children in tough neighborhoods are pointed toward college through enrichment activities.



UAI is an example of how hard work and dedication have made one organization a leader in its field and an effective champion for the community it serves. And it is also one example of how a group of committed people have used The Grantsmanship Center's *Program Planning & Proposal Writing* approach to help achieve its mission.

"We had five employees, a \$300,000 budget, and a tiny office on Skid Row," recalled UAI Executive Director Dave Rambeau, who rallied a small group of like-minded people in 1979 to tackle the daunting problems confronting urban Indians. "We needed money to keep the programs going and to expand to meet other needs."

None of the staff had the expertise to grow funding for the agency. "So we went to this Indian guy at UCLA," Rambeau said, "and he recommended Norton Kiritz and The Grantsmanship Center. He said that was the place to start if you're looking to learn."

That referral was the beginning of a long relationship between UAI and the Center. "I took the training and started applying for money," Rambeau said. His first proposal generated a \$25,000 grant from Los Angeles County, giving his group the confidence and credibility to tap other funding sources.

"What we learned from Norton helped raise our profile, and that allowed us to get more funding," Rambeau said. The *Program Planning & Proposal Writing* approach was Rambeau's blueprint for documenting and articulating the case for funding and for developing logical and realistic program plans. "I'd go back to Norton for help whenever I got stuck," said Rambeau. He continues to send his staff to The Grantsmanship Center for training. And since it began using the Center's model, UAI has expanded to three cities, with more than 130 employees and an annual budget of \$8.5 million.

But grant dollars are only a means to an end, and the true measure of success is impact. UAI's grant funding is well-targeted and well-spent. It contributes toward the organization's mission in a way that transforms lives and will pay dividends for generations to come.

You can see the impact of the agency's growth in its annual Robert Sundance Summer Youth Camp. The camp started with eight kids on Skid Row and now takes 150 Native American children from Central and Southern California to the High Sierra every summer to fish, swim, bike, ride horses, climb rocks, and careen down ziplines.

But it's more than just a good time. Campers get physical exams, healthy food, and real-life guidance. The rules are strict—no video games, cellphones, or music players—and social support follows the campers home. Family services and school-year activities help these children from tough, discouraging circumstances to blossom and become leaders. Many of them even go back to camp as counselors, dedicated to helping young children succeed as they did.

To this day, UAll uses the principles of grantsmanship laid out in this book, strengthening its ability to attract the funding it needs to continue to serve and fortify its community.

**SANDY BANKS**

Columnist, *Los Angeles Times*

# What is Grantsmanship?

Grantsmanship is a philosophy, a code of ethics, and a set of skills that, when practiced together, can produce positive change. Here's how The Grantsmanship Center defines it.

## **When you practice grantsmanship:**

- You never lose sight of your organization's mission.
- You know your field and stay up to date on relevant research and best practices.
- You know the people and the community your organization serves and treat them with genuine respect, encouraging their input and involvement.
- You're committed to planning because you know it's essential to making a real difference.
- You engage others in planning—staff, constituents, board members, community members, other organizations—because you value diverse perspectives.
- You build partnerships with colleague organizations, not because the funders say you have to, but because you're committed to the expanded viewpoints, resources, and program effectiveness that genuine partnerships bring.
- You view funders as partners, allies, advisors, and advocates.
- You proactively search for funding opportunities that fit your organization's mission and priorities rather than passively waiting for something "right" to come along.
- You refuse to misrepresent or fabricate information, disparage other organizations, or compromise a program in order to win a grant.

A grant is not about money alone, because money by itself doesn't protect battered families, help children to read, fill the plates of the hungry, clean polluted lakes, or open museum doors. But when a grant is used to finance a well-planned program run by a capable and committed organization, it can be a powerful catalyst for change. A grant is a tool—a means to an end.

Similarly, the size of a grant is not the measure of success. A large grant to support an ill-conceived program can be a waste of money. A small grant to support a well-designed program can be tremendously effective. Grantsmanship is not about chasing dollars—it's about getting good results.



# Getting Started

You're Not Alone

You've got a great idea or an important project in mind—something your organization can do to make the world better. Now what? How can you transform these good intentions into effective action? No matter what's motivating you, the next step is to answer some questions. Why is the work necessary? What is the change you want to see? How can your organization make it happen? Where should you start? And at some point, what will it cost and where will the money come from?

In language,  
clarity is everything.

CONFUCIOUS



This book is here to help. It lays out The Grantsmanship Center Model for planning programs and then writing grant proposals to fund them.

Originated by Norton J. Kiritz in 1972, this model is the accepted standard in the field. It has been adopted throughout the world by grantmakers to establish grant proposal guidelines and by grantseekers to write grant proposals.

Always start with planning. Imagine a complex road trip without a map, a clock, or a GPS. A program and a grant proposal that aren't based on good planning have the same disadvantages. They're likely to be off track, unlikely to inspire confidence or support, and most important, less likely to generate good results.

A program plan must be able to withstand a hard shake because those who award grant funds will do just that—give your grant proposal a tough examination. You must be able to explain your concern, the desired changes, what your organization wants to do, how you'll measure change, how you'll sustain the work beyond grant funding, and how your organization will spend the requested money.

Good, solid planning is the foundation for success. Once a plan is in place, you're prepared to speak intelligently on the topic, to rally community support, to build partnerships, to influence decision makers, and to write compelling grant proposals. You're ready to make the case for support.

Organizations that devote sufficient time and energy to the planning process can reap benefits beyond grant funding. These often include:

- increased understanding of the problem
- clarity about long-term goals
- a focus on measurable program outcomes
- better program evaluations
- better record-keeping systems
- more targeted use of resources and better financial management
- enhanced credibility.

## Using This Model for Planning

Effective program planning can't be done in a vacuum, sitting alone in a corner, separate from the views of others. Involve board members, administrators, those who will run the program, and most important, the beneficiaries.

Welcoming others from outside your organization into the process will bring fresh perspectives that aren't available in-house. Tap the expertise of collaborating organizations and community experts.

When developing a grant proposal, it's essential to allow adequate time for both planning and writing. Clear writing can't compensate for an incoherent plan.

The Grantsmanship Center Model includes eight categories or sections of information, which are presented on page 13. Of those eight sections, three are particularly important because they make up the core of the proposal: Problem, Outcomes, and Methods. By involving others as you answer questions raised in these sections, your organization will strengthen its plan and give it a better chance of success.

**First examine the problem.** Start by exploring the situation that's motivating your organization to take action—what we call the problem. Use this book's discussion of the problem as a planning guide to help you formulate the questions to be answered

and identify data you'll need to gather and decipher.

It can take time to develop a full understanding of the situation. You may need to convene meetings, talk to people who are affected, conduct online research, read reports, and talk to experts. But this is time well spent. Until you understand the situation, its significance, and its causes, it's not possible to propose a solution.

### **Determine what change is possible.**

Once you understand the problem, you're ready to consider how you want that situation to change—what we call outcomes. For example, if the concern is the poor reading scores of students, the planning team will consider how much improvement you should aim for. Use this book's discussion of outcomes to guide your planning.

### **Decide how your organization will produce the desired change.**

When considering how much change is reasonable to expect, your planning team will naturally start thinking about what approaches can produce the change—what we call the methods. Use this book's discussion of methods to guide your planning.

It can be tempting to start the planning process by considering the methods your organization wishes to implement. Please don't. To produce change, the methods

must relate directly to the cause of the problem. So until you've defined the problem and have an understanding of why it exists, you're not in a position to propose an approach for correcting it.

The Grantsmanship Center Model isn't a magic formula. It's just an orderly way of organizing your thinking as you plan a program or an activity. Use this format to develop your plan. Then draw from the plan what's needed for any specific grant application.

## Some Basics

### Who should write a grant proposal?

Some organizations have a full-time “grants coordinator,” “director of development,” “planning director,” “federal aid specialist,” or the like. But most proposals are developed by a staff person who wears another hat (or two or three). Because planning and proposal writing are so tightly related, whoever writes the proposal should have access to the organization's decision-makers.

Whether working independently or as the head of a team, the lead proposal developer needs to act as a facilitator, bringing the concerns of the beneficiaries, the applicant organization, and the funding source into one coherent and logical plan. To do this well requires a high level of commitment from the organization—a commitment that's the first step toward achieving an effective program.

This format is primarily for program grants. Modifications are required in proposals for arts and culture, capital projects, strengthening agency infrastructure, general operating support, planning, or research. In the last chapter you'll find guidance on adapting this model for these other types of proposals. Since this model is the basic recipe upon which all variations are based, it's important to understand it first.

Team planning is essential, but team writing is difficult. Designate a lead writer. Assigning one person as the lead writer is the best way to end up with a smooth-reading proposal that's consistent in tone and voice and that uses terminology uniformly.

**Follow directions.** If the funder provides instructions, follow them. If you don't understand the instructions, ask for clarification. Failure to follow directions is the leading reason that proposals are not funded.

**Make it neat, clean, and easy to read.** No typographical errors should mar your final copy. Break up the text: nobody wants to look at a proposal that starts at the top of one page and goes on interminably, without paragraphs or some other breathing space.

If you use a very unusual format, perhaps to attract attention, you risk focusing too much attention on the form of the proposal instead of its content. If you depart from the norm, you had better do it well. One applicant submitted 1,000 proposals in a question-and-answer format, with questions in blue and answers in red, and received not a single response. Recipients probably thought it was a request for a campaign donation.

**Avoid jargon.** Proposal writing isn't an opportunity to demonstrate your mastery of bureaucratese. Even if the prospective funder seems addicted to jargon, use it only if you really must, and follow it with a clear definition of what you mean. Generalities won't do. For example, the person who is reviewing your “career education” proposal probably has his or her own understanding of what that term means. Tell the funder what you think it means. If a proposal declares teens are “at risk” and says no more, readers may wonder “at risk of what?” and “why?” You need to elaborate. For example, the teens are at risk of dropping out of school because they are frequently absent.

**Have an outsider read a draft.** To test the clarity of the writing, ask friends or family to read the proposal. Some of your best comments will come from people unfamiliar with your field, not operating with the same assumptions, and unaware of the jargon. Merely passing a proposal around your organization has limitations. Staff may think they know what you mean or may be less than critical because of your role (or theirs). Look for someone who genuinely wants to

understand your proposal; who is intelligent but not familiar with your organization or field; and who will give you honest feedback—someone like your grandmother.

**Be concise.** What is the proper length for a proposal? Just long enough for you to clearly communicate your message, but not long enough to produce a stupor. A ten-page proposal can leave readers hungering for more; a two-page proposal can still put them to sleep.

**Be positive.** Get yourself up for the task. Remember, you're offering the funder the opportunity to be part of an important, useful undertaking. Writing for grant support is not like writing home from college for money. You don't have to apologize. You're an applicant, not a supplicant. Don't beg!

**Don't blow your credibility.** Funders build their reputations by supporting winners, not losers, so don't call undue attention to past mistakes. Because few grantmakers want to provide an organization with its last grant on the road to oblivion, avoid statements like this:

.....  
*We are sure that you are aware of the sudden departure of our fiscal officer some three years ago and the subsequent investigations of this agency by the General Accounting Office that resulted in charges against three of our board members.*  
 .....

If your organization is just emerging from some kind of crisis, acknowledge that. But focus on the recovery—the positive changes taking place. Emphasize the promise and

excitement of what’s happening now and express confidence that steady forward momentum will continue.

**Avoid assumptions.** The astute reader finds any number of assumptions or unsupported claims in most grant proposals. Here are a few examples.

- The proposal includes almost no information about the applicant organization because the writer assumes the funder knows all about it.
- The proposal describes the national scope of the problem but fails to document its existence in the community to be served.
- The proposal presumes a cause-and-effect relationship but doesn’t back it up. For example, children from poor families are said to be at increased risk for failure in school, but no evidence is presented to show the relationship between poverty and school failure.
- The proposal declares that a program is unique but fails to show why.

Statements starting with “we believe” signal an assumption. Without solid evidence behind a statement, it won’t carry much weight. Replacing beliefs with evidence is a check on logic, results in a more coherent proposal, and shows the funder you know what you’re talking about. If you can’t support a statement, consider eliminating it.

Present enough evidence to support your position, and no more. Don’t overkill. Pages of tables, charts, and graphs will probably

not be read and too often fail to make the point. Cite sources of data in the body of the proposal and avoid footnotes. A proposal’s not a doctoral dissertation.

**Choose words wisely.** Language is powerful and its use in a proposal must be sensitive and respectful. Careless word selection can taint the proposal with hints of sexism, racism, or countless other “isms” even though none is meant. Are teens in the after-school program “young women” or “girls”? What terminology should you use for men returning to the community from jail?

**Make it human.** Quotes and stories express the feelings and experiences of the people your organization serves. They engage readers in a way that statistics and other hard data can’t. The story of how a problem affects a particular family makes hard data human. Include voices of real people telling how a problem or solution touches their lives.

**Balance.** This is an important concept in proposal writing. For example, during one week The Grantsmanship Center received an order for 2,000 reprints of its original *Program Planning & Proposal Writing* publication from the U.S. Department of Labor and another order for one reprint from a proposal writer who said:

••• *“I’m from a small town in New Hampshire working for the mayor. Last week City Hall burned to the ground and, what’s worse, my only copy of PP&PW went with it. Please send another copy immediately. I can’t manage without it.”*

The quote from the New Hampshire proposal writer has human interest, and the statistic of the 2,000-copy order from a large government agency shows respect for the publication and adds credibility on a grander scale.

Balance can mean balancing statistics and quotes. It can also mean including the opinions of clients along with those of noted experts. When you’re attuned to the concept of balance, your proposal will be better documented and more enjoyable to read.

## PROPOSAL PLANNING

- Include others
- Examine the problem
- Determine what change is possible
- Select methods for optimal results

## PROPOSAL BASICS

- Follow funder guidelines
- Make it easy & pleasant to read
- Avoid jargon
- Have an outsider read it
- Be concise
- Get “up” for the work
- Focus on the positive
- Avoid assumptions
- Choose words wisely
- Make it human
- Balance the content

# Private vs. Government Grantmakers

The importance of planning and the basic principles already covered apply to all grant proposals. That said, there are differences in working with private and corporate foundations and with government agencies. It’s crucial to understand these differences. The next two pages offer a quick side-by-side comparison of private and government grantmakers.

## PRIVATE AND CORPORATE FOUNDATIONS

**Importance of the written proposal varies.** The majority of private foundations don't employ staff, and most unstaffed foundations don't accept unsolicited proposals; many contribute only to preselected organizations. With unstaffed foundations, your organization's credibility and personal relationships with foundation trustees and friends are essential. Even when unstaffed foundations do request a written proposal, the quality of the relationship generally trumps the quality of the document.

Staffed private foundations and corporate foundations (which almost always have staff) are also more likely to make grants to organizations with which they have a relationship or have had prior contact—a meeting or referral. But no matter how you get their attention, these grantmakers expect a coherent proposal. Here, the quality of the written proposal carries considerable weight.

Because these funders tend to support organizations they know and trust, relationship building is crucial. Some people are better at this than others. The person who develops the proposal may not be the one to develop the contacts. Board members, administrators, or well-connected volunteers are prime candidates for building and nurturing relationships with funders.

**Proposal requirements.** The proposal requirements of private funders range from detailed application guidelines, specific forms, and strict deadlines all the way to no application guidelines and no deadlines at all.

Often you'll be asked to submit a letter, and for some funders this will be the only proposal you'll submit. Unless instructed otherwise, keep the letter between three and five pages and structure it according to The Grantsmanship Center Model described in this book. Be sure it addresses all specific questions asked by the funder and expresses your organization's full commitment to the program.

**Pre-proposal requirements.** Some private funders request a letter of interest, letter of intent, letter of inquiry, or other pre-proposal document as a screening device. Based on what you submit, they'll either request a full proposal or drop you from consideration. This is a competitive process—an elimination round. Use the same care you would when writing a full proposal and, in the absence of specific instructions, hold the letter to two or three pages and use The Grantsmanship Center Model to structure the content. This is your chance to convince the funder that a full proposal would be worth reviewing.

If the pre-proposal document requested by a funder is only a form, open formal communications with the funder by attaching a cover letter expressing your organization's commitment to the program. A full discussion of cover letters begins on page 182.

## GOVERNMENT FUNDERS

**Quality of the written proposal is critical.** Because government grant competitions are meant to be objective, personal or organizational relationships with government staff and elected officials are rarely essential, though they can be useful. With government funders, the proposal carries more weight than the relationship, and a proposal that strictly adheres to the guidelines is imperative.

Most government funders score proposals using a point system. The funder assigns points that can be earned in each section of the proposal and defines the criteria that reviewers will use to allocate those points. If the grant application guidelines don't include the points assigned to each section of the proposal or the scoring criteria, ask for that information. A section worth a lot of points is worth a lot of planning time. That said, it's foolhardy to neglect any section, even those that are assigned fewer points. Work to maximize your total score.

Sometimes, even a wonderful proposal doesn't get funded. If such factors as the geographic distribution of awards or the diversity of target groups are important to the funder, the highest score may not be the deciding factor. Nevertheless, to be in the running, a proposal must receive a high score. Exactly how high depends on the scores of competitors, the funds available, and how far the funds will stretch.

**Proposal requirements.** Not every private funder has a grant application form or specific proposal guidelines, but government funders have both in ample supply. The concepts included in The Grantsmanship Center Model are consistent with those of most government agencies, but the terms used and the order in which information is requested are often different. Don't substitute our model for the instructions of the funder. If you don't understand the instructions, call or email the funder's designated contact person. Don't guess. Government funders usually disqualify proposals that are incomplete, contain forms that are incorrectly filled out, or fail to follow the instructions exactly.

**Pre-proposal requirements.** Government funders are less likely than private funders to use pre-proposals as competitive screening devices. But it's not unusual for a government funder to ask for a letter of intent or a notice of intent to apply. This may be a letter of less than a page or even a form to sign and submit. Sometimes this submission is required for entering a funding competition. Usually, its purpose is to let funders know how many proposals to expect so they can begin organizing review panels.



# Summary

## The Proposal in a Nutshell

Put it before them briefly  
so they will read it,  
clearly so they will appreciate it,  
picturesquely so they will  
remember it, and above all,  
accurately so they will be  
guided by its light.

JOSEPH PULITZER

People who review grant proposals want to know up front what a proposal is about and how much money is involved. They don't want to have to plow through the entire document to find out what you're requesting. A concise, clearly written summary is your chance to make a good first impression.

**Put It First, Write It Last.** Don't write the summary until you've completed the proposal. This may seem backward, since the summary will appear at the beginning. But details such as budget figures and sources of outside support often change during the process of writing a proposal. Writing the summary last ensures that it's consistent with all other sections of the document.

**Keep it brief. Don't say too much.** If the summary begins to look like a mini-proposal, the reviewers may feel no need to read further. Limit the summary to a couple of paragraphs, half of a page at most.

# Importance of the Summary

**The summary may be all that is read.**

When applications are screened at the funder’s door, funders may use the summary to decide whether a proposal matches their criteria and priorities. It helps them determine whether the proposal is eligible and worth reviewing.

**The summary is your first chance to grab the reader’s attention.**

A crisp, interesting summary makes the reader want to learn more.

**It orients the reader.** It provides context for all other sections. It’s difficult to review

a proposal when wondering what the point is. A good summary frames the proposal, preparing the reviewer to understand your request.

**It tells how much money the applicant is requesting.** That way the funder doesn’t need to search the Budget Section to figure it out.

**It may be widely distributed.** Funders sometimes post the summaries of successful proposals on their websites.

**Summary**  
may also be called

.....

- abstract
- executive summary
- proposal overview
- proposal synopsis

# Contents of the Summary

Different funders have different requirements. Government agencies usually provide their own forms with specific instructions limiting the number of words or lines of type they’ll accept.

Some private funders require applicants to follow an exact format or to complete a cover sheet.

If a funder does not give specific instructions about what to put in the Summary Section, write one to three paragraphs that include:

- Identification of other organizations that will play major roles, if there are any.
- The time frame for the grant you are seeking. One year? Two? Longer?
- A brief outline of the budget: the amount requested from the funder, the resources others have promised to commit, and the total cost of the program. Make sure the numbers are consistent with the Budget Section later in the proposal.
- Identification of the applicant organization and a sentence or two about its credibility.
- A sentence or two explaining the issue, problem, or need motivating your request.
- A brief statement of the measurable outcomes you expect the program to produce.
- One or two sentences describing the methods you’ll use to achieve the outcomes.

## EXAMPLES: SUMMARY

Here's a not-so-good example.

### EXAMPLE 1: Building Responsible Citizens

*The long-range goal of this proposed program is to help students develop into adults who think creatively and independently, learn by observation, work together in inquiring teams, develop judgment and decision-making abilities and, most important, adults who can conceive of more satisfactory alternatives to social problems than passive acceptance or militant violence. In short, this program's aim is to help students to grow into adults who actively practice and participate in democratic citizenship.*

Not only does this summary leave out just about all of the basics, it's also an exercise in the use of rhetoric. We're not sure what they're going to do, but it feels like maybe we should salute it.

Here are two examples of good summaries that put it all together. Each is concise but thorough, and sets up the reader nicely for the proposal that will follow:

### EXAMPLE 2: Reentry House Program

*Reentry House is a residential program that helps people who have been in jail transition successfully back into the community. Since 1997, when Reentry House opened in Kettle, Texas, 80% of the 600 offenders who have participated have stayed out of jail. On average, state and national recidivism rates are much higher, with 50% of offenders committing another crime and returning to jail within a year.*

*Reentry House will open a new residential program in Laurel, Texas, where each year the state prison releases about 50 inmates into the community. This new program will serve 20 offenders per year and expects that approximately 15 of them will stay out of jail.*

*Reentry House has purchased a residence, is completing renovations, and has secured funds for furnishings. The program must now hire and train staff, prepare the residence, and finalize the financial systems that will sustain it. This final stage of start-up will cost \$150,000. Reentry House will contribute \$50,000 of that amount and requests a one-time grant of \$100,000 from the Caring Foundation.*



### EXAMPLE 3: Arts Alive

*Riverside Arts is a nonprofit organization in Cartwright, Utah, that offers a vibrant schedule of performances, exhibitions, and art education programs. Each year, approximately 10,000 people participate in Riverside Arts events and classes. The State Arts Council recognized Riverside Arts' exceptional commitment to the community last June with its annual Art Impact Award.*

*The National Endowment for the Arts has proven that children who participate in the arts are more likely to excel academically and develop positive skills and behaviors. While 75% of children from moderate- to high-income families in Cartwright are involved in the arts, only 10% of children from low-income families have that advantage. To benefit more low-income children, Riverside Arts will establish Arts Alive. This program will engage and educate 1,500 children from our city's low-income neighborhoods over the course of three years.*

*The cost of Arts Alive will be \$600,000 (\$200,000 per year). An amount of \$354,000 has already been committed: \$225,000 from the State Arts Council, \$105,000 from local businesses, and \$24,000 in administrative services from Riverside Arts. This proposal requests \$82,000 a year for three years—for a total of \$246,000.*



## CHECKLIST: SUMMARY

- 1. Is at the beginning of the proposal.
- 2. Identifies the applicant.
- 3. Includes at least one sentence establishing applicant's credibility.
- 4. Describes the problem that is compelling the applicant organization to submit a grant proposal.
- 5. Defines the measurable outcomes that the program is expected to produce.
- 6. Provides an overview of the methods to be used.
- 7. Identifies major partners, if any.
- 8. Specifies the requested funding period.
- 9. Includes a budget synopsis stating:
  - a. dollars requested from funder
  - b. cash and in-kind resources contributed by others, if any
  - c. total cost of the program.
- 10. Is brief—one to three paragraphs, half of a page at most.
- 11. Is written last.



# Index

## A

Accuracy, of budget, 152  
 Activity, components of, 84  
 Administrative overhead, 165–166, 176  
 Annual fund appeals, 139  
 Appearance of proposal, 6–7  
 Arts and culture proposals, 191–192  
 Assumptions, avoiding, 8  
 Attachments, 184–185  
 Awards, 29  
 Awareness, as outcome, 69–70

## B

Balance, 8–9  
 Baseline, for evaluation, 117–118, 135  
 Beneficiaries  
   focusing on, 44  
   in Introduction Section, 28  
   involving, 45  
   in Methods Section, 83–84  
 Board of directors  
   commitment of, 143  
   in Introduction Section, 27, 31  
 Budget  
   accuracy and completeness of, 152  
   correlating with methods, 89  
   itemizing, 152–153  
   keeping real, 153  
   review of, 154  
   syncing with narrative, 152  
 Budget narrative, 152, 176  
 Budget Section, 14, 15, 149–177  
 Budget summary, 156, 157, 176  
 Business ventures, 141

## C

Capacity-building proposals, 192–195  
 Capacity of organization, matching to problem, 45

Capital project proposals, 195–198  
 Cash contributions, 176  
 Causes of situation, in Problem Section, 43  
 Change magnitude promised, 67  
 Checklists  
   for Budget Section, 177  
   for Evaluation Section, 135  
   for future support, 147  
   for Introduction Section, 39  
   for Methods Section, 111  
   for Outcomes Section, 79  
   for Problem Section, 59  
   for Summary Section, 23  
 Client fees, for earned income, 140  
 Collaborative programs  
   budgets for, 155  
   collaborator adoption of program after  
     grant period and, 142  
   in Introduction Section, 28, 31, 32  
   in Methods Section, 85–87  
 Color, 181  
 Community leaders, connecting with, 144  
 Community support, 30, 31  
 Conciseness, 7  
 Confidentiality, evaluation and, 124–125  
 Consultants. *See* Contractors  
 Contractors  
   as evaluators, 121–122, 135  
   expenses for, 162  
   IRS criteria for, 162  
 Corporate foundations, 10, 154  
 Cost-benefit analysis, 120  
 Cost-effectiveness, 120  
 Cover letters, 182–183

- Credibility  
 establishing, 28–29, 30, 31, 114  
 guarding, 7–8
- D**
- Data. See also Hard data; Soft data  
 defined, 135
- Data analysis, for evaluation, 119–120
- Data collection, for evaluation, 118–119
- Deadlines, 187–188
- Delayed outcomes, 71
- Demonstration programs, 89–90
- Detailed line-item budgets, 156–157, 176
- Direct expenses, 161–164, 176
- Documentation, for budget, 159
- E**
- Earned income, 140–141
- Electronic submissions, 186–187
- Endowment, 140
- Equipment  
 expenses for, 163  
 in Methods Section, 88
- Estimates, for budget, 153
- Ethics, of evaluation, 124
- Evaluation instruments/tools, 135
- Evaluation results, 29
- Evaluation Section, 14, 15, 113–135
- Expenses, 161–166  
 direct, 161–164, 176  
 indirect, 165–166, 176
- F**
- Facilities  
 expenses, 162  
 in Methods Section, 88
- Federated fundraising, 141
- Fees  
 client, 140  
 membership, 139
- Finances, 30
- Fonts, 180
- Formatting the proposal, 7, 180–181
- Founders, 31
- Fringe benefits, 161–162
- Full funding, 188–189
- Full-time equivalents (FTEs), 176
- Fund development programs, 139–140
- Funders  
 developing relationships with, 144  
 evaluations conducted by, 123  
 government. See Government funders  
 private and corporate foundations as, 10, 154
- Funding sources, 30, 31
- Future support, 137–147  
 documenting commitments for, 142–143
- Future Support Section, 14, 15
- G**
- General operating proposals, 198–199
- Gifts  
 major, 139  
 planned, 140
- Goals, outcomes vs., 68
- Government funders, 11, 141  
 budget guidelines from, 154  
 electronic submissions for, 186–187  
 forms required by, 185  
 indirect expenses and, 165–166  
 reviewing unfunded proposals with, 189–190
- Grant hopping, 142
- Grant proposals  
 responsibility for writing, 6
- Grantsmanship, defined, 1
- The Grantsmanship Center Model, 4, 13–15  
 adapting for specific types of  
 organizations, 191–206
- "Grant writers," 208
- Graphic elements, 181
- H**
- Hardcopy submissions, 186
- Hard data  
 for evaluation, 120–121  
 in Problem Section, 46–49
- Hard match, 159–160
- History of organization, in Introduction Section, 27
- I**
- Implementation grants, 200
- Indicators, 135
- Indirect expenses, 165–166, 176
- In-house evaluation, 122–123
- In-kind resources, 155, 158, 162, 163, 176
- Introduction Section, 14, 15, 25–39
- J**
- Jargon, avoiding, 7
- K**
- Kiritz, Norton, xii, 4, 207, 213–214
- L**
- Leadership, commitment of, 143
- Letters of commitment, 86–87
- Line items, 150
- Logic models, 90–91
- M**
- Major gifts, 139
- Managers, involving in budget planning, 152
- Matching resources, 159–160, 176
- Membership fees, 139
- Memoranda of understanding (MOUs), 86
- Merchandise, sale of, 140
- Methods  
 correlating with budget, 89  
 lack of, problem vs., 50–52  
 outcomes vs., 63–64
- Methods Section, 5, 14, 15, 81–111
- Mission  
 alignment with problem, 44  
 in Introduction Section, 27
- Model programs, 89–90
- Motivation for action, in Problem Section, 43
- N**
- Name of organization, 32
- Negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, 176
- New organizations, establishing credibility of, 31
- Normed instruments, 135
- O**
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB)  
 circulars, 154–155
- Outcome evaluation, 115
- Outcomes  
 awareness as, 69–70  
 delayed, 71  
 goals vs., 68  
 methods vs., 63–64  
 statements of, 65
- Outcomes Section, 5, 14, 15, 61–79
- Output, quantifying, 84–85
- Overhead expense, 165–166, 176
- Overview, in Methods Section, 82
- P**
- Packaging, 181
- Page limits, 180
- Partial funding, 189
- Participants, sensitivity to, evaluation and, 125
- Per diem, 163
- Personnel expenses, 161–162
- Pictures, 185
- Pilot programs, 89–90
- Plan B, 89
- Planned gifts, 140
- Planning  
 of budget, 150–151, 153  
 of proposal, 4, 5–6, 9
- Planning grants, 200–203
- Positive approach, 7, 62
- Pre/post test, 135

Prevention programs, 71  
Private foundations, 10, 154  
Problem  
    cause of problem vs., 52  
    documenting in local community, 44–45  
    lack of method vs., 50–52  
Problem Section, 5, 14, 15, 41–59  
Process evaluation, 115, 116  
Programs  
    in Introduction Section, 28, 31  
    reasons for evaluating, 114  
Proofreading, 181  
Proven approaches, terminology for, 83  
Public funding. See Government funders  
Public relations, to gain future funding, 143

## Q

Quotes, 8, 29

## R

Rationale, in Methods Section, 82  
Referring agencies, 29  
Rejected proposals, 189–190  
Reliable instruments, 135  
Research proposals, 203–206

## Resources

    in budget, 158–160  
    matching, 159–160  
Revenues, in budget, 158–160

Review, by outsiders, 7

## S

Sales, for earned income, 140  
Self-funding, for time beyond grant period, 139  
Service area, in Introduction Section, 28  
Significance of situation, in Problem Section, 43  
Size of organization, in Introduction Section, 27  
SMART outcomes, 66

## Soft data

    for evaluation, 120–121  
    in Problem Section, 46–49

Soft match, 159–160  
Special events, as fundraisers, 140  
Spreadsheets, working, 151  
Staff expertise, 29  
Staffing, in Methods Section, 87  
Standardized instruments, 135  
Stories, 8, 29  
Structure of organization, in Introduction Section, 28  
Subgrants, 155, 176  
Submitting proposals, 186–188  
Summary Section, 14, 15, 17–23  
Supplies  
    expenses for, 163  
    in Methods Section, 88  
Support letters, 185

## T

Team writing, 6  
Third-party evaluators, 121–122, 135  
Third-party payments, 141  
Timelines, 88  
Travel expenses, 163

## U

Unfunded proposals, 189–190

## V

Valid instruments, defined, 135  
Vision, in Introduction Section, 27

## Volunteers

    in budget, 158–159  
    in Methods Section, 87

## W

Web presence, 32  
Word choice, 8  
Working spreadsheets, 151