



The Hestia Fund

Introduction

The Hestia Fund (HF), a women's giving circle based in Massachusetts, was formed in January 2000. By the spring of 2002, HF had recruited over 40 members and had given away more than \$300,000 in grants to a wide range of after school programs in the Boston area. However, HF was not a private foundation, nor was it even a formal 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization. It was a "pass-through" grant-making organization that liquidated all of its funds each year to provide grants to nonprofits. Eschewing foundation boardrooms for living rooms, this women's giving circle provided its members with an alternative model of charitable giving, one that emphasized learning, due diligence, and collective decision making.

Named after the Greek goddess of the hearth, Hestia, HF was the brainchild of philanthropist Susan Priem, who searched in the late 1990s for a charitable giving vehicle that could accommodate her twin goals of increasing her own giving and educating women about the importance of strategic philanthropy. According to Priem, the focus on educating women about strategic giving was a primary driver:

I wanted to really encourage women to learn to be philanthropic and to be comfortable with it. I believe that women are the next generation of philanthropists; that was my real thrust.

She was intrigued by the concept of giving circles, defined as "groups of individuals who pool their charitable gifts to fund projects that improve the quality of life in their communities,"¹ and decided to start her own giving circle with nine of her friends, each of whom anteed up \$5,000 to

¹ Shaw-Hardy, Sondra. *Creating a Women's Giving Circle: A Handbook*. Women's Philanthropy Institute. Madison: Women's Philanthropy Institute, 2000, p. 4.

This case was written by Roy Ahn, Research Assistant, for Christine Letts, Rita E. Hauser Lecturer in the Practice of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership and Associate Director of the Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Funding was provided by the Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations. (0403) Revised October 2003.

Copyright © 2003 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. No part of this publication may be reproduced, revised, translated, stored in a retrieval system, used in a spreadsheet, or transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise) without the written permission of the Case Program. For orders and copyright permission information, please visit our website at www.ksgcase.harvard.edu or send a written request to Case Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 79 John F. Kennedy Street, Cambridge, MA 02138

form the initial funding pool for grants and agreed to a three-year commitment totaling \$15,000. Though an experienced fundraiser and head of her own small family foundation, Priem was a newcomer to giving circles, and did not have any preconceived ideas of how HF should be run. She and the other HF members would make several important strategic decisions during the evolution of the giving circle: the circle would have no by-laws or external governing board, key decisions would be made via group consensus—rather than voting—and nearly all of the work of the circle would be conducted by its members, who were volunteers. These and other strategic decisions had significant implications for the organization in terms of its development, and also for Priem’s ability to meet her original philanthropic goals. Over time, HF experienced a tremendous expansion in its membership as well as its financial resources. By 2002, HF carved a niche for itself within Greater Boston’s philanthropic community as a small-scale funder of children’s after school programs, with individual grants of generally \$25,000 or less.

HF’s evolution, however, would also be accompanied by questions about its future long-range goals, its grant-making foci, its membership, and its sustainability as an informal and small giving circle. Would growth serve as a catalyst or constraint for the organization? How could an informal organization ensure sustainability in membership as well as leadership? Would the giving circle continue to be an appropriate philanthropic vehicle, in terms of strategic fit, for Priem?

Susan Priem

A giving circle appeared to be well suited for Susan Priem, who had spent most of her adult life mobilizing and managing people. After a career working in the airline industry, she worked in fundraising for arts and culture organizations in New York. She served as president of the New York Opera Guild, and in her own words, was “always fundraising and managing volunteers who fundraise.” She was a trustee of the Cape Museum of Fine Arts on Cape Cod.² In 1993, when she and her husband moved to Boston, Priem returned to school—first to complete an undergraduate degree at Regis College, then to complete a mid-career Master of Public Administration program at Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government (KSG). Following her graduation from KSG in 1998, Priem turned her attention to managing the small family foundation that she and her husband had founded. They agreed to try to increase their own giving while educating others about the importance of philanthropy. Initially, Priem had the idea of collaborating with other private foundations in the Boston area to increase the impact of her giving, but this synergy failed to materialize:

Maybe I didn’t know enough to be organizing it at that time, and a lot of people with small foundations did not want to disclose what they did.

² Milton, Susan. “Venture Philanthropy Idea Comes Full Circle.” *Cape Cod Times*, October 9, 2000.

But the idea of collaborating with other donors stayed with her, and once she learned about giving circles, she decided to start a small one of her own in 1999. Though she had no experience being a member of or leading a giving circle, the idea seemed simple enough to Priem: bring together other like-minded women and pool their money and ideas to increase the impact of their giving, all the while learning to become more strategic in their philanthropy. Her goals were to raise \$100,000 and recruit 20 women for the first year of the giving circle. She says:

I had never been entrepreneurial before. But it seemed that I could gather 10 people, and that I should have a goal of 20 [women] for the first year.

HF originally comprised Priem and nine other women. In the beginning, Priem asked friends within her extended social network to join and help launch the circle. As Linda Nelson, HF treasurer and founding member, recalls about joining the circle:

Susan called and asked. She's such a friend and good person, and it was purely on the basis of that, supporting something that she was going to get started.

Nelson had a lengthy professional career in communications before joining the circle, first as a speech drama teacher, then as a television reporter in Colorado, and finally as a communications consultant. Nelson regards the "4-H" and her family as early inspirations for her own philanthropy, and adds that HF is "a small piece of what my family—my husband and I—give away."

Priem asked each member to recruit new women from her own social circle until HF reached its first year goal of attracting 20 women. Recruitment was exclusively word-of-mouth. The women in the circle were generally affluent, white, and from Greater Boston. Some had professional careers (a media consultant, a Harvard Business School professor, among others), and some had experience in philanthropy and/or nonprofit board experience. However, early on, recruitment was a challenge. Priem recalls one conversation:

I remember one of the women saying to me, 'How did you know to do this?' and I said, 'It's called flying by the seat of my pants, and she said, 'Oh no!' and I said, 'Oh yes!' But I had a basic plan, how many women, how much money, what a giving circle was. ... I knew how it was going to end up to some degree, and that it [the giving circle] would work, or else I wouldn't have done it.

Mission and Goals

The initial HF meetings, which were held in Priem's home, were brainstorming sessions on the mission and goals of the giving circle. It was clear that Priem wanted to create a democratic

One time permission to reproduce granted by the Case Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University on 2010-05-26

environment for the group rather than imposing her own ideas and values on the organization. Acting as facilitator, she allowed the group to discuss and develop its own program areas for funding. There was no *a priori* set of social causes: “Whatever focus and mission the women came up with would be my focus,” Priem recalls. In the spirit of learning and cooperation, Hestia members initially nominated 20 potential funding areas and then began eliminating areas, until they chose a single funding area. For much of the spring of 2000, members researched potential funding areas, even bringing in guest speakers from nearby Harvard University to brief them on pressing social policy issues.

By May 2000, the group, which had 15 members at the time, approved the mission statement that had been drafted and revised by two HF members.³

The mission of the Hestia Fund is to positively impact the lives of low-income women and their children living in Massachusetts. Through our involvement with philanthropically minded women, we seek to find causes that share our vision.⁴

See Appendix F for “Hestia Fund 2001 Annual Report.”

Consistent with the mission statement, HF members approved a set of organizational goals:

- To educate ourselves about grant making.
- To increase the number of women in philanthropy.
- Make grants totaling \$100,000 in our first year.⁵

HF members also felt strongly about selecting program areas and funding programs where they could make the greatest measurable impact on their intended beneficiaries. Priem, in particular, was a proponent of strategic giving, having spoken to Social Venture Partners in Seattle and other giving circles during the startup phase of HF. The group winnowed down possible funding areas within “low-income women and their children living in Massachusetts”⁶ to three finalists: “scholarship [f]und for [h]igh [s]chool students,” “[m]entoring/[e]ducation/[c]hildren [m]entoring [c]hildren,” and “[a]fter school” programs.⁷ Research “task forces”—four HF members in each task force—then contacted thought leaders and practitioners in each of these three fields to

³ Nelson, Linda. “History of Hestia.” Hestia Fund, Boston.

⁴ Hestia Fund. “Hestia Fund 2001 Annual Report.” Hestia Fund, Boston.

⁵ Block quote above from Hestia Fund. “Giving Circle Minutes.” Hestia Fund, Boston. May 2, 2000, p. 1.

⁶ Hestia Fund, “Hestia Fund 2001 Annual Report.”

⁷ Hestia Fund. “Giving Circle Minutes, May 2, 2000.” Hestia Fund, Boston. May 9, 2000, pp. 2-3.

One time permission to reproduce granted by the Case Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University on 2010-05-26

determine what the funding needs were.⁸ At the June 2000 HF meeting, the membership chose children’s after school programs as its main focus, noting that these programs “... appeared to have significant and well-defined need and to be an area in which the group could see making a perceivable impact.”⁹ The group reasoned that mentoring programs—one of the other finalists—could be subsumed under the umbrella of after school programs.¹⁰ The group also decided that HF would only fund nonprofits that worked in Massachusetts. Later that year, HF further restricted its funding to the metropolitan Boston area.¹¹

The discussions about HF’s funding focus suggested that the members were not looking to duplicate the efforts of larger established foundations. Instead, members wanted to take a more entrepreneurial approach to grant making. During the June meeting, HF members began sketching out a skeleton for the development of formal funding criteria:

- a. Seeking out programs/organizations that are more risky/innovative.
- b. Seeking out programs that have a difficult time obtaining funding because they are too small or simply haven’t yet built up the appropriate infrastructure.
- c. Trying to identify opportunities to broker relationships between quality programs and linking complementary organizations.
- d. Seeking out programs that serve low-income children and families in a holistic fashion—serving both the children and the parents—and that are integrated into the community.
- e. Identifying programs that have strong leadership and with whom the Giving Circle would like to work.¹²

Financial Structure

By May 2000, the structure of HF emerged. The idea was to start the organization modestly, and then grow the organization incrementally. From a financial standpoint, the group decided that each member would contribute \$5,000 annually and commit to HF for three years. Priem notes that the concept of equal vesting by each member—\$5,000—was a way of “encourag[ing] equality” and “discourag[ing] some women from having more of a say than others.” The multi-year commitment was seen as important for two reasons:

⁸ Hestia Fund, “Giving Circle Minutes, May 2, 2000,” pp. 2-3.
⁹ Hestia Fund. “Giving Circle Minutes, June 6, 2000.” Hestia Fund, Boston, June 25, 2000.
¹⁰ Hestia Fund, “Giving Circle Minutes, June 6, 2000.”
¹¹ Nelson, Linda, “History of Hestia.”
¹² Block quote above from Hestia Fund, “Giving Circle Minutes, June 6, 2000.”

- (1) The women could take a longer range view of their funding options; and
- (2) Only then could the organization begin to see some evidence of impact.

For many of the women, the annual financial commitment represented only a small fraction of their overall charitable giving. “We started off with 20 women and \$100,000, and it was always Susan’s goal to grow. We knew that from the beginning,” observes Nelson. The \$100,000 was earmarked for grants only. Priem personally offered to underwrite the operating costs of HF for the first year—staff, postage, office rent, telephone, etc.

Another structural question was, “Where should HF house the money?” In general, giving circles have several options in terms of where they can place their money—e.g., placing their money in “a joint bank account” or by “creat[ing] a public foundation.”¹³ After mulling over the options, the group opted to house the \$100,000 in an account at the Fleet Charitable Gift Fund, a 501(c)(3) charitable organization that manages and disburses monies on behalf of HF. The gift fund account allowed HF members to deduct their \$5,000 contributions, and also gave HF the time to decide which charities to support. Fleet offered to waive its standard fee, “1.25 percent on the funds deposited,”¹⁴ for the first year. About her decision to place the funds in the gift fund rather than create a separate 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization, Priem says:

My attitude was always, ‘Why do anything until it makes sense to do it?’
 What we did was that we took our money and had a 501(c)(3)
 organization house our money.

As for the decision to go with Fleet, Priem observes, “I bank there, and I knew them already.” Because the giving circle was a “pass-through” organization, Priem says the money was invested in conservative money market funds rather than in “high risk stocks.” Treasurer Nelson calls the investment decision “fortunate” given the downturn of the stock market in 2001.

Decision-Making Processes

From the outset, there was some question about how the work of the giving circle would be done. Because it was not formally a nonprofit organization, HF had no board of directors or trustees to steward the organization. While Priem assumed the titles of founder and chair, she did not necessarily envision a traditional, top-down structure for HF. After all, the members of HF were volunteers. Some had careers and all had other obligations besides HF. Initially, the ties that bound the women to HF—and each other—were social rather than contractual.

¹³ Giving New England and Jones, Marianne. “Giving Circle Starter Kit.” Giving New England, Boston. 2000, p. 2.
¹⁴ Hestia Fund, “Giving Circle Minutes, June 6, 2000.”

Nelson describes the Hestia Fund culture as “friendly and comfortable” with a “home” feeling. There was a general resistance to making HF too formal. During the first year, the members *literally* sat in chairs that formed a circle in the living room of a member, seven times a year, two hours per meeting, and switching meetings to a more formal location did not make sense at the time. The group decided not to have organizational by-laws. Also, the group agreed to make organizational decisions by consensus rather than by voting. Each member was given the opportunity to voice her opinion on any particular issue. Recalls Nelson:

That was a vision of Susan’s. That for as long as we could, we would move through with a mutual trust and come to consensus.

Priem adds:

I think that there is a realization that, ‘Hey, we’re a women’s group, first of all.’ Consensus seems to be a women’s thing. We make decisions differently. Anybody can meet at an institution. ... I am kind of thrilled that people are happy [meeting] in homes. We are not a corporate board or museum board.

Once the philanthropic and financial goals were agreed upon, Priem began planning the myriad tasks of the group: managing finances, conducting due diligence on after school programs in Boston, organizing meetings and guest speakers, making and managing grants, among other tasks. It was apparent to Priem that forming committees made the most sense for dividing up both the work and the members. A finance committee was formed to handle operational expenses, to invest HF’s money, and to collect contributions from members; a membership committee was formed to handle recruitment and orientation of new members; and a grants committee was proposed to help screen grant applications and to select grantees. Each HF member was also expected to conduct site visits of after school programs in Boston in order to:

- (a) Assess the needs of organizations; and
- (b) Improve HF’s own understanding of after school programs.

In anticipation of the workload, Priem hired Adria Goodson—HF’s only paid staff member—as HF’s program manager in May 2000. Goodson’s hiring, which Priem says “was probably the smartest thing I did,” appeared to be a good fit. Goodson was a doctoral student in sociology at Boston College studying after school programs as part of her dissertation, and she also had over 10 years of nonprofit and for profit work experience. Over time, she became a hub for the various committees, managing the flow of information among committee members.

Funding Focus

At the September 2000 meeting, Priem announced that HF had met its goals of recruiting 20 members and securing a grant-making budget of \$100,000. Furthermore, she announced that the goal for the next year would be to double HF’s membership and money: 40 members and a grant-making budget of \$200,000.

The attention of the group turned to further refining its funding focus in the fall of 2000. In September, the group invited Michelle “Micki” Seligson, a member of Boston Mayor Tom Menino’s Task Force on After School Time, to speak to them about the state of after school programs in Massachusetts. Seligson noted that there were two competing views on after school programs. Some were geared towards improving children’s academic performance, while others were multidimensional and took a “developmental approach”—“emotional, social, moral and spiritual, cognitive, and physical development.”¹⁵ After a lively discussion, HF members decided to focus on the latter, identifying multi-dimensional after school programs in Greater Boston as its primary funding focus and niche. Furthermore, the group favored funding a small number of grants—less than five—for larger dollar amounts, rather than funding many organizations for smaller amounts of money. They reasoned that larger grants could have greater impact. Margot Trotter Davis, grants committee member, recalls:

The number of ideas was incredible, and it was a discussion about how we felt and where we felt we could make impact. What needs are out there? What seems to jibe with us as women? What do we know? How can we support programs that really need some extra help that aren’t getting it elsewhere?

In the fall of 2000, HF members met with after school leaders and conducted their own site visits of potential grantees. The site visits gave HF members a first-hand view of after school programs in action, and the subsequent write-ups were an important part of the decision-making process for selecting grantees. However, the process was not entirely smooth the first year. Some members had experience conducting site visits, while others did not. Consequently, some write-ups did not include organization’s budget numbers. Some site visit reports contained qualitative narratives about the merits of the organization, while other reports did not. By Thanksgiving, HF developed a list of 21 potential grantees in the after school field.

Although Priem had set a goal of granting the \$100,000 by the end of the 2000 calendar year, it was clear that the group needed more time to arrive at its funding decisions. Rather than rushing the process, she and the group postponed giving out grants until the spring of 2001 to ensure that grant-making decisions were made in a thoughtful and deliberate fashion.

¹⁵ Hestia Fund. “The Hestia Fund Minutes for September 19, 2000, Meeting.” Hestia Fund, Boston.

Grant Making: Multi-Step Process

While individual HF members participated in identifying the 21 potential grantees, the locus of responsibility for grant making ultimately fell on the shoulders of the grants committee. According to Priem, the entire group “empowered” the grants committee to screen candidates and develop a final list of grantees. Essentially, the committee was given full autonomy in making funding decisions on behalf of the group. The eight-member committee, which was chaired by Diana Barrett, a senior lecturer at the Harvard Business School, comprised women with varying experience in philanthropy and/or nonprofits. In addition, a strategic giving consultant was brought in to participate in the grants review meetings.

To screen potential grantees, the committee met twice between December 2000 and January 2001. In the spirit of collaboration, each grants committee member was allowed to have a say on each applicant until a consensus among the committee was reached on a final list of candidates. The committee developed a set of funding criteria—see Appendix B—that was used to “rate” programs along the following domains: “Mission, Program Structure, Program Quality, Evaluation, and Diverse Portfolio.”¹⁶ Specifically, one committee member had previously suggested that “a diverse portfolio of grants that reflected different interests and levels of participation from THF members” be used as a formal funding criterion.¹⁷ The committee developed this screening process, including the funding criteria, to guard against potential biases in the process— e.g., members lobbying to have their favorite organizations funded. And despite the fact that each woman’s annual financial contribution to HF was the same—\$5,000—the potential remained for the grant-making process to rankle one or two members in the group. Grants committee member Trotter Davis observes:

... [T]here are some members of Hestia that we have who have their own family foundations or do a huge amount of private philanthropy, and have requested [that we] fund their pet programs. I call them pet programs. They wouldn’t call them pet programs, because there is a good reason why they are supporting those programs, and I respect that. But that is really an ongoing tension when all is said and done and grants are made. People sit back and they say to themselves or verbalize, ‘Why wasn’t my program funded?’ ‘Why didn’t Hestia feel that this certain program didn’t deserve our money?’ There really is tension around that.

In January 2001, the grants committee returned to the full membership with a list of six final grant candidates. The next step of the grant-making process was to ask these final candidates to submit formal proposals to HF that specified the need and nature of the funding request. Each

¹⁶ Hestia Fund. “The Hestia Fund Monthly Meeting Minutes, January 23, 2001.” Hestia Fund, Boston. February 1, 2001, p. 2.

¹⁷ Hestia Fund, “The Hestia Fund Minutes for September 19, 2000, Meeting.”

One time permission to reproduce granted by the Case Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University on 2010-05-26

grants committee member, along with one or more general HF members, was assigned to work with a finalist to help the organization put together its grant proposal for the committee’s review. At this juncture, the finalists, barring a major problem with their proposals, had a strong probability of receiving funding. Trotter Davis says about the final proposals: “ ... [U]nless it’s way off base, we are going to fund [the organization].” Priem notes, however, that the committee ultimately did not award a grant to one of the six finalists, because it had failed to provide HF with enough information about its program to be considered for funding.

In April 2001, 16 months after its formation, HF announced its first grants in the living room of one of its members:

- G-Row [a girl’s rowing program in Boston] to receive \$27,000 for a new rowing coach.
- Nativity Prep [a Boston school] to receive \$25,000 for new sports uniforms, a new nutrition program and photography equipment.
- Federated [Dorchester Neighborhood Houses, a Boston nonprofit] to receive \$17,500 to launch its new horticultural program next September.
- U.S.E.S. [United South End Settlement Houses, a Boston nonprofit] to receive \$17,500 to support field trips in its maritime curriculum and new computers.
- Arts in Progress [a Boston arts program] to receive \$17,500 to support their teen after-school arts initiative.¹⁸

Priem suggests that, as a group, the grantees for the first year were relatively low risk in the sense that all of them were established organizations—none was a start-up organization.

At the first Hestia Fund Annual Meeting in May 2001, members generally expressed satisfaction with the first year’s accomplishments, citing benefits of membership, such as:

- The power of working with other ‘like-minded’ women who care about their community.
- Working with proactive versus reactive people.
- Learning about and beginning to take control and understand the process of philanthropy.

¹⁸ Block quote above from Priem, Susan. Memorandum to Hestia Fund members, Boston. April 4, 2001.

- Being able to have more impact through working collectively and leveraging resources.
- Working with an organization that is still new and in formation.
- Developing friendships and learning from one another.¹⁹

Growth in the Offing

Amid the excitement of having just completed its first grants cycle and fiscal year—April 2000 to April 2001—Priem and HF had major structural decisions to contend with heading into the summer break. The group was literally outgrowing the office that had been set up in Priem’s home. HF was moving rapidly toward its goals of securing 40 members and a grant-making budget of \$200,000. HF was becoming visible as a funder in the Boston after school program community. The operating budget for Year Two—April 2001 to April 2002—was projected to be \$19,600.²⁰ Furthermore, the group needed to plan for the longer term—beyond the initial three-year commitment of Priem and the other founding members.

Planning for Year Two

Covering the operating costs of HF could be handled two ways:

- (1) Creating a separate operating fund for HF, paid for by member dues; or
- (2) Soliciting donations from members to pay for operating costs.²¹

Ultimately, the group decided on member dues, \$500 per member annually, to cover the operating costs: Goodson’s part-time salary, office rent, office supplies, mailing costs, funds for a philanthropy consultant if needed, and fees for development of a Hestia logo. According to Priem, at no time did the group consider using a portion of the grant-making pool of money to underwrite its operations. She had paid HF’s operating costs out-of-pocket during the first year. Because the group had insisted that all money be passed through to the grantees each year, member dues were deemed the most appropriate solution for paying for operating costs.

In order to mitigate the daily bookkeeping hassles associated with administration, HF partnered with Associated Grant Makers (AGM), a grant makers’ association based in New England, to handle HF’s operating funds. Treasurer Nelson recalls about the arrangement:

¹⁹ Block quote above from Hestia Fund. “Hestia Fund First Annual Meeting Summary, May 9, 2001.” Hestia Fund, Boston.

²⁰ Hestia Fund. “The Hestia Fund Minutes, March 27, 2001.” Hestia Fund, Boston. April 4, 2001, p. 2.

²¹ Hestia Fund. “The Hestia Fund Minutes, February 20, 2001.” Hestia Fund, Boston. February 27, 2001.

Each Hestia member sends \$500 to AGM in the late spring, early summer. That 'pot' becomes our operating expenses account. Hestia itself has no checking account.

AGM charges us only the interest that is earned on the active account. That's probably not even five percent. AGM is a 501(c)(3), so every Hestia member gets to take a tax deduction for her \$500 contribution.

HF moved its offices outside of Priem's home and into a second floor commercial office in the heart of Beacon Hill. HF hired a graphic designer to develop a logo—a stylized facial profile of the goddess Hestia—that adorned the masthead of the organization's stationery. The organization began to take on a more professional look, and as HF headed into its second year of grant making, Priem paused to think about what needed to be done to secure the future of the organization. She recalls:

I was sort of running everything in the first year and part of the second year. It occurred to me that Hestia has to have a succession plan. For Year Two, I selected a steering committee, and we decided to meet in the summer of 2001—a year and a half into the fund—and our goal was long range planning.

Priem selected five members to join her on the steering committee, and the committee met three times during the summer. Because HF did not have an external governing body or formal organizational by-laws, the steering committee, in effect, served as a proxy governing board for Hestia. Because Priem's term as chair of HF was going to end in 2003, the steering committee decided that developing a succession plan of leadership was the most critical long-term issue for HF.

These meetings led to a leadership structure that comprised a chair and vice chair of HF. Under this structure, the chair and vice chair would both serve one-year terms. The plan provided for Priem to have a vice chair for 2002-03. The vice chair would assume Priem's chair in 2003. According to Priem, the committee developed the vice chair position in order to share some of the chair's responsibilities, but also for another critical reason: "I thought it was now important to have a partner. The group respects shared leadership."

Three formal committees conducted the work of the organization: steering, membership, and grants. Heading into the fall of 2001, replete with new members, the steering committee knew the challenges ahead, namely issues related to the organization's growth—in size, diversity, grant-making foci, and professionalization. The committee presented its "SWOT" analysis of the organization to the full membership in September:

- Strengths: people kept their promises; the mission statement; and the annual meeting.

- Weaknesses: [m]ission could be limiting; lack of succession plan; and lack of knowledge about population we are funding.
- Opportunities: to enhance relationships with grantees.
- Threats: [l]arger size could destabilize Hestia; [l]oss of start-up energy.²²

Heightened Expectations

Expectations were high for the second fiscal year of the Hestia Fund. By November 2001, HF reached its ceiling of 40 members, and the new members held strong opinions about how the organization should be run. At issue was how the organization could continue to flourish as a friendly, informal women’s giving circle where women spent time getting to know one another while fulfilling its mission of being a strategic, impact-focused philanthropy. Cassandra Gordon, a travel writer who joined HF in the fall of 2001 and would serve on the grants committee, recalls:

Of the new members that have come in this year, I would say that a lot of them are savvy but younger. In other words they are a little more open minded and innovative and also are professional. They have careers themselves and are young mothers.

We are starting to get that. Before, the group ran from late 40s to early 60s, and now people are in their early 40s.

Gordon, a neighbor of Priem’s, had no formal background or experience in philanthropy when she joined HF. In addition to her friendship with Priem, Gordon says that the potential to see her money make an impact was a motivation for joining HF:

If I were to walk into the United Way with a check for \$5,000, what does my \$5,000 do? I would see no results whatsoever.

The change in the composition of the membership in terms of age, as well as professional and philanthropic experience—though the group remained relatively socio-economically homogeneous, upper class—challenged some of the precedents that had been set the previous year. For example, in October 2001, the HF membership revisited the issue of what powers the grants committee should have. Some members argued that all grant applications should be put to the vote of the full membership, while others favored giving the grants committee the full authority to screen and recommend grants. Ultimately the membership decided to continue giving decision-making autonomy to the grants committee. Even the issue of meeting place was debated: a few members suggested that the group meet at the Harvard Club rather than in people’s homes

²² Block quote above from Hestia Fund. “Hestia Fund Minutes, Monthly Meeting, September 6, 2001,” Hestia Fund, Boston.

One time permission to reproduce granted by the Case Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University on 2010-05-26

to accommodate the growing membership. The group decided to continue meeting in each other’s living rooms. Priem notes that she applauded the diversity in views:

The women with careers came in, and I could see them in the very beginning saying, ‘I think we should be more professional.’ And I am so thrilled that we have that group, and I think that they are being tempered by the earlier group that may not have focused on a career, and they complement each other.

Also at issue was the setting of expectations for individual HF members. Because one of the goals of HF was to educate its membership about strategic giving, there was considerable discussion among members about the level of engagement that could and should be expected of each individual in the circle. Though voluntary, members were encouraged to attend full meetings and to participate in at least two site visits during each grant-making cycle; additional committee work required significant amounts of time. However, as Priem notes, about “75 percent” of members actively participated, while the remaining members were solely financial contributors. Gordon characterizes the majority of this group as “doers.” While noting that the financial-only members missed out on “intellectually stimulating” work of the group, Priem says that she had no problem with the bifurcated structure of membership—financial-only versus others—because even the financial-only contributors walked away with a positive experience from HF:

The financial contributors, they feel the \$5,000 they’ve given will really be invested wisely in after school programs.

Year Two Grant Making

The expanded group also made subtle but important changes to the grant-making funding criteria for the 2001-02 funding year. Stressing the importance of teen development, HF agreed to fund programs serving youth ages 5 to 18 years, rather than 5 to 14 years in the prior grant-making cycle. The group added the criterion, “[t]ime spent by children in the program is appropriate to the stated goals,”²³ as an outcome performance measure of the grantees. Furthermore, the “diversity of portfolio” selection criterion was dropped,²⁴ although the group agreed to look at the final composition of grants to ensure an appropriately broad range of funded activities at the end of the funding cycle. See Appendix C for the list of selection criteria.

Margot Trotter Davis, a grants committee member in Year One, was named chair of the grants committee for 2001-02. A practicing psychotherapist and active board member for several nonprofits, she also had substantial experience in philanthropy. Says Trotter Davis:

²³ Hestia Fund. “Hestia Fund Monthly Meeting Minutes, November 6, 2001,” Hestia Fund, Boston. November 20, 2001, p. 3.

²⁴ Hestia Fund, “Hestia Fund Monthly Meeting Minutes, November 6, 2001,” p. 3.

I've been in the field of mental health for 20 to 25 years. Early in my career, I did a lot of grant making with state funds, so this [Hestia] comes very naturally for me. ... In my own philanthropy, my husband and I do quite a bit. Every year we sit down with the kids and discuss what programs we want to help this year.

Trotter Davis made a concerted effort to improve the grant-making process. The grants committee comprised eight women—four holdovers from the prior year and four new members—with varying professional and philanthropic backgrounds. With a year under its belt and a doubling of its financial resources, the committee made alterations to its selection process with an eye towards greater efficiency and objectivity. First, the committee gave more specific instructions to grant applicants with respect to the type of information that it needed. As Treasurer Nelson recalls, there was improvement from Year One to Year Two:

[I]n the first go-round [2001-02], we didn't get budgets from everyone, and I was totally upset by that. You have to have a budget, a very crisp budget from everybody.

Nelson also notes that the process became more “streamlined,” because of the year of experience that Trotter Davis and program manager Goodson had in managing the grant-making process. As a result, the paperwork was reduced, site visits were better coordinated, and applicants emailed their grant applications directly to HF. Furthermore, all HF site visitors were asked to provide a qualitative narrative assessing the candidate organization in order to augment the quantitative information—e.g., budgets, child to staff ratio, funding request—that was submitted to the grants committee.

In 2001-02, the committee grouped applicants by type of after school program—“community/settlement/general, sports, school-based programs, Latino programs, teen programs, and arts programs”²⁵—which facilitated “apples-to-apples” comparisons between organizations.²⁶ Finally, each grants committee member was assigned to one applicant organization—a point person for all matters related to the application process was assigned to each applicant organization to ward off any confusion about what HF was looking for in its grant applications.

The process appeared to go over well with grant applicants. Says Emily Jennett, executive director of G-ROW, which was funded by Hestia for 2000-01, as well as 2001-02:

I had one particular woman who was assigned to me to help me through the proposal writing process, and that was really helpful just to have one 'go-to' person. ... I get the sense that they really are streamlining their

²⁵ Hestia Fund. “Hestia Fund Monthly Meeting Minutes, February 5, 2002,” Hestia Fund, Boston. February 14, 2002, p. 2.

²⁶ Hestia Fund, “Hestia Fund Monthly Meeting Minutes, February 5, 2002,” p. 2.

guidelines, and know what they're looking for. ... I don't have vast experience in proposal writing, but it seems like most program officers usually look at 5,000 applicants. This is what they do for a living. They are burned out, and you're lucky if you can get them on the phone. Whereas, working with Hestia Fund members, you get the sense that this is kind of fun for them, ... they're invested, and they are choosing to be part of the process. So, I feel like they are more accessible and also very forthcoming about the fact that we are all in this together and learning as we go.

Higher Risk, Greater Impact

There was also a shift in the types of organizations and funding requests the grants committee considered from Year One to Year Two. Priem says:

Last year, one of the issues on the grants committee was, 'Do we want to take any risks?' and the bottom line was that the women didn't really want to take a risk. ... I think this year they feel a little different about risk, that maybe we should allocate a certain portion or percentage and be able to fund a start-up [organization], or somebody in trouble.

The group had only supported established programs in Year One, guarding against the possibility that a new/start-up organization could fold. Trotter Davis notes that the grants committee took "more risks than usual" in its second year. Demonstrating social impact was at the core of HF's goal of engaging in strategic giving, but the committee was also cognizant of the need to balance that risk.

Aside from financial risk there was also the issue of social risk to consider. Grants committee member Gordon recalls the debate over the funding of one controversial organization that the group ultimately funded:

We have [an] organization that does a teen magazine, and in this magazine they deal with some very 'in-your-face' issues. This is not *Seventeen Magazine* and cosmetics for girls. This [magazine] talks about date rape; drugs. Some people were very upset that we even considered it.

After meeting throughout the winter and early spring, the grants committee chose to fund 11 organizations in April 2002, with grants ranging from \$10,000 to \$25,000—see Appendix D for grant summaries, and Appendix G for "Hestia Fund 2002 Annual Report." The full membership approved the full docket of grants. Diversity—of causes, type and size of organizations, ages of children served—carried the day. The committee chose to fund long-established organizations—

One time permission to reproduce granted by the Case Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University on 2010-05-26

e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs of Boston—as well as three start-up, “risk-taking” ventures²⁷—e.g., a new, untested enrichment program for elementary school children in Dorchester. For the first time, the committee provided money to an organization strictly for overhead costs (i.e., infrastructure). Nelson says:

... I think the group is looking on a need-by-need basis and asking, ‘What does this group need?’ If [the organization] is not ready to branch off into programming, then let’s help them get a little more grounded.

The committee also decided to provide grants to two programs specifically targeting Hispanic youth. Finally, the committee awarded grants to two out of the five grantees from the previous year. On the issue of the duration of grants, Trotter Davis says: “We feel very comfortable making the commitment for one year.” However, the issue of single-year versus multi-year commitments remained an open question.²⁸

In spite of the increased workload placed on the grants committee, Trotter Davis says that she was pleased with the strides that the committee made in terms of professionalizing the grant-making process. And while noting that greater efficiencies in the process could be achieved in future years, she says that developing and maintaining camaraderie among committee members was also important: “We decided whenever we could that we would do this by consensus; we all walk in as friends, and we all walk out as friends.” Referring to the culture of the grants committee, she adds, “We really like a mix of people. It’s interesting how the culture of Hestia has been developed and reinforced.”

Planning for Sustainability

The steering committee set forth a blueprint for moving the organization ahead—from social experiment to sustainable, philanthropic institution. While Priem’s leadership and energy had carried HF through its first two grant-making cycles, Priem looked forward to making way for a new chair in 2003. The job description for Priem’s replacement included the following passage—see Appendix E for a full-text job description:

For the first two years, the job of the chairperson was to build the organization and grow the membership, and thereby the fund. Now that the Hestia Fund has reached its second year goal of 40 women, (and \$200,000 for grants), the role of the chair is changing from one of entrepreneur to one who will firmly establish Hestia as a community institution.

²⁷ Examples of “risk taking” are described in “Hestia Fund 2002 Grant Summaries.” See Appendix D.

²⁸ Note: Eventually, in July 2002, the steering committee authorized the grants committee to begin *considering* multi-year grants in the 2002-03 funding cycle if it made sense to do so.

Due to a more defined committee structure, (i.e., steering [long-range planning], grants, membership and finance), the second key transformation in the role of the chairperson is from the sole initiator of action to one of leader and manager of activity via committee heads and staff.²⁹

The steering committee announced in the spring of 2002 that Treasurer—and founding member—Linda Nelson would succeed Priem as chair in 2003. Nelson would assume the title of vice chair and work with Priem until she took over as chair in May of 2003.

Additionally, during that March 2002 meeting, the full membership was asked what it wanted HF to look like in two years. Several themes emerged from the discussion. Members said that they wanted to be “highly engaged” with grantees.³⁰ They wanted to improve the “knowledge base” of the organization with respect to after school programs.³¹ They wanted to “leverage” HF’s grants with other funding—funding from foundations—in order to increase the impact of the grants.³² There was even a discussion about spinning off satellite Hestia Fund groups in other parts of Massachusetts.

In response to these member concerns as well as in anticipation of future growth, several new committees were formed:

- Education committee: the goal was to educate members about all aspects of philanthropy—e.g., conducting site visits, evaluation—and the committee aimed to bring in philanthropy professionals and guest lecturers to educate members;
- Leveraging committee: the goal was “... to find money from other sources/donors for the programs the Hestia Fund gives grants to. We may want to have an initial goal of matching our grants,” says Priem; and
- Annual meeting committee: the goal was to plan HF’s Annual Meeting, which involved members as well as the grantees.

Trotter Davis notes that one of the membership’s downstream goals—to be highly engaged with grantees—was feasible and, in some cases, already being done:

We feel we have expertise, we have ideas, and we have interest, and we want to help organizations not only financially but in terms of coordinating efforts with different programs. We’ve been able to do that in

²⁹ Hestia Fund. “Chairperson of the Hestia Fund.” Hestia Fund, Boston. December 17, 2002.

³⁰ Quoted from the author’s notes from the Hestia Fund meeting, March 5, 2002, in Boston, Massachusetts.

³¹ See Note 30.

³² See Note 30.

a couple of cases. We've been able to provide technical support. One of our grantees last year was developing a cooking curriculum the kids really wanted, and the teacher didn't really have expertise to teach cooking. So someone in Hestia in her own professional work had developed a cooking curriculum for kids, and had a video developed for that purpose, and so it's that sharing of ideas that we can do that we really want to do with programs. I'm not sure that big foundations have the means or interest in [doing those things].

Ongoing Issues and Challenges (2002)

As of the summer of 2002, several major issues remained unresolved for HF. The biggest issue was growth of the organization. Though the membership favored staying at between 40 and 50 members, that sentiment could change over time. The threat of growth concerned Trotter Davis, who says:

... I think that the issues that concern me then are the issues going forward: how to maintain a culture in Hestia that is sincere to the mission of the organization and how to keep people from fractionalizing. We're just a bunch of women, really, without much structure. Some of these committees now have more structure, but we are being held together by something internal as opposed to something external. ...

On her practical concerns about HF's growth, Gordon adds:

Growth is going to be a big thing. I know the steering committee has talked about expanding, and I shudder to think how that would work. I think it could become very unwieldy. Also, we have talked about branching out. We are literally Greater Boston. There are some people that feel that we should look further afield. I think there is a little divisiveness there about people who feel we have become or are getting to be known as after school programs in Boston and haven't really done it and stayed with it and be the best. ... I think this consensus issue is going to be a bigger problem, just by sheer numbers. It's an ideal, it's wonderful, but I don't know if in reality it can work. You're talking about high-powered women who are used to getting their own way.

The larger questions that remained were whether the giving circle would be appropriate for a membership larger than 40 women, and what size—if any—would allow the organization to grow and be sustained, in perpetuity. There were warning signs that the format of decision making via consensus could be difficult to sustain in the future. Priem recalls:

We had a close call recently, but consensus prevailed, and ultimately with people feeling good about hearing everybody's point of view. We literally had to go around the room. I didn't want to give in to a vote, when that would have set a new precedent and changed our way of making decisions. I thought something so critical to our culture and personality should surface for review at the leadership level.

In addition, the composition of the membership over time was an issue. Although the membership had attempted to recruit more young, professional women into the circle, it remained unclear whether HF could retain its distinctive culture—lack of by-laws or voting, emphasis on socializing and meeting in living rooms, consensus-style decision making—if the composition of the membership shifted drastically over time.

Furthermore, the education of the membership in philanthropy remained incomplete. While significant strides had been made in building some systematic knowledge around the topic of after school programs, there was significant room for learning in several areas of philanthropy. For example, Trotter Davis notes that more training on conducting site visits will be needed in the future:

... [A]nother thing we need to do next year is to do more training around the site visits. A lot of these women have never been on a site visit.

Barrett also believed that formal site visit training would be necessary, and added that a review of how to read organizational financial statements would be beneficial for the membership. Evaluation was another pending challenge for HF. While the full membership was in agreement that evaluation and monitoring of grants were crucial to meeting the long-term objectives of the organization, few systems had been put into place to perform such functions. Grantees were asked to submit half-year and year-end progress reports, but otherwise, no formal monitoring or evaluation systems—with performance measurement, i.e., process or outcomes—were in place. Priem notes that HF asked one organization to return its grant, because the grantee had not carried out the program that it had proposed in its original grant application. Furthermore, any claim about HF's social impact was anecdotal.

Diversity of membership remained a thorny issue for some HF members. Nelson and Gordon were among the members who expressed a desire to recruit members in order to increase the socioeconomic diversity of the group. Others favored keeping the existing composition of the group. Recalls Gordon:

I felt there should be more diversity in the group. The only criteria is that you have to give the \$5,500 each year and you have to make a three-year commitment to do that. I feel that I had mentioned that perhaps we could have a separate category where people have marvelous ideas and

different backgrounds but can't contribute the \$5,500. ... That was not received well.

And while a solid succession plan of leadership had been put in place, the effect of Priem's departure as chair of the organization was not known. She had not decided what role she would have in HF after 2003, although she knew that she would stay involved with the organization in some capacity. As the founder of the organization and the recruiter of a significant portion of the members, Priem's leadership style and ability to manage this particular group of women were effective in bringing HF to its position in 2002. Observes Barrett:

There is a tremendous fit between the founder [Priem] and her style and her socioeconomic class and the people she's attracting, and I think that plays a very large role.

Whether the new leadership could sustain the momentum—HF was a larger, more complex organization than the one Priem had started—as well as manage the personalities of the group, remained open questions.

Meeting Donor Objectives

Several members were convinced that their involvement in HF had taught them to become more informed philanthropists. Nelson says:

I know just in my case that I take this money much more personally, because I feel so involved in where it's going, whereas if I write a check to an art museum, I'm not nearly as clear about what that money is going to be used for. I understand why I'm giving it, but I'm not as linked to where it's going.

Gordon, who had no philanthropy experience before joining HF, notes that she had exceeded her own expectations in terms of her level of involvement:

I thought I would go to a monthly meeting, go on a site visit. ... I didn't just do what was asked of me, I went beyond it, because I got so excited about the vision of the group. So by becoming more and more involved, I became more and more sure that this was the good thing and the right thing and [was] hoping that I could do as much as I possibly could.

Gordon says that this attitude pervades the membership:

What I like to see most is that women who come from affluent backgrounds surprise themselves and participate more fully than they first expected. The learning curve is truly fantastic.

Priem says that her original goals—to find a third career where she could educate women about philanthropy and promote the idea of charitable giving in the community—have been met by the giving circle. She notes:

I have been influenced as well in my giving to take more interest in a couple of our programs [grantees]. I'm sure this will lead to my personal support.

Furthermore, she suggests that a residual effect of the circle has been the catalytic effect of HF on individual members' giving outside of the circle:

I have spoken with two [members] to confirm my suspicion that they have given grants to programs they were exposed to at Hestia. They are impressed by the due diligence done by HF.

Overall, she says that the most rewarding aspect of her involvement in the Hestia Fund has been in watching other women get excited about the process of strategic giving:

I think that the coming together and working together of those who have never worked and those who have careers, and the women's various levels of experience in philanthropy, is quite a wonderful thing. But here in the Hestia Fund, you have [an] independent group of women working on the same projects, and I think that they are all learning from each other. I love watching that.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Timeline of Key Events in the Hestia Fund’s Evolution

Appendix B: “Hestia Fund Selection Criteria Draft” (January 2001)

Appendix C: Hestia Fund Selection Criteria 2001-2002

Appendix D: “Hestia Fund 2002 Grant Summaries”

Appendix E: Hestia Fund Job Description (“Chairperson of the Hestia Fund”)

Appendix F: “Hestia Fund 2001 Annual Report”

Appendix G: “Hestia Fund 2002 Annual Report”

The Hestia Fund _____ CR16-03-1691.0

Appendix A
Timeline of Key Events in the Hestia Fund's Evolution

2000	2001	2002
<p>January 2000: Susan Priem Forms Giving Circle</p> <p>May 2000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission Statement Approved • First Staff Member Hired (Adria Goodson) • Fund Selects Fleet Charitable Gift Fund as Vehicle <p>June 2000: After School Focus Chosen</p> <p>Fall 2000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals of 20 Members and \$100,000 Met • Grants Committee Formed • Site Visits Conducted <p>January 2001: First Funding Criteria Established</p> <p>April 2001: First HF Grants Announced</p> <p>May 2001: Hestia Fund Inaugural Annual Meeting Held</p> <p>Summer 2001: Meeting of Newly Formed Steering Committee Held</p> <p>Fall 2001:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member Dues Used to Pay for Operating Expenses • Organization Doubles to 40 Members and \$200,000 • Site Visits Conducted • Grants Selection Criteria Revised by Grants Committee <p>Spring 2002:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 HF Grants Announced • Linda Nelson Named as Successor to Susan Priem as Hestia Fund Chair • New Committees Formed, Anticipating Growth of Hestia Fund 		

Appendix B³³

Hestia Fund Selection Criteria Draft (January 2001)

Hestia Fund Selection Criteria Draft

The following set of criteria can serve as a guide to aid in the selection of grantees from the Hestia Fund /2001

1. Mission Criteria

- Programs should “positively impact low income women, children and their families in the Greater Boston area” (excerpt from THF mission statement)
- Programs should serve children from the ages of 5-14

2. Program Structure

- Programs are already established in that they have:
 - A defined mission
 - A target population
 - Serve their local community
 - Have a leadership and governance structure in place
 - Have organizational infrastructure that supports leadership development and staff training

3. Program Quality

- Existing standards that are either in place or will be addressed in the program proposal are (see 2-6 report and NSACA standards)
 - Good staff to child ratio
 - Have programming that is appropriate to developmental level of the children
 - Staff and children are engaged in warm, nurturing relationships
 - Transportation mechanisms in place for children (good accessibility)
 - Ability to serve children in their local community
 - Attention paid to staff compensation and skill development

4. Diverse Portfolio

- The Hestia fund is committed to funding programs in the Greater Boston area that are at a variety of stages in their development and innovation. These programs can or may fall under the following categories:
 - Newer programs that are small but are in the process of trying to expand their capacity and increase their quality
 - Established programs which are engaged in an innovative component of after-school and/or are looking to expand in a particular area
 - Programs that are interested in teaching best practices through collaboration and/or training with other after school programs

³³ Source: Hestia Fund. “Hestia Fund Selection Criteria Draft.” Hestia Fund, Boston. January 2001,

Appendix B (continued)

- The five programs that are selected to go through the proposal process should reflect diverse programmatic content, including, but not limited to academic, arts and sports programs which are reflected in the current list of candidates.

5. *Evaluation*

- Programs should show a willingness to document impact of grant received from the Hestia fund. This documentation can be used to both measure impact of grant and to continually improve the quality of the program. This can be done through mechanisms that fit the style and orientation of the program. Suggestions for this can include:
 - Quantitative measures
 - Qualitative measures
 - Anecdotal

Appendix C³⁴

The Hestia Fund Selection Criteria 2001-2002

Hestia Fund Selection Criteria

2001/2002

REVISED 11/19/01

1. Mission of Hestia

- To support After School Programs that primarily serve or directly benefit low income women, children and their families in the Greater Boston area
- Programs should serve children from the ages of 5 to 18.

2. Program Structure

Programs have:

- A defined mission
- A target population
- Build a sense of community
- Have a leadership and governance structure in place
- Have organizational infrastructure that supports leadership development and staff training

3. Program Quality

Existing standards that are either in place or will be addressed in the program proposal are (see 2-6 report and NSCACA standards)

- Good staff to child ratio
- Have programming that is appropriate to developmental level of the children
- Staff and children are engaged in warm, nurturing relationships
- Transportation mechanisms in place for children (good accessibility)
- Attention paid to staff compensation and skill development
- Time in the program is appropriate to the stated goals

4. Evaluation

Programs should show a willingness to document impact of grant received from the Hestia fund. This documentation can be used to both measure impact of grant and to continually improve the quality of the program. This can be done through mechanisms that fit the style and orientation of the program. Suggestions for this can include:

- Quantitative measures
- Qualitative measures
- Anecdotal

³⁴ Source: Hestia Fund. "Hestia Fund Selection Criteria Draft, 2001/2002." Hestia Fund, Boston. November 19, 2001.

Appendix D³⁵

Hestia Fund 2002 Grant Summaries

Hestia Fund 2002 Grant Summaries

Boys and Girls Clubs of Boston requested funding for their College Clubs in four clubhouses. They expect to expand to the fifth clubhouse and to double the numbers of children served from 30 to 60 in the next three years. Our funding will help the expansion. The college club operates during after school hours and is open to individuals one evening per week. Members engage in college-prep activities including SAT preparation, essay redrafts, college visits, apply for financial aid. This program enables high school juniors and seniors to explore their interests and to set appropriate goals. This grant is considered instrumental in deepening existing services in a program with a proven record.

Row As One (G-Row) requested funding to expand to another school site. Hestia will be "adopting" the first girls' crew team at Madison Park High School in Roxbury. This site will be modeled after the G-Row sites in the schools we funded last year which remain successful and continue to operate with other funds. Madison Park, unlike the other sites, offers vocational training as well as academic. It is a challenging site because students tend to be less academically focused and experience a high rate of dropout. Recruiting will begin in April with a team compliment on the water this spring. This grant is considered risk taking due to the lack of a proven record at Madison Park.

Hyde Square Task Force requested funding for funding to begin an after school component in the Curley School in Jamaica Plain. Due to Hyde Square's successes in the Kennedy School, Curley asked them to develop a program in their school. It will serve 25 students in grades 6-8. Hestia's grant will allow Hyde Square to develop a curriculum which integrates the after school math, literacy, and arts, into the middle school Boston Public School curriculum. They plan to create a model which can be replicated. This grant will allow an increase in number of after school slots.

La Alianza Hispana requested funding for academic and recreational field trips for middle school age youths in Roxbury and Dorchester. They collaborate with two other Latino agencies (Sociedad Latin and Hyde Square Task Force). Their after school component provides a "stress free" environment in which students complete school assignments. They provide educational enrichment and social skills development as well. The field trips will allow students to have exposure to areas of city and cultural life outside their own neighborhoods. The Hestia grant will deepen the program curriculum.

Lucy Stone Initiative requested funding for an enrichment program in connection to its recently established after school program, begun in January 2002. They have contracted with the B.E.L.L. foundation to operate the after school component in their elementary school, a Boston public school in Dorchester. The after school program serves 50 boys and girls grades 1-5. Hestia funding will support an enrichment component including artists in residence for music and art, field trips, choral group, Girls Club for older girls and a Boys-2-Men group for older boys with Harvard students coming to the site. Because of the recent start up of this site, this grant is considered a risk based on the definition of risk being a new and untried program.

Mission Safe requested funding for a program they are developing with Simmons College to mentor with girls attending this community based afterschool center. Because of the financial stresses Mission Safe is under and because we considered this site to be essential to filling a huge gap in service delivery to this Mission Hill neighborhood, we are encouraging the program to shore up current services before expanding into other arenas. Hestia funding will be used towards general operating expenses to strengthen this program during a fragile transition time.

³⁵ Source: Hestia Fund. "Hestia Fund, 2002 Grant Summaries." Hestia Fund, Boston.

Appendix D (continued)

Multicultural Youth Tour of What's Now (MYTOWN) requested funding to develop their communication capacity in order to increase their overall support, visibility and marketing of the Youth Guide's walking tours and public presentations. The Youth Guide program employs 33 teenagers, 14 –18 years old, each year. The program builds leadership capacity, communication skills, critical thinking ability and cultural competence among young people by helping them research and teach their neighborhood histories. Hestia funding will provide stipends for the Teen Youth Guides enabling more teens to participate, outfit the Youth Guides with official "tour gear" allowing visitors and tour takers to identify them readily, help to produce printed materials to promote the availability of MYTOWN's new tour that expand the organization's capacity to serve additional neighborhoods, and helping to expand the organization's capacity to generate much needed additional resources through hiring a professional grant writer for one year. This grant will help build the institutional capital in an innovative and strong program.

Nativity Preparatory School requested funding for two projects that will enhance and expand their after-school programming which Hestia funded last year. In the first project, the students will create, in conjunction with members of their families, a quilt for display at the Nativity Preparatory School based on their backgrounds and aspirations. The quilt will be create by sixteen boys, divided into two groups of eight. The second project, which expands on a grant given by Hestia last year, will grow and improve the very popular cooking program. 16 Nativity students will be introduced to the world of cooking and nutrition in a small, interactive cooking class and pass their new-found skills on to younger students. The enhanced cooking program will enlist the services of "Kids Can Cook" which has been quite successful in other inner city school based programs. Classes will run once a week for two hours during the entire school year. This grant will expand and strengthen a proven program that the Hestia Fund helped to launch last year.

New England Scores requested funding to support their after-school Soccer Program, which is a key component of their program which combines soccer and creative writing activities for inner-city youth at 12 public schools located in Boston. The program serves 360 children and runs five days a week during after-school hours. The student-athletes are in the 3rd through 5th grade and are both girls and boys. The very successful program has had difficulty funding the soccer portion of their program because many funders are more interested in the creative writing activities. Hestia funding will support the discreet costs of transportation for the children to and from the soccer program and, to a lesser extent, coach stipends. Through funding these critical infrastructure costs, Hestia will help to address the inequities that exist regarding the access of inner city school-aged children to organized sports. Additionally, supporting the soccer portion of the program enables New England SCORES to achieve their larger objectives through the team sport of soccer, to create a team environment which fosters the teamwork, leadership and writing skills necessary in the creative writing portion of the program. This grant is considered instrumental in strengthening the infrastructure and foundation of a program that is poised for growth and expansion in coming years.

Sociedad Latina requested funding to enhance the Mission Enrichment Program (MEP) to provide middle school students with an after-school program where learning is fun, interactive and includes activities that engage students. The Mission Enrichment Program serves 80+ Tobin middle school students September through June, Monday –Thursdays during after-school hours. The program is a collaborative effort between Sociedad Latina and the Tobin School in Mission Hill. Hestia funding will enable Sociedad Latina to strengthen the programs ability to provide character-building, creative, recreational and skill-building program that will enhance the academic portion of the program. Hestia funds will enable Sociedad Latina to contract art and

Appendix D (continued)

theater consultants to work with MEP students to explore new methods of expression through the use of various art mediums, purchase sports equipment for the program to provide participants with healthy physical activities and, lastly, to support the recreational activities of the program to engage and well as educate MEP participants. This grant, in conjunction with the other two grants to Latino programs, will help to expand and deepen programs within an area/population that is historically lacking in resources.

Teen Voices requested funding to support their SHOUT! program which is an out-of-school time mentoring program for low-income girls of color, ages 12-19, in the Boston area that teaches transferable skills of research, editing, and writing needed to produce Teen Voices magazine. The SHOUT! program consists of more than 100 at risk teenage girls, who are called Teen Editors. In this program, one mentor is matched with one or two Teen Editors, and this small team works up to six hours per week during the school year, and 12 hours per week during the summer. Hestia funding will support the current school year program, ending in June 2002, funding the teen mentoring program. This grant is considered to be risk taking because the grant is serving to help the organization finish out this operating year in the hope of providing a stable foundation for next year.

Appendix E³⁶

Hestia Fund Job Description (“Chairperson of The Hestia Fund”)

CHAIRPERSON OF THE HESTIA FUND DRAFT 12/17/02

Background

For the first two years, the job of the chairperson was to build the organization and grow the membership, and thereby the fund. Now that the Hestia Fund has reached its second year goal of forty women, (and \$200,000 for grants), the role of the chair is changing from one of entrepreneur to one who will firmly establish Hestia as a community institution.

Due to a more defined committee structure, (i.e. steering [long range planning], grants, membership and finance), the second key transformation in the role of the chairperson is from the sole initiator of action to one of leader and manager of activity via committee heads and staff.

The third important factor which will determine the role of the chair in the near future is the addition of a vice chairperson (effective May, 2002). As part of the succession plan developed by the Steering Committee, the vice-chairperson will work with the chairperson for one year in order to be groomed for the chair position the following year – thus a two-year working commitment. The relationship of the chair and vice chair has not yet been refined and may be determined to some degree by the strengths and primary interests of the individuals involved.

Job Description

The ultimate operation and overall management of the Hestia Fund is the responsibility of the Chairperson.

Based on the above changes, the job of Chairperson of the Hestia Fund includes the following responsibilities:

1. Trains and supervises Vice Chairperson (effective 5/02)
2. Chairs the Steering Committee
3. Hiring, supervision and management of staff, (currently one part-time project manager)
4. Oversees Committee chairs, (Financial, Grants, Membership), to ensure:
 - A. The Fund's activity is within the guidelines of its mission and objectives
 - B. The Fund's grant activity is with in the scope of the Fund's focus
 - C. The number of women, and resultant grant money, is maintained at the Fund's desired size, (currently 40/\$200,000)
 - D. A budget is set and adhered to and that the Fund's money for operations and for grants is responsibly managed
5. Personally represents the Hestia Fund and be the spokesperson publicly or delegate it to the Vice Chair. Builds and maintains the network of organizations and individuals that can help to support the work of the Hestia Fund and their grantees.
6. Financial commitment: the chair will agree to continue her financial commitment for an additional year following her chairship to ensure continuity and visibility of the Hestia Fund.

³⁶ Source: Hestia Fund. “Chairperson of The Hestia Fund.” Hestia Fund, Boston. December 17, 2002.

Appendix F37
Hestia Fund, 2001 Annual Report

Hestia Fund
2001 Annual Report

In January 2000, nine friends came together to form what was then simply called “The Giving Circle.” The goal of these nine friends, led by Susan Priem, was to develop a group of philanthropic women who could work together to further extend the impact of their charitable giving by acting collectively. Over the course of the first six months of operation, the giving circle became a true organization in its own right named **Hestia Fund** in honor of Hestia, the Greek goddess of the hearth.

Hestia Fund developed and achieved significant goals in its first year of operation. The group worked together to develop a mission statement, organizational goals and a funding focus.

The mission of the Hestia Fund is to positively impact the lives of low-income women and their children living in Massachusetts. Through our involvement with philanthropically minded women, we seek to find causes that share our vision.

The goals for the first year of Hestia were to recruit 20 women to participate with equal vesting, a multi-year commitment and funds to grant totaling \$100,000. Through recruitment, the membership of Hestia grew from the original nine women to twenty-one women resulting in a total of \$105,000 in grant making funds for year one.

By summer 2000, the women of Hestia had identified their focus: out-of-school time. Subsequently, they began researching specific programs in the greater Boston area. This research was followed by site visits to twenty-one of the programs as well as meetings with experts in the out-of-school arena. After gathering all of this information, the women conducted a thoughtful and thorough screening process of formal proposals from selected programs.

In April 2001, the Hestia Fund was pleased to announce the recipients of our first year grants. Of the twenty-one programs reviewed, five were selected as recipients:

Arts in Progress, Inc.
\$17,500 for after school arts programming
Federated Dorchester Neighborhood Houses, Inc.
\$17,500 for a new horticultural curriculum and programming
G-ROW
\$27,000 to support a new rowing coach
Nativity Preparatory
\$25,000 for sports equipment, photography lab equipment and a new nutrition program
United South End Settlement Houses
\$17,500 to support Maritime curriculum field trips and computer equipment

As Hestia Fund members celebrate their first year of grant making and set their sights on their second year, the group has already moved forward on their goals of expanding the group to forty women and increasing their funds available for grant making to \$200,000. The women will continue to work together to increase their knowledge of philanthropy and their expertise in after school programming serving the families of Massachusetts.

³⁷ Source: Hestia Fund. “Hestia Fund 2001 Annual Report.” Hestia Fund, Boston.

Appendix G³⁸

Hestia Fund, 2002 Annual Report

Hestia Fund

2002 Annual Report

In January 2000, nine friends in Massachusetts came together to form what was then simply called "The Giving Circle." The goal of these nine friends, led by Susan Priem, was to develop a group of philanthropic women who could work together to further extend the impact of their charitable giving by acting collectively. Over the course of the first six months of operation, the giving circle became a true organization in its own right named **Hestia Fund** in honor of Hestia, the Greek goddess of the hearth. It was critical to the success of the Hestia Fund that the women agreed to equal vesting and a multi-year commitment. The vesting is \$5,000 per woman per year and the commitment is three years.

The mission of the Hestia Fund is to positively impact the lives of low-income women and their children living in Massachusetts. Through our involvement with philanthropically minded women, we seek to find causes that share our vision.

The grant making focus, which was decided by the women, is after school programs in the Boston metropolitan area. In our first year, Hestia funded programs in five Boston organizations. Building on the first year, the women set the ambitious goal of doubling the size of the membership and the size of the grant budget. Having achieved their goal, the current membership is 41 women with a grant budget of \$206,000. Through providing these resources, Hestia Fund seeks to increase both the quantity and quality of after school programs serving children ages 5 –18.

In 2002, Hestia Fund members reviewed 25 organizations and requested proposals from eleven. In April, the Hestia Fund was pleased to announce the recipients of our 2002 grants:

Boys and Girls Clubs of Boston - \$12,500
GROW/Row as One - \$24,000
Hyde Square Task Force - \$20,000
La Alianza Hispana - \$18,500
Lucy Stone School Initiative - \$25,000
MissionSAFE - \$25,000
Multicultural Youth Tour of What's Now (MyTOWN) - \$25,000
Nativity Preparatory School - \$20,000
New England SCORES! - \$25,000
Sociedad Latina - \$18,500
Teen Voices - \$10,000

**Total grant budget is \$223,500 due to a carryover from 2001 totaling \$17,500.*

As Hestia Fund members celebrate our second year of grant making and set our sights on the third year, the group is looking forward to refining our long term plan to ensure the perpetuity of Hestia and to refining our vision for grant making. Additionally, the women will continue to work together to increase our knowledge of philanthropy and our expertise in after school programming serving the families of Massachusetts.

³⁸ Source: Hestia Fund. "Hestia Fund 2002 Annual Report." Hestia Fund, Boston.