2014

Non-Profit Performance Report

An Analysis of Management, Staff, Volunteers and Board Effectiveness in the Non-Profit Sector

by Taylor Jackson
and Jason Clemens

Report based on the analysis
undertaken as part of the

**DONNER CANADIAN
FOUNDATION AWARDS**
for Excellence in the Delivery of Social Services

FRASER
INSTITUTE

The Donner Awards Program serves to encourage the spirit of initiative and independence, and represents an important step forward in the development of an objective, quantifiable system of measuring non-profit performance.

Contents

Acknowledgments

About the Authors

Taylor Jackson is a Policy Analyst at the Fraser Institute. He holds a BA in Political Science and is currently an MA candidate at Simon Fraser University. Taylor is the coauthor of *The Effect of Wait Times on Mortality in Canada* and of "The USA and Canada: Political and Economic Challenges to Deeper Co-operation" in *The USA and Canada*, with Alexander Moens (Routledge). He is also a co-author of the Fraser Institute's *Global Petroleum Survey, 2014.*

Jason Clemens is the Fraser Institute's Executive Vice-President. He held a number of positions with the Fraser Institute between 1996 and 2008, including Director of Research Quality, Director of Budgeting and Strategic Planning, and Director of Fiscal Studies. He most recently worked with the Ottawa-based Macdonald-Laurier Institute (MLI) as Director of Research and held a similar position with the San Francisco-based Pacific Research Institute for over three years. Mr. Clemens has an Honours Bachelor's Degree of Commerce and a Master's Degree in Business Administration from the University of Windsor as well as a Post-Baccalaureate Degree in Economics from Simon Fraser University. He has published over 70 major studies on a wide range of topics, including taxation, government spending, labour market regulation, banking, welfare reform, health care, productivity, and entrepreneurship.

Introduction

Canada's non-profit sector is a vital component of Canadian civil society, providing many important social, cultural, and environmental amenities independently of both the government, and the for-profit business sector. Including approximately 161,000 charities, church groups, community associations, and mutual aid societies, this sector is also an important component of the Canadian economy.[1] Not including the value of volunteer labour, Canada's core non-profit sector (with the exception of hospitals, universities, and colleges) contributed $35.6 billion to Canada's gross domestic product (GDP) in 2007, or 2.5 percent of the nation's economy. Between 1997 and 2007, economic activity in the core non-profit sector increased faster than for the economy as a whole. The social services sector contributes 23 percent of core non-profit economic activity, the highest share of any group in the sector.[2]

The non-profit sector not only provides valued goods and services to those in need, it also binds our communities together by providing citizens with the opportunity to actively participate in finding solutions to some of Canada's most pressing social problems. In 2007, Canadian non-profit organizations benefited from 2.1 billion volunteer hours—the equivalent of 1.1 million full-time jobs—and $10 billion in individual donations.[3] The voluntary nature of this sector is one of its most defining characteristics.

The Donner Canadian Foundation Awards

Regrettably, the sector's valuable contribution to Canadian society often goes unrecognized. The *Donner Canadian Foundation Awards for Excellence in the Delivery of Social Services* were established in 1998 as a means of both providing this well-deserved recognition and rewarding excellence and efficiency in the delivery of social services by non-profit agencies across the country. The national scope and $60,000 purse makes the Donner Awards Canada's largest non-profit recognition program. Since 1998, $1,080,000 has been granted to Canadian non-profits through the Donner Awards.

By providing non-profits with tools to measure and monitor their performance, the Donner Awards Program also encourages agencies to strive to ever-higher levels of excellence. In turn, the commitment to excellence and accountability demonstrated by Donner Awards participants can help encourage public confidence and involvement in this important sector of Canadian society.

Excellence and Accountability

Demonstrated commitment to excellence and accountability is particularly important at a time when charities and other non-profit organizations are coming under increased scrutiny for the efficiency and effectiveness of their program delivery and management practices. Almost two-thirds of business leaders polled by COMPAS in September 2003 said they would be more likely to donate to charity if the

---

1   There are approximately 86,000 registered charities in Canada. While a charity is, by definition, a non-profit agency, non-profit agencies are not necessarily charities. Registered with Revenue Canada, charities are subject to its guidelines and regulations. Charities do not pay income tax, and are able to issue tax-deductible receipts to donors. While other non-profits are also exempt from paying income tax, they are not able to issue tax-deductible receipts.

2   Statistics Canada (2009), *Satellite Account of Non-profit Institutions and Volunteering, 1997 to 2007*, cat. no. 13-015 (Ministry of Industry).

3   Statistics Canada (2009), *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2007 Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*, cat. no. 71-542-XIE (Ministry of Industry).

charities were more accountable.[4] Similarly, while 77 percent of Canadians surveyed by the Muttart Foundation in 2008 reported that they have "a lot" or "some" trust in charities, others (30 percent of those that don't have "a lot" of trust) complain of a lack of information about where their money is really going. While almost all Canadians think it's important that charities provide information about their financial management (fundraising costs and use of donations) as well as the delivery and impact of their services, only half (or less) of those surveyed are happy with the information they actually receive from the charities they support.[5]

Measurement Challenge

Unlike the for-profit business sector, the non-profit sector has been hampered in its ability to assess performance due to the lack of an objective, quantifiable performance measure. The for-profit sector relies on a number of objective measures to assess performance, including profitability, market share, and return on assets. The existence of standard, objective performance measures in the for-profit sector allows for comprehensive and comparative performance analysis.

Unfortunately, there is no such parallel for the non-profit sector. While more than three quarters of non-profit organizations surveyed for the Voluntary Sector Evaluation Research Project (VSERP) in 2001 reported that they had engaged in some type of evaluation in the previous year,[6] the sector has relied almost exclusively on subjective reviews to assess performance. Subjective assessments normally entail a consultant or performance evaluator individually reviewing the performance of agencies and submitting recommendations.

While these types of assessments can be extremely useful, they are not readily comparable to other agencies' performance assessments unless the same person performs all the analyses. Even in these circumstances, the scope for comparison is limited and costly, especially for many small and medium-sized agencies. This poses a real challenge for Canadian non-profits, especially as donor expectations for more rigorous performance evaluation steadily grows. Almost half of the non-profit organizations in the VSERP survey reported that funder expectations had increased over the previous three years.[7]

Anticipating this need, The Fraser Institute began developing an objective non-profit performance evaluation system in 1997.[8] With the vision and support of the Donner Canadian Foundation, this system became the basis of the selection process for the annual Donner Canadian Foundation Awards. Between 1998 and 2014, non-profit organizations from all 10 provinces and 3 territories submitted 7,602 unique social service programs for evaluation in the Donner Awards Program.

This evaluation process represents a major step forward in the development of an objective, quantifiable measure of performance for non- profit organizations. Non-profit performance is measured in ten areas: Financial Management, Income Independence, Strategic Management, Board Governance, Volunteers, Staff, Innovation, Program Cost, Outcome Monitoring, and Accessibility. In addition to the ten specific criteria, a composite score is also calculated to indicate

4   Drew Hassleback (2003), "Charities Need to 'Act Like Business'" *National Post*, Sept. 12, p. FP2. See also Sylvia LeRoy (2003), "Growing Accountability and Excellence in the Non-profit Sector," *Fraser Forum*, December, pp. 5-7.

5   Ipsos Reid (2008), *Talking About Charities 2008—Report* (The Muttart Foundation). Available digitally at http://www.muttart.org/sites/default/files/downloads/TAC2008-02-ExecutiveSummary.pdf.

6   Michael Hall, Susan D. Phillips, Claudia Meillat, and Donna Pickering (2003), *Assessing Performance: Evaluation Practices & Perspectives in Canada's Voluntary Sector* (Canadian Centre for Philanthropy).

7   See Hall et al. (2003), *Assessing Performance*.

8   The evaluation system was developed with input from the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (now Imagine Canada), the Canadian Cancer Society (BC and Yukon Division), the Trillium Foundation, and Family Services Canada.

Table 1: Components of Performance Measurement

Section	Area of Measurement	Components
One	Financial Management	annual surplus—composite measure of the 4 year average and most recent year
		revenue increase—composite measure of the 3 year average and most recent year
		cost containment—composite measure of the 3 year average and most recent year
		program spending versus overall spending—composite measure of the 4 year average and most recent year
		financial reporting
Two	Income Independence	number of sources of income adjusted for the average size of the donation
		percentage of revenue provided by largest revenue source
		percentage of revenue provided by government
		size of accumulated surplus relative to expenses—composite measure of the 4 year average and most recent year
Three	Strategic Management	use and prevalence of a mission statement
		level of objective and goal setting
		depth of involvement
Four	Board Governance	independence
		financial contributions
		level of involvement as measured by frequency of meetings
		level of participation as measured by attendance at meetings
		policy guidelines to avoid conflicts of interest
Five	Volunteers	use of volunteers relative to staff—composite measure of agency total and program total
		recruiting activities
		management and development of volunteers
		donations other than time by volunteers
		turnover
Six	Staff	level of programming provided by employees
		percentage of employees working in programs
		turnover
		management and development of staff
Seven	Innovation	uniqueness of agency's program
		level of restructuring / change
		use of alternative delivery systems / technology in the delivery of services

Table 1: Components of Performance Measurement

Section	Area of Measurement	Components
Eight	Program Cost	cost per hour of programming provided
		cost per client—*information only*
		hours per client—*information only*
Nine	Outcome Monitoring	defining desired outcomes/goals for program
		measured actual outcomes
		desired versus actual outcome comparisons
		plans to deal with divergences
Ten	Accessibility	process of assessing need and targeting assistance
		measurement of the level of usage by clients
		determination of the cause of a client's difficulties
OVERALL SCORE		Composite of ten areas of measurement

overall performance. Table 1 presents the ten criteria of the performance index as well as the sub-components of each.

It is not the intent of the Donner Canadian Foundation Awards, or the performance measurement process, to reward large agencies simply because of their size. Rather, the focus is to assess and reward the quality provision of goods and services. Thus, a series of calculations were completed to ensure that measurements focus on the quality of the program and not on the size of the organization.

Evaluation Process

In 2014, the Donner Awards Program recognized seven categories of service provision: Counselling Services/Crisis Intervention, Education, Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse, Provision of Basic Necessities, Services for Children, Services for People with Disabilities, and Services for Seniors.

The selection of categories included in the Donner Awards Program should in no way be seen as prioritizing or preferring certain services provided by the non-profit sector. It is simply a result of limited re-

sources and the tremendous breadth of services the sector provides.

Stage One

The Donner Awards Program involves two stages of evaluation. In the first stage, agencies complete a detailed application. Data from the application is then used to objectively assess the agency's performance on a comparative basis in key performance areas (see table 1). The performance of agencies is measured in a relative way by ranking the results from all of the agencies in a particular service category. Agencies are, therefore, rated against each other rather than assessed on the basis of an imposed standard.

Stage Two

In the second stage of evaluation, the top three, in some cases four, agencies in each of the seven categories complete a number of essay-style questions. In 2014 the finalists responded to a series of questions about their program delivery, results, financial management, and innovation. All Donner Award applicants are required to report how their organization approaches innovation and outcome monitoring on their Stage One application form.

Table 2: Select Summary Statistics, 2014

Category	Number of Applicants	Total Revenues ($)	Total Expenses ($)	Total Assets ($)	Staff (FTE*)	Volunteers (FTE*)	Number of Clients**	Hours of Programming Provided***
Counselling Services/Crisis Intervention	42	$61,897,894	$60,044,502	$52,512,227	682	466	159,277	1,896,005
Education	48	$79,018,185	$78,014,532	$48,228,259	1,015	2,207	3,103,237	25,621,837
Prevention & Treatment of Substance Abuse	10	$14,725,370	$15,431,782	$21,970,669	202	93	6,141	464,735
Provision of Basic Necessities	36	$77,994,403	$65,375,027	$141,996,318	754	5,629	527,334	11,442,889
Services For Children	42	$66,245,711	$63,443,699	$87,330,668	891	493	338,782	3,332,417
Services for People with Disabilities	57	$135,404,762	$133,418,817	$79,323,406	1,821	1,648	92,196	9,624,805
Services for Seniors	28	$83,329,363	$83,318,836	$88,840,965	1,575	888	40,306	3,034,579
TOTAL	263	$518,615,688	$499,047,195	$520,202,512	6,940	11,424	4,267,273	55,417,267

*FTE refers to Full-Time Equivalent, calculated by assuming 37.5 hours per week, 52 weeks of the year.
**Refers to the number of clients participating in programs applying for recognition.
***Refers to the number of hours of programming provided by the programs applying for recognition.

The Stage Two evaluation questions are designed to elicit a more comprehensive picture of each applicant's "best practices." This involves a discussion of how each finalist ensures effective delivery of programs, the actual results or outcomes achieved (both short-term and long-term), strategies for controlling costs while growing revenues, and expanding on their Stage One response to innovation in their program and its impact on the organization. Finalists were also asked to discuss a "non-profit challenge" and provide two independent letters in support of their application to the 2014 Donner Awards.

In 2014, the distinguished panel of judges that evaluated the Stage Two finalist agencies' submissions included: Brendan Calder (Professor of Strategic Management, Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto), Alan Dowd (Senior Fellow, Fraser Institute America), Stephen Easton (Professor of Economics, Simon Fraser University), Allan Gotlieb (Chairman, Donner Canadian Foundation) and John Rietveld (Past President and Executive Director, Fondation Scouts Canada Foundation). The awards were presented to the winning agencies in December 2014.

The Seventeenth Annual Donner Awards

A total of 263 applications were received from non-profit agencies for the first stage of the awards. Participating non-profits came from all ten provinces. Table 2 summarizes the number of applications received in each category and key statistics about the organizations analyzed in this performance report. These agencies had a full-time staff equivalent of 6,940 and the equivalent of 11,424 full-time volunteers serving 4.3 million clients.[9]

The following list contains the 21 finalist organizations that advanced to the second stage of the 2014 Donner Awards, with the category award recipients in italics. Later in this report is a directory of all finalists that have participated in the Donner Awards Program between 1998 and 2014.

Counselling Services/Crisis Intervention

Michael House Pregnancy Care Centre (Guelph, Ontario)

London Crisis Pregnancy Centre (London, Ontario)

Rose of Durham Young Parents Support Services (Oshawa, Ontario)

Education

PARO Centre for Women's Enterprise (Thunder Bay, Ontario)

Elephant Thoughts (Collingwood, Ontario)

Girls Incorporated of Durham (Ajax, Ontario)

Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse

Fresh Start Recovery Centre (Calgary, AB)

Servants Anonymous Society of Calgary (Calgary, AB)

Simon House Recovery Centre (Calgary, Alberta)

Provision of Basic Necessities

NeighbourLink Calgary (Calgary, Alberta)

Alice Housing (Dartmouth, Nova Scotia)

Kawartha Lakes Food Source (Lindsay, Ontario)

Services for Children

Oak Park Neighbourhood Centre (Oakville, Ontario)

Cariboo Chilcotin Child Development Centre Association (Williams Lake, British Columbia)

Educational Program Innovations Charity Society (North Sydney, NS)

Services for People with Disabilities

Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada—Calgary and Area Chapter (Calgary, AB)

Continuing On In Education (Belleville, Ontario)

Seizure & Brain Injury Centre (Timmins, Ontario)

Services for Seniors

Les Aînés de Jonquière (Jonquière, QC)

Metis Local 1990 Elders Caring Shelter (Grande Prairie, Alberta)

The Good Neighbours' Club (Toronto, Ontario)

Each of the finalists received a certificate noting their achievement in reaching the second stage. The award recipient in each category received a $5,000 award in addition to being recognized as the recipient of the *Donner Canadian Foundation Award for Excellence* in the delivery of their particular service.

The prestigious 2014 *William H. Donner Award for Excellence in the Delivery of Social Services,* which includes a cheque for $20,000, was awarded to the organization with the highest score overall: **Fresh Start Recovery Centre** of Calgary, Alberta.

---

9   There is much diversity in the definition of "clients" among the various categories of agencies. For example, agencies providing services for people with disabilities have fewer clients receiving a significantly higher numbers of hours of service than agencies providing counselling services/crisis intervention.

In addition, the eleventh annual *Peter F. Drucker Award for Non-Profit Management* was presented to **Fresh Start Recovery Centre** of Calgary, Alberta, along with a $5,000 cash award. This award recognizes a non-profit organization whose consistent record of excellence and innovation in management and service delivery reflects the philosophy of Peter F. Drucker.

How to Use the *Non-Profit Performance Report*

The Performance Criteria section of the *Non-Profit Performance Report* provides details about the components of performance measurement for the ten performance criteria evaluated by the Donner Awards Program. Each of the ten performance criteria, as well as the overall composite score, has a separate section in this report. The separation of each criterion allows agencies to focus on particular areas of performance or, alternatively, to use the composite score to assess overall performance.

The relevant scoring information for an individual agency and the category in which they applied is contained in their one-page Confidential Report. Appendix A includes a discussion of how the scores were calculated along with additional methodological information.

An Illustrated Example

The following example illustrates how an individual agency can use the Confidential Report in conjunction with this report to assess its own performance. The agency used in the example is fictitious and does not represent any particular agency or composite of agencies.

A sample of the Confidential Report that each participating agency receives is reproduced on pages 12-13.

Confidential Report

The Confidential Report, independent of the *2014 Non-Profit Performance Report*, contains an agency's particular performance in all ten areas of evaluation. The executive director or board of an agency can use the report to isolate areas of high performance, as well

as areas in need of improvement, using the measures as benchmarking tools in their strategic planning processes. With the express permission of participating agencies, charitable foundations and other donors may also use these reports as evidence that their charitable dollars are being well spent.

In our hypothetical example, the ABC Food Bank scored high in Strategic Management, Board Governance, and Volunteers. For instance, the ABC Food Bank scored the highest of all participating agencies in the section pertaining to Board Governance, garnering a perfect score of 10. In the Volunteers category the agency also did extremely well as evidenced by its score of 6.1 compared to the highest overall score of 7.3 and scores of 5.0 for both the average and median.

The Confidential Report also indicates areas of poor performance. Again, using our hypothetical example, the ABC Food Bank scored relatively low in four areas: Accessibility, Program Cost, Innovation, and Staff. The agency received scores well below both the average and the median in all four of these performance areas.

The Confidential Report also indicates where an agency performed moderately well. In the hypothetical example, the ABC Food Bank performed reasonably well in the Financial Management and Income Independence assessment areas. In these areas the agency's scores were close to, or above the average and median scores, indicating moderate to good performance.

The final score presented in the Confidential Report is the composite score, which takes one-tenth of each of the component scores and aggregates them for an overall performance score. With a score below both the average and median scores for its service category, the agency in our example performed relatively poorly.

Once they have used the Confidential Report to identify areas of poor performance, executive directors or boards can use the Performance Criteria section of this *Non-Profit Performance Report* to identify ways to improve. Suggested resources to guide such improvement are listed on our website, www.donnerawards.org.

2014 Performance Report
Agency Name: ABC Food Bank
Category: Provision of Basic Necessities
Password: Basic Necessities
Code: 39
Identifier: 1986

Note: See "Calculating the Scores" in Appendix A to understand score meanings

Criteria/Components	Agency Score	Category Average	Category Median	Category High	Category Low
I. Financial Management	**6.3**	**6.6**	**6.6**	**7.3**	**5.3**
Annual surplus	3.9	7.1	7.4	9.8	3.9
Revenue increase	10.0	2.4	2.0	10.0	0.4
Cost containment	9.7	9.0	9.6	9.8	0.0
Program spending	3.0	5.0	5.2	9.5	0.0
Financial reporting	5.0	9.4	10.0	10.0	5.0
II. Income Independence	**7.5**	**6.2**	**6.7**	**8.9**	**2.0**
Number of sources of income	9.9	9.2	9.9	10.0	0.0
Concentration of revenue	5.2	4.5	5.2	10.0	0.0
Percent of revenue provided by government	5.0	3.9	3.7	10.0	0.0
Size of accumulated surplus to expenses	10.0	7.4	8.4	10.0	0.0
III. Strategic Management	**10.0**	**9.1**	**9.3**	**10.0**	**6.7**
Use of mission statement & goal setting	10.0	9.3	10.0	10.0	8.0
Staff involvement	10.0	8.9	10.0	10.0	4.2
IV. Board Governance	**10.0**	**7.6**	**7.5**	**10.0**	**3.3**
Independence from staff	10.0	9.9	10.0	10.0	9.0
Financial contributions	10.0	4.1	2.8	10.0	0.0
Level of involvement	10.0	7.2	7.5	10.0	0.0
Level of participation	10.0	8.9	9.1	10.0	0.0
Conflict policy	10.0	7.7	7.9	10.0	0.0

Criteria/Components	Agency Score	Category Average	Category Median	Category High	Category Low
V. Volunteers	**6.1**	**5.0**	**5.0**	**7.3**	**2.0**
Volunteers to staff; usage	8.0	1.4	0.7	10.0	0.0
Recruiting	10.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	0.0
Management and development	6.7	6.9	6.7	10.0	0.0
Donations	8.0	5.5	3.5	8.0	0.0
Turnover	4.2	8.0	9.2	10.0	0.0
VI. Staff	**2.8**	**5.5**	**5.9**	**7.6**	**2.5**
Level of programming provided	1.1	1.2	0.1	10.0	0.0
Percentage of staff in programs	3.2	6.6	8.6	10.0	0.0
Turnover	3.5	7.3	7.9	10.0	0.0
Management and development	3.3	7.0	6.9	10.0	0.0
VII. Innovation	**2.9**	**5.5**	**5.6**	**7.6**	**2.6**
Uniqueness of program	4.0	7.1	6.7	10.0	3.3
Restructuring/change	2.5	4.2	3.5	8.3	0.5
Use of technology	2.2	5.1	5.0	10.0	1.0
VIII. Program Cost	**1.1**	**6.1**	**6.9**	**10.0**	**0.0**
Dollar cost per hour of programming[2]	$40.56	$18.10	$14.30	$45.78	$0.07
Dollar cost per client[3]	$4.92	$2,718.45	$1,537.52	$20,838.10	$4.92
Hours per client[3]	0.1	1,012.0	104.0	8,760.0	0.1
IX. Outcome Monitoring	**6.2**	**8.3**	**9.0**	**10.0**	**1.0**
X. Accessibility	**2.8**	**6.4**	**7.5**	**10.0**	**2.8**
COMPOSITE SCORE	**5.6**	**6.6**	**6.9**	**8.1**	**4.1**

[1]This report is produced from data provided in your 2014 application to the Donner Awards Program. It must be read in conjunction with the *2014 Non-Profit Performance Report*, which may be downloaded from www.donnerawards.org.

[2]Data presented in this manner are for information purposes only.

[3]Data presented in this manner are for information purposes only; not used in the calculation of the criteria score.

Performance Criteria

Financial Management

Financial Management is the first of two areas dealing with financial performance in this report. It is the most comprehensive measure of all the performance criteria, with five separate variables: year-over-year financial management, growth in revenues, cost containment, ratio of program spending to total spending, and financial reporting.

All five variables evaluate, in different ways, an agency's competence and ability to manage its financial affairs. The first variable, year-over-year management, assesses the agency's ability to generate an optimal surplus each year. The surplus accumulated from annual surpluses provides an agency with insurance against any unexpected income change in a particular period. It enables the agency to avoid borrowing to finance any unexpected deficit while at the same time providing the agency with some level of financial flexibility.

The second and third variables evaluate the agency's ability to increase revenues while at the same time containing costs. This skill is particularly important for the non-profit sector since, for a majority of the agencies, there is little or no relationship between revenues and expenses. That is, there is no direct relationship between an increase in demand for services and the revenues of a non-profit organization. Thus, cost containment and the expansion of revenues are critically important to the success of non-profit organizations.

The fourth variable, program expenditures as a percent of total expenditures, is perhaps the most important as it assesses how much of the financial resources of the agency were directly used to deliver programs. Generally non-profit sector watchdogs suggest that at a minimum, 60 to 75 percent of expenses should be devoted to program spending.[10]

In order to measure both recent and historical performance by an agency in each of the above four variables, the evaluation system calculates a score based on the average of the agency's most recent year's performance, and the three or four year average performance (depending on the availability of data).

The final financial variable, financial reporting, deals with whether or not the agency has an independent entity, such as an accountant or consultant, validate the agency's financial records, and whether an annual report is sent to donors and members of the agency. It is strongly recommended that organizations have their financial statements audited, or prepared under review engagement.

Income Independence

Income Independence is the second of two measurements dealing with finances. Income Independence assesses the level of diversification in an organization's revenues. Diversification insulates agencies against unexpected changes in income sources, and increases the stability of the organization's revenues.

For instance, assume two agencies both have revenues of $1 million. The first agency has a well-diversified pool of income so that the largest contributor accounts for less than 5 percent of total revenue. The second agency's revenues are much less diversified; the largest income source accounts for 25 percent of revenues. If the largest donor for both agencies decides that it no longer wants to fund non-profit agencies, the first agency's revenues will be affected much less than the second agency's, which will decline by one-quarter.

---

10 The American Institute for Philanthropy's *Charity Rating Guide* recommends that 60 percent or more of a charity's donations should go to program expenses (for details see http://www.charitywatch.org). The Better Business Bureau (BBB) Wise Giving Alliance's *Standards for Charity Accountability* suggest that at least 65 percent of expenses should be devoted to program spending, with no more than 35 percent spent on fundraising (see information for charities and donors at http://www.bbb.org/us/). Charity Navigator, founded in 2001 to rate the financial health of US charities, uses a system that rewards 75 percent program spending as optimal (see http://www.charitynavigator.org). Seven out of 10 charities they evaluate spend at least 75 percent of their budget on their programs and services. Nine out of 10 spend at least 65 percent.

Income Independence also indirectly indicates how independent an organization is from its funding sources. For instance, the first agency in the example would be more able to resist influence from its major funding sources than the second, due to the larger dependence of the second agency on one particular donor.

Four measures were used to assess performance: the number of revenue sources adjusted for the size of the agency, the percentage of total revenue accounted for by the agency's largest donor, the extent of government versus private funding, and the size of the accumulated surplus.

The number of revenue sources is important. This measure does not weight contributors according to the amount donated. Agencies with a large pool of small donors would perform substantially better than agencies with a small pool of large donors.

The second variable accounts for concentration within the pool of revenues. It measures, to a greater degree, an agency's real diversification level. For instance, an agency might have a large pool of small donors but still be overly reliant on one particular donor if that donor accounts for a large percentage of the agency's revenues.

The third variable illustrates the level of voluntary contributions received by the organization. Over the last three decades, government funding has been one of the least stable sources of funding for non-profits. Over-reliance on government funding may, therefore, affect the long-term stability of an agency's funding. In addition, a large body of research suggests that government funding may actually "crowd out" private giving, with private donations decreasing as government involvement increases.[11]

The final variable, the size of the accumulated surplus compared to expenses, measures an agency's ability to weather difficult financial periods. The optimal size of the accumulated surplus is equal to one year's annual expenses, permitting agencies to provide a year of service without any revenues. Surpluses below this

amount, or deficits, place increased pressure on the agency and create instability in the planning process. Alternatively, surpluses larger than this may introduce an element of insulation wherein the agency does not have to respond to financial signals quickly.

Strategic Management

Strategic Management is a multi-staged, multi-faceted process of goal setting and resource allocation. It is a process by which resources, both tangible (personnel, monies, physical assets, etc.) and intangible (motivation, effort, etc.) are directed towards a common goal or objective.

The first stage in this process is to articulate a mission, or vision statement. The mission essentially defines why an organization exists, and the ultimate objective that it wants to achieve. For instance, an adult literacy program may have as its mission to completely eliminate adult illiteracy in its city. It is a far-reaching mission but one that clearly articulates the specific objective toward which the organization constantly aspires. It is crucial for an organization to have a clear definition and an understanding of the problem or need that is being addressed, as well as the client group for whom services are being provided.

The second step, derived from the mission statement, is to form organizational goals. Organizations need to establish a link between the intent of the mission statement and their agency's specific goals. This step in the strategic management process essentially quantifies the mission statement. For instance, in our example, the literacy program's ultimate mission is to eliminate adult illiteracy in its city, but its immediate goal for this year may be to successfully introduce a new program, or increase the literacy rate by ten percent.

The next step is to form program-specific objectives. A particular program's objectives must be conducive to, and support, the goals of the organization and its mission statement. Using our example, program-specific objectives might take the form of increasing the

---

11   For a review of the empirical literature, see Arthur C. Brooks (2000), Is there a Dark Side to Government Support for Nonprofits? *Public Administration Review* 60, 3 (May/June): 211-18.

number of participants in a specific program, or decreasing the dropout rate in another program.

Finally, the staff and volunteers must agree on specific goals to support the program goals, the organizational objectives, and the mission statement.

All the goals and objectives must cohesively exist within a broad framework of the mission and vision of the organization. Specifically, the goals for staff and volunteers must reinforce the objectives of the program, which in turn must be part of the agency's overall objectives, which themselves must support the organization's mission. The multiple goal-setting framework of the strategic management process enables the efforts of staff and volunteers as well as the resources of an organization to be directed toward a common objective.

The questions in the survey assessing strategic management focus on the extent of involvement and active participation by staff and volunteers in the strategic management process.

Board Governance

The Board of Directors is the critical link between the donors and members of a non-profit organization and its staff and managers. One of the key responsibilities of the Board of Directors is to ensure that the management, and ultimately the organization's executive director, is operating the agency prudently and responsibly and in a manner consistent with the agency's stated goals and objectives. Another important role for the Board of Directors is to have contact with the community. The executive director, despite being the most visible spokesperson for the agency, has a limited capacity to establish community connections. The Board of Directors, simply by virtue of sheer numbers, has a much greater capacity to establish such ties.

This report assesses five areas of Board Governance: independence, contributions, involvement, participation, and conflict policy. These areas of assessment represent a foundation upon which to assess the independence, accountability, and effectiveness of board governance.

The first area (the number of paid staff on the board) and the final area (conflict of interest policy guidelines) were adapted from standards developed for charities by the National Charities Information Bureau (NCIB) and the Council for Better Business Bureau Foundation's Philanthropic Advisory Service in the United States. In 2001, these two organizations merged to form the BBB Wise Giving Alliance. While including all of them would be prohibitive, their *Standards for Charity Accountability* dealing with the independence of the board have been adopted for the evaluations appearing in this report.[12] The Wise Giving Alliance standards suggest that a maximum of one paid staff member (or 10 percent, whichever is greater), normally the executive director, be a voting member of the board. This paid staff member should not hold the duties of the chair or the treasurer in order to ensure a certain minimum level of accountability and independence. The NCIB's conflict policy suggested the board review all business or policy decisions without the presence of those staff or board members who may benefit, directly or indirectly, from the decision in question. Further, the Wise Giving Alliance standards cite the following factors to consider when concluding whether or not there is a conflict of interest transaction: the establishment of arm's length procedures by the organization, transaction size relative to like expenses, the seeking of competitive bids, and how often the transaction occurs.

The second question, the percentage of board members who are financial contributors, deals with the concept of board members as supporters of the agency. The Board of Directors should be one of the greatest sources of revenue development for an agency, both directly through donations, and indirectly through the development of new funding sources, the introduction of new supporters, and increasing the community profile of the agency.

---

12   These standards can be reviewed under information for charities and donors on the BBB website, http://www.bbb.org/us/Charity-Standards/.

The third and fourth questions attempt to discover the Board of Directors' activity level. There is a fine line between an active and interested Board of Directors and one that is overly intrusive in the affairs of the organization. For this report the regularity and attendance at meetings has been adopted as an acceptable proxy of a board that is interested and fulfilling its custodial duties as trustees, yet not overtly intrusive in the day-to-day management of the agency.

Volunteers

The use of volunteers is the first of two criteria dealing with the effectiveness and use of personnel, both paid and volunteer. Volunteerism is one of the critical areas for the long-term success of non-profit organizations, and is one of the defining characteristics of the non-profit sector. Volunteers provide unpaid staffing, and in some agencies provide the frontline contact and services to clients; in addition, studies confirm that there is a greater tendency for people who donate time to organizations to make donations of money and goods.[13] Therefore, volunteers are an important source of resources, including unpaid services and donations of both money and in-kind gifts. Along with staff, the volunteers of non-profit organizations form the foundation of the organization and ultimately determine its long-term success.

Five measures assess the use of volunteers: ratio of volunteer hours to staff hours, recruiting activities, management and development of volunteer resources, donations (other than time), and turnover.

The first variable indicates the extent of an organization's use of volunteers relative to staff. It does not differentiate among volunteers on the basis of function. Volunteers involved in program delivery are counted equally with those who perform administrative tasks, or serve on the board, or on a committee. Those agencies that operate solely with volunteers receive their category's high score equivalent because agencies operating with no paid staff epitomize voluntary action.

The second variable in this section measures the extent to which the agency attempts to recruit individuals, particularly past clients, for volunteer activities. Past clients who come to the agency as volunteers are already familiar with the agency and its mission, as well as first-hand experience with the problem or the need the agency is dedicated to addressing.

The third variable deals with the management and development of volunteers. It includes questions such as whether volunteers are screened, assessed for job allocation, trained, and evaluated for performance. This section determines whether an agency attempts to place individuals in positions that use their particular skills, and develops the skills of their volunteers through a training program.

The fourth variable assesses whether agencies maximize the charitable contributions of their volunteers by assessing what percentage of an agency's volunteers donate gifts in addition to their time.

The final variable, volunteer turnover, assesses what percentage of an agency's volunteers remain active. Constantly recruiting and training new volunteers can be costly and time consuming for an agency. A high rate of volunteer retention ensures that agency resources can be concentrated on service or expansion, rather than simply replacement.

Staff

Staff is the second variable assessing personnel effectiveness. One of the greatest strengths of any organization is its staff. Staff provide the front line contact and services to clients, as well as the support and managerial services that enable the program staff and volunteers to achieve their goals. The Volunteers and Staff

---

13   See Statistics Canada (2009), *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights From the 2007 Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating,* cat. no. 71-542-XIE (Minister of Industry); The National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal (1997), *Giving Better, Giving Smarter* (available digitally at http://pcr.hudson.org/ index.cfm?fuseaction=book_giving); and A. Picard (1997), *A Call to Alms: The New Face of Charities in Canada* (Atkinson Charitable Foundation).

variables both deal with the human resources of agencies—key determinants to their success.

The staff performance measure focuses on four areas: the number of program hours provided per full-time equivalent (FTE) staff member, the ratio of program staff to total staff, turnover, and staff management and development. Agencies that rely solely on volunteers (i.e., no staff) are not penalized, but simply receive a "not applicable" (N/A) rating for the Staff performance area.

The first measure considers the number of program hours provided per FTE staff member. It measures the total amount of service provided by the agency on a staff basis, focusing on total hours of programming, so as to effectively eliminate any differences arising from variation in the nature of programs provided by different agencies. For instance, a long-term, intensive program with only a few clients may provide as much or more hours of programming than one that focuses on short-term, crisis intervention with a large number of clients. The measure assesses the amount, not the nature or quality, of program hours the organization delivers.

The second measure, the ratio of program staff to total staff, assesses the intensity of program delivery on a staff basis. It evaluates the percentage of staff directly involved in program delivery, as opposed to the number of support or administrative staff.

These first two measurements emphasize the agency's success in allocating the maximum amount of staff resources directly to program provision. The third variable, staff turnover, was included in the report at the suggestion of several organizations after the 1998 Report was released. Turnover is an important measure for both staff and volunteers since it can be used as an early warning signal for larger managerial problems. Also, it indicates the level of return being garnered by the agency on its staff and volunteers. Agencies invest significant resources in training and developing staff and volunteers. The longer the duration of stay for both, the larger the agency's return on its investment.

The final variable concerns staff training. An agency that has a staff training program in place can ensure that its employees have the skills required to perform their duties appropriately and efficiently, and are able to stay current with new developments in their program area.

Innovation

Innovation is perhaps the most difficult of the ten performance areas to measure. Many of the key aspects of innovation are difficult to quantify, and even more difficult to assess objectively. An organization's culture and leadership play an important role in fostering innovation in an organization. Staff and volunteers must be receptive to and supportive of change for innovation to occur regularly and have a positive effect.

Innovation is critical to the success of an organization's overall operations. Innovation and the change brought about by it enable agencies to be responsive to their communities, clients, and surrounding dynamic environments. To ensure that programs keep pace with external and internal changes, the programs as well as their volunteers and staff must also be dynamic. Innovation allows for such program-improving changes.

Innovation can also help increase an agency's efficiency. As agencies develop new ways to deliver programs, they are often able to find ways to reduce their costs, or improve the delivery of their service. By studying and replicating best practices within the non-profit sector, innovative agencies ensure that their programs continue to serve their clients efficiently and effectively.

Because innovation is so qualitative, this indicator can only be of the crudest nature and should be regarded as such. Organizations were asked questions dealing with how they responded to change, and the progress they made toward implementing innovative new practices. They were also asked about the uniqueness of their programs in order to assess the degree to which they have paved new ground in delivering a service. Finally, organizations were asked about their use of new technologies in program delivery, especially computers, to determine whether they were taking advantage of the opportunities provided by technological advancements.

Program Cost

This performance measure assesses the per-hour cost of providing a program or service. It is important to re-iterate how the scores were calculated. The scores range from 0 to 10. The lowest cost per hour received a score of 10, while the highest cost per hour received a score of 0. The remaining scores were standardized to fall within the 0 to 10 range.

The costs included in the calculations do not include indirect administrative expenses, such as a portion of the senior managers' or executive director's salaries. They do, however, include administrative and non-program expenses such as utilities, rent, and phone charges that are directly related to the provision of the program. The intent of the calculation is to assess the *direct cost* of providing a particular program.

One of the limitations of this particular performance measure is that it does not account for program quality. The measure only assesses the direct cost of providing the program. An example illustrates the possible limitations of this measure. If two agencies both provide 1,000 hours of programming in, say, the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, but one agency's program costs $100,000 while the other agency's program costs $500,000, then there would obviously be a substantial difference in their score on this measure. The first agency would receive a performance score approximately five times better than the second agency. But what if the two programs were sufficiently different so as to make comparison difficult? Suppose, for instance, that the latter agency's program was an intensive, long-term treatment program while the former agency's program was a short-term, crisis intervention program. The nature and focus of the programs in this case are sufficiently different to make cross-comparison tenuous.

It is, therefore, important to note that one of the future objectives of the *Donner Canadian Foundation Awards for Excellence in the Delivery of Social Services* is to expand the number of categories to maximize the probability that sufficiently similar programs will be compared to one another.

Nonetheless, this performance measure does indicate the cost of an agency's program relative to similar programs based on a common category of program provision. It is, therefore, an important resource for assessing the overall cost of a program relative to other similar programs across the country.

In addition to the overall score for program cost, the Confidential Reports also indicate the dollar cost per program hour provided, the dollar cost per client, and the number of hours of programming provided per client. These data are presented in this manner for information purposes only. Note that the cost per client and the hours per client components are not used in the calculation of performance scores.

Outcome Monitoring

Outcome Monitoring is essentially a micro-example of the Donner Awards Program's main objective of providing quantitative performance information for non-profit organizations. It measures the extent to which organizations assess their own performance in terms of achieving specific goals in their programs.

Outcomes, which describe the intended result or consequence of delivering a program, should not be confused with *outputs*, a measure of the goods or services actually provided by a program. While outputs (measured in the Program Cost section) should support outcomes in a reasonable fashion, outputs are more process-oriented. To put it another way, outputs are the means to an end, while outcomes are the desired end itself.

The basis for this measurement is the premise that it is not enough simply to provide a program. Agencies must diligently assess whether or not their programs are achieving the desired results and, if not, implement changes to correct any problems.

This type of outcome measurement is obviously more applicable in certain program categories, such as the Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse. However, it is important for all program categories to actively measure and assess their programs to ensure that they are achieving their stated objectives, whether the service is the Provision of Basic Necessities or Services for Children.

Two sets of questions assess Outcome Monitoring. The first set asks whether the agency has defined the

program's desired outcomes (i.e., what it is that the program is attempting to achieve), and whether or not, given the definition of the desired outcomes, the actual outcomes can be, and are, measured objectively. Common methods of monitoring outcomes often include such tools as client surveys and tracking, typically carried out over defined periods of time ranging from a few months to several years. Outcome monitoring techniques are frequently unique to individual agencies, in that they must be closely tied to the agency's mission. By monitoring and measuring their outcomes, agencies gain insight into what is and is not working, and are able to adjust their programming accordingly.

Thus, the second set of questions deals with how the organization actually uses the outcome information. For instance, agencies were asked whether or not the desired and actual outcomes were compared to one another, and whether there was a plan for dealing with any divergences. These questions focus on whether the agency attempts to measure its success in achieving its goals.

Accessibility

Accessibility is perhaps one of the greatest challenges facing program providers. On the one hand, agencies must ensure that their programs are available, without prejudice, to all who require assistance. On the other hand, non-profit agencies, like for-profit and government organizations, have limited resources. They must ensure that those who cannot afford the program are offered services while at the same time ensuring that those who do have the available financial resources are assessed fees for the service, if appropriate. Further, agencies must ensure that adequate and timely resources are provided to those who are deemed truly needy.

This performance measurement, like the Outcome Monitoring measure, is more applicable in some categories, such as the Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse and the Provision of Basic Necessities, than in others. For this reason, two categories are not included in the analysis of this section: Education and Services for Children.

This section asks several questions regarding accessibility to programs, including whether inquiries are made regarding the cause of the current circumstance, whether program use is monitored, and whether program access is restricted or prioritized according to need. All of the questions focus on the primary issue of whether or not the agency assesses need and then allocates resources accordingly. The scarcity of resources makes determining the nature of a client's circumstances essential to agencies seeking to provide effective and compassionate aid to those most in need.

2014 Donner Awards Alumni Directory

This directory provides a complete list of all organizations that have been short-listed as finalists in the Donner Awards since 1998. Organized alphabetically, the directory indicates the category of social service in which finalists were short-listed and the year(s) that they were recognized in the Donner Awards, either as a finalist, or award recipient.

Organization Name	City	For Further Information	Finalist Category & Year	Category Award	William H. Donner Award	Peter F. Drucker Award
A Loving Spoonful	Vancouver, BC	www.alovingspoonful. org	BAS '03, '05	BAS '03, '05		
Alberta Northern Lights Wheelchair Basketball Society	Edmonton, AB	www.alberta northernlights.com	DIS '98	DIS '98		
Aleph-Bet Child Life Enrichment Program Inc	Winnipeg, MB	www.alephbetdaycare.ca	CHIL '05, '11			
Alice Housing	Dartmouth, NS	www.alicehousing.ca	BAS '04, '07-'14	BAS '04-joint, '07-'13	2008-joint	2010
Alzheimer Society of Huron County	Clinton, ON	www.alzheimerhuron. on.ca	SEN '10			
Alzheimer Society of Oxford	Woodstock, ON	www.alzheimer. oxford.on.ca	SEN '08-'10	SEN '08		
Alzheimer Society of Sault Ste Marie and Algoma District	Sault Ste. Marie, ON	www.alzheimer algoma.org	DIS '06	DIS '06		
Alzheimer Society of Thunder Bay	Thunder Bay, ON	www.alzheimer thunderbay.ca	SEN '98, '00-'07	SEN '01	2001	
Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) Society of Manitoba	Winnipeg, MB	www.alsmb.ca	BAS '99-'00; DIS '08-'09			
Antigonish Seniors' CARE Society	Antigonish, NS		DIS '13			
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Kitchener Waterloo and Area	Kitchener, ON	www.bbbskw.org	COUN/CRIS '99; CRIS '01			
Big Brothers Big Sisters of North Simcoe	Midland, ON	www.kidsdomatter.com	CHIL '12- '13			
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Peterborough	Peterborough, ON	www.bigbrothersand sistersofptbo.com	CHIL '05-'10	CHIL '06, '08	2008-joint	
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Quesnel	Quesnel, BC	www.bigbrothersbigsistersof quesnel.ca	CHIL '11-'12			
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Victoria	Victoria, BC	www.bbbsvictoria.com	CHIL '00, '03	CHIL '01, '03-joint		
Big Brothers Big Sisters of West Island	Kirkland, QC	www.bbsofwi.org	ALT '04	ALT '04		
Big Brothers Big Sisters of York	Newmarket, ON	www.bbbsy.ca	CHIL '06			
Big Brothers of Regina	Regina, SK	www.bigbrothersof regina.com	CHIL '98			
Boys and Girls Club of London	London, ON	www.bgclondon.ca	BAS '01; CHIL '13			

Donner Awards Alumni Directory

Organization Name	City	For Further Information	Finalist Category & Year	Category Award	William H. Donner Award	Peter F. Drucker Award
Boys and Girls Club of Niagara	Niagara Falls, ON	www.boysandgirlsclub niagara.org	CHIL '01-'05	CHIL '03-joint		
Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater Vancouver	Vancouver, BC	www.bgc-gv.bc.ca	CHIL '98			
Breast Cancer Action Ottawa/ Sensibilisation au cancer du sein	Ottawa, ON	www.bcaott.ca	COUN '01			
British Columbia Association of People who Stutter	White Rock, BC	www.bcaps.bc.ca	DIS '07			
Calgary Inter-Faith Food Bank	Calgary, AB	www.calgaryfood bank.com	BAS '02-'08	BAS '04-joint		
Calgary Meals on Wheels	Calgary, AB	www.mealson wheels.com	SEN '07-'08			
Calgary Pregnancy Care Centre	Calgary, AB	www.pregcare.com	CRIS '06-'08; COUN/ CRIS '09, '12-'13	CRIS '06-'08; COUN/ CRIS '12		
Canada Place Childcare Society	Edmonton, AB	www.cpccs.org	CHIL '00			
Canadian Association for Porphyria	Neepawa, MB	www.cpf-inc.ca	COUN '00			
Canadian Mental Health Association for the Kootenays	Cranbrook, BC	www.kootenays.cmha. bc.ca	CRIS '07			
Canadian Mental Health Association Halifax-Dartmouth Branch	Halifax, NS	www.cmha.ca	DIS '00			
Cariboo Chilcotin Child Development Centre Association	Williams Lake, BC	www.cccdca.org	CHIL '10; CHIL '14			
Castor and District Housing Authority	Castor, AB	www.castorhousing.ca	SEN '13			
Centre for Affordable Water and Sanitation Technology	Calgary, AB	www.cawst.org	EDUC '10			
Centre Youville Centre Ottawa Carleton Inc.	Ottawa, ON	www.youvillecentre.com	CHIL '99-'00	CHIL '99		
Chatham Kent Family YMCA	Chatham, ON	www.ckymca.com	CHIL '99			
Community and Primary Health Care—Lanark, Leeds and Grenville	Brockville, ON	www.cphcare.ca	SEN '05-'12	SEN '06-'07, '10- '12	2012	2011
Community Living Campbellford/Brighton	Campbellford, ON	www.communityliving campbellford.com	COUN '07; DIS '02-'05, '09, '11, '12; SEN '06; DIS '13	DIS '02-'03, '05-joint, '09-joint, '11, '12	2003, 2005-joint 2011-joint	2009
Community Living Kawartha Lakes	Lindsay, ON	www.community livingkl.ca	DIS '98			
Community Living Peterborough	Peterborough, ON	www.communityliving peterborough.ca	DIS '10			
Continuing on in Education	Belleville, ON	http://continuingonin education.ca	ALT '01-'07; DIS '14			

Donner Awards Alumni Directory

Organization Name	City	For Further Information	Finalist Category & Year	Category Award	William H. Donner Award	Peter F. Drucker Award
Cornwall Alternative School	Regina, SK	www.cornwallalternativeschool.com	EDUC '98; TRAD '00, '02-'08	EDUC '98; TRAD '00, '02-'04, '06-'08	2002	2006
Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention Centre of British Columbia	Vancouver, BC	www.crisiscentre.bc.ca	CRIS '00, '02-'03, '05-'07, '12; TRAD '08; EDUC '09	CRIS '03, '05; EDUC '09; COUN/CRIS '13		2013
Dartmouth Learning Network	Dartmouth, NS	www.dartmouth learning.net	EDUC '98			
Distress Centre of Ottawa and Region	Ottawa, ON	www.dcottawa.on.ca	CRIS '02, '04-'05			
Dorothy Ley Hospice	Etobicoke, ON	www.dlhospice.org	SEN '98-'99	SEN '98		
East York Learning Experience	Toronto, ON	http://eyle.toronto.on.ca	EDUC '99			
Edmonton Chinese Bilingual Education Association	Edmonton, AB	www.ecbea.org	TRAD '08			
Educational Program Innovations Charity Society	North Sydney, NS	http://epiccharity.com	CHIL '07-'14	CHIL '07, '09-'13	2010, 2013	2012
Eganville and District Senior Citizens' Needs Association	Eganville , ON	www.eganvilleseniors.com	SEN '12-'13			
Elephant Thoughts	Collingwood, ON	www.elephantthoughts.com/	EDUC '12-'14	EDU '12-'13		
Elizabeth Fry Society of Greater Vancouver	New Westminster, BC	www.elizabethfry.com	BAS '98			
Elizabeth Fry Society of Mainland Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, NS	www.efrynovascotia.com	COUN '08, COUN/CRIS '10			
Etobicoke Services for Seniors	Etobicoke, ON	http://ess.web.ca	SEN '00, '02	SEN '02		
Evangel Hall	Toronto, ON	www.evangelhall.ca	BAS '99-'00; COUN/ CRIS '98-'99; EDUC '99			
FEED Nova Scotia	Halifax, NS	www.feednovascotia.ca	BAS '02	BAS '02		
Fife House	Toronto, ON	www.fifehouse.org	BAS '99-'00	BAS '00		
Fraser Recovery Program	Quebec, QC	www.thefrp.org	SUB '04, '10			
Fresh Start Recovery Centre	Calgary, AB	www.freshstartrecoverycentre.com	SUB '06-'14	SUB '10, '13-'14	2014	2014
Friends of the Canadian War Museum (FCWM)	Ottawa, ON	www.friends-amis.org	ALT '08			
Girl Guides of Canada	Toronto, ON	www.girlguides toronto.com	CHIL '02			
Girls Incorporated of Durham	Ajax, ON	www.girlsinc-durham.org	EDUC '11, '13-'14			
Habitat for Humanity— National Capital Region	Ottawa, ON	http://www.habitat ncr.com	BAS '09			
Habitat for Humanity Halton	Burlington, ON	www.habitathalton.ca	BAS '06	BAS '06		

Donner Awards Alumni Directory

Organization Name	City	For Further Information	Finalist Category & Year	Category Award	William H. Donner Award	Peter F. Drucker Award
Harmony	Sarnia, ON	www.harmonyfor youth.org	CHIL '08-'09			
Horton Street Seniors' Centre	London, ON	www.bgclondon.ca/ seniorsPrograms.html	SEN '98			
Hospice Dufferin	Orangeville, ON	www.hospicedufferin. com	COUN '05-'06			
Hospice Greater Saint John	Saint John, NB	www.hospicesj.ca	SEN '03-'06, '09	SEN '04-'05, '09		
Hospice Muskoka	Bracebridge, ON	www.hospicemuskoka.com	SEN '11			
Hospice of Waterloo Region	Kitchener, ON	www.hospicewaterloo.ca	COUN '02-'04, '06-'07; SEN '05			
Inner City Home of Sudbury	Sudbury, ON	www.innercityhome sudbury.ca	BAS '01-'12			
InnerVisions Recovery Society of BC	Port Coquitlam, BC	www.innervisions recovery.com	SUB '03-'07	SUB '06	2006-joint	
Janus Academy Society	Calgary, AB	www.janusacademy.com	ALT '05			
John Knox Christian School	Oakville, ON	www.jkcs-oakville.org	TRAD '05, '07	TRAD '05		
Julien House Society/ Westminster House	New Westminster, BC	www.westminster house.ca	SUB '00	SUB '00-joint		
Kawartha Lakes Food Source		www.www.kawarthalakes foodsource.com	BASIC '14			
Kids Come First Child Care Services	Thornhill, ON	www.between- friends.org	CHIL '02, '04, '08	CHIL '02, '04		
Kitsilano Area Child Care Society	Vancouver, BC	604-732-6327	CHIL '00	CHIL '00		
Lakeview Montessori School	Windsor, ON	http://lakeview- school.com	EDUC '98			
Last Door Recovery Centre	New Westminster, BC	www.lastdoor.org	SUB '98, '13			
Les Aînés de Jonquière	Jonquière, QC	www.ainesdejonquiere.ca	DIS '12; SEN '13-'14	SEN '13-'14		
London Christian Elementary School	London, ON	www.londonchristian.ca	TRAD '01			
London Crisis Pregnancy Centre	London, ON	www.notalone.ca	CRIS '03-'06, '08; COUN/ CRIS '09-'11, '13-'14	COUN/ CRIS '11		
Lynn Valley Parent Participation Preschool	North Vancouver, BC	www.lvppp.org	TRAD '00-'01	TRAD '01		
Maidstone Group Home Society Inc	Maidstone, SK	www.caringcareers.ca/ member_agencies/ details.php?id=53	DIS '06, '08, '10			
Manne du Jour	Mont-Laurier, QC		BAS '13			
Metis Local 1990 Elders Caring Shelter	Grande Prairie, AB	Facebook, Metis Local 1990	SEN '14			
Michael House Pregnancy Care Centre	Guelph, ON	www.michaelhouse.ca	COUN '14	COUN '14		

Donner Awards Alumni Directory

Organization Name	City	For Further Information	Finalist Category & Year	Category Award	William H. Donner Award	Peter F. Drucker Award
Mid Toronto Community Services	Toronto, ON	www.midtoronto.com	SEN '00			
Minden Food Bank	Minden, ON		BAS '10-'11			
Moncton Crisis Pregnancy Center Inc	Moncton, NB	www.pregnancy support.ca	ALT '00; CRIS '99-'00			
Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada—Calgary and Area Chapter	Calgary, AB	www.mscalgary.org	DIS '99-'14	DIS '00, '01-joint, '04, '05-joint, '07, '08-joint, '09-joint, '10, '13, '14	2000-joint, 2005-joint	2005
Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada— Timmins Chapter	Timmins, ON	www.mssociety.ca/ chapters/timmins	DIS '01			
National Council of Jewish Women of Canada, Toronto Section	Toronto, ON	www.ncjwc-ts.org	EDUC '99; SEN '99			
NeighbourLink Calgary	Calgary, AB	www.neighbourlinkcalgary.ca	BASIC '14	BASIC '14		
Niagara Regional Literacy Council	St. Catharines, ON	www.literacyniagara.org	ALT '03			
Norfolk Association for Community Living	Simcoe, ON	www.nacl.ca	DIS '98 - '03	DIS '99, '01-joint		
North Shore Volunteers for Seniors	West Vancouver, BC	www.nsvs.ca	SEN '11, '12			
Oak Park Neighbourhood Centre	Oakville, ON	www.opnc.ca	CHIL '14	CHIL '14		
Opportunity for Advancement	Toronto, ON	www.ofacan.com	ALT '05			
Ottawa Waldorf School	Stittsville, ON	www.waldorf.cyberus.ca	EDUC '99; TRAD '03			
Our Place Society	Victoria, BC	www.ourplacesociety.com	BAS '13			
Pacific Assistance Dogs Society	Burnaby, BC	www.pads.ca	DIS '05, '07-'08, '11	DIS '08-joint		
Parkgate Community Services Society	North Vancouver, BC	www.myparkgate.com	ALT '02; SEN '01-'03	ALT '02; SEN '03		
PARO Centre for Women's Enterprise	Thunder Bay, ON	www.paro.ca	EDU '13-'14	EDU '14		
Penticton Christian School	Penticton, BC	www.pentictonchristian school.ca	TRAD '05-'06			
Pickering Christian School	Ajax, ON	www.pickeringcs.on.ca	TRAD '00-'01			
Planned Parenthood— Newfoundland and Labrador Sexual Health Centre Inc	St. John's, NL	www.nlsexualhealth centre.org	ALT '08			
Recovery Acres (Calgary) Society	Calgary, AB	www.recoveryacres.org	SUB '99, '01-'03			
Regent Park Focus Youth Media Arts Centre	Toronto, ON	www.catchdaflava.com	SUB '98			
Rose of Durham Young Parents Support Services	Oshawa, ON	www.roseofdurham.com	COUN '12, '14			

Donner Awards Alumni Directory

Organization Name	City	For Further Information	Finalist Category & Year	Category Award	William H. Donner Award	Peter F. Drucker Award
Royal Canadian Legion Greater Edmonton Poppy Fund	Edmonton, AB	www.poppyfund.ca	BAS '12			
Sarnia Lambton Rebound: A Program for Youth	Sarnia, ON	www.reboundonline.com	ALT '00-'08; COUN/CRIS '98-'99, '09-'11; CRIS '00-'06, '08; EDUC '09-'11 SUB '11	ALT 03, '05-'08; COUN/CRIS '98-'99, '09-'10; CRIS '00-'02, '04	1998, 2000-joint, 2004-joint, 2009	2004
Saskatchewan 4H Council	Saskatoon, SK	www.4-h.sk.ca	EDUC '10-'12	EDUC '10-'11		
Saskatchewan Abilities Council	Saskatoon, SK	www.abilitiescouncil. sk.ca	DIS '99			
Saskatchewan Music Educators Association	Cudworth, SK	www.musiceducation online.org	EDUC '09			
Second Base Youth Shelter (Scarborough)	Scarborough, ON	www.secondbase.ca	BAS '98			
Seizure & Brain Injury Centre	Timmins, ON	www.seizurebraininjury centre.com	DIS '14			
Servants Anonymous Society of Calgary	Calgary, AB	www.servantsanon.com	SUB '13-'14			
Servants Anonymous Society, Surrey	Surrey, BC	www.sasurrey.ca	SUB '11-'12	SUB '11-'12	2011-joint	
Simon House Residence Society	Calgary, AB	www.simonhouse.com	SUB '98-'99, '02-'05, '07-'10, '12, '14	SUB '98, '03-'05, '07-'09	2004-joint, 2007	2007
Society for Christian Education in Southern Alberta	Lethbridge, AB	www.sonrisechristian academy.com	TRAD '02-'03			
Sonrise Christian Academy	Picton, ON	www.sonrisechristian academy.com	TRAD '04-'05			
Southwest Day Care and Early Learning Centre	Moose Jaw, SK	swdc_elc@lycos.com	CHIL '01, '03			
St. Joseph's Villa	Dundas, ON	www.sjv.on.ca	SEN '98-'01	SEN '99-'00	1999	
Sudbury Action Centre for Youth	Sudbury, ON	www.sacy.ca	COUN '01-'08; SUB '01-'02, '04-'09	COUN '04-'07; SUB '02	2006-joint	2008
Sunshine Centres for Seniors	Toronto, ON	www.sunshine centres.com	SEN '02			
Teen Aid Southwest Inc	Swift Current, SK	teenaidsw@sasktel.net	ALT '06-'07			
The Air Cadet League of Canada (NB) Inc.	Saint John, NB	www.aircadetleaguenb.ca	EDUC '12			
The Children's Garden Nursery School	Pembroke, ON	www.thechildrens garden.org	CHIL '01-'07	CHIL '05		
The Good Neighbours' Club	Toronto, ON	http://goodneighboursclub. org/	SEN '14			
The Mississauga Food Bank	Mississauga, ON	www.themississaugafood bank.org	BAS '98			

Donner Awards Alumni Directory

Organization Name	City	For Further Information	Finalist Category & Year	Category Award	William H. Donner Award	Peter F. Drucker Award
Together We Can Drug and Alcohol Recovery and Education Society	Vancouver, BC	www.twcvancouver.org	SUB '00; COUN '00			
Toronto Heschel School	Toronto, ON	www.torontoheschel.org	TRAD '02			
Trenton Christian School Society	Trenton, ON	www.trentonchristianschool.com	TRAD '04; '06-'07			
Vancouver AIDS Society	Vancouver, BC	www.aidsvancouver.org	BAS '99-'01	BAS '99, '01		
Vernon and District Hospice Society	Vernon, BC	www.vernonhospice.ca	COUN '00-'01, '03	COUN '00-'01		
Vernon Disability Resource Centre	Vernon, BC	www.vrdc.ca	DIS '04, '06			
VON Corner Brook	Corner Brook, NL	www.von.ca/National Directory/branch.aspx?BranchId=58	DIS '01; SEN '99			
Western Ottawa Community Resource Centre	Kanata, ON	www.communityresourcecentre.ca	ALT '00-'01; CHIL '99; COUN '01; TRAD '03	ALT '01		
Willowridge Information and Recreation Centre	Etobicoke, ON	www.wirc.ca	CHIL '98	CHIL '98		
Women's Addiction Recovery Mediation WARM	Fort Erie, ON	www.warmniagara.org	SUB '00	SUB '00-joint		
Womens Centre	Oakville, ON	www.haltonwomenscentre.org	COUN '00			
Women's Crisis Services of Waterloo Region	Cambridge, ON	www.wcswr.org	BAS '98	BAS '98		
Wood's Homes	Calgary, AB	www.woodshomes.com	SUB '99, '01	SUB '99, '01		
Yee Hong Centre for Geriatric Care	Scarborough, ON	www.yeehong.com	SEN '04			
YMCA of Greater Toronto	Toronto, ON	www.ymcatoronto.org	SUB '00			
YMCA Sarnia Lambton	Sarnia, ON	www.ymcasar.org	BAS '02; COUN '02-'03, '05-'06	COUN '02-'03		
York Region Abuse Program	Newmarket, ON	www.yrap.ca	ALT '00, '04; COUN/ CRIS '98-'99; CRIS '00; COUN '04-'05; EDUC '99	ALT '00; EDUC '99		
Youth Services of Lambton County—Huron House Boys' Residential Home	Bright's Grove, ON	www.hhbh.ca	COUN '07-'08, '11	COUN '08		

Alumni Directory—Category Definitions

ALT   Alternative Education: includes agencies or programs providing education (continuing or alternative) and training outside the confines of traditional primary and secondary education.

BAS   Provision of Basic Necessities: includes agencies or programs that provide at least one of three basic life necessities: food, clothing, and shelter.

CHIL   Services for Children: includes agencies or programs that provide care and development for children outside a classroom environment.

COUN   Counselling Services: includes agencies or programs that provide support and information through counselling, whether it is by telephone, in written form, one-on-one, or in a group.

CRIS   Crisis Intervention: includes agencies or programs that provide support and information to those in distress. The service needs to focus mostly on distress; that is, it tends to be an immediate crisis response rather than an attempt to get at the underlying cause.

COUN/CRIS   Counselling Services/Crisis Intervention: combines the Counselling Services and the Crisis Intervention categories. This category was offered in 1998 and 1999, after which it was split into two separate categories. In 2009 the two categories were combined again.

DIS   Services for People with Disabilities: includes agencies or programs that provide goods and/or services for people with a disability.

EDUC   Education: combines the Alternative Education and the Traditional Education categories. This category was offered in 1998 and 1999, after which it was split into two separate categories. In 2009 the two categories were combined again.

SEN   Services for Seniors: includes agencies or programs that provide goods and/or services for people who are senior citizens.

SUB   Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse: includes agencies or programs that promote wellness and assist people in dealing with drug and alcohol addictions.

TRAD   Traditional Education: includes classroom-based education for any grade from Kindergarten to Grade 12.

Appendix: Technical Discussion of the Performance Scores

Calculating the scores

The calculation of the scores was as objective as possible. The agency scores in each of the various criteria were ranked from highest to lowest. The subsequent range (highest value – lowest value) represented the span of scores. The scores were then adjusted to a range of between 0 and 10. The best performing agency received a score of 10 and became the upper limit, while the lowest-ranked agency received a score of 0 and became the lower limit. All the remaining scores were placed according to their original performance within the 0 to 10 range.

Some performance areas represent a composite score of several variables. For instance, Financial Management measures five separate areas of financial performance. Program Cost, on the other hand, assesses only one particular area of performance.

Only agencies that identified themselves as working in similar fields, such as services for seniors or prevention and treatment of substance abuse, were compared with one another. In this way, agencies can view their relative performance to other, similar agencies.

In addition to the calculations this year, we used a specific method to control for outliers. If an outlier was present in the data, the max or min was capped at ±1.5 standard deviations from the mean. This method helps us avoid a situation where the rankings are captured by a strong influence from a significant outlier.

Also, in the past if an agency had no staff, they were not penalized and received a score of N/A. However, if an agency reported to have no volunteers, they were penalized with a score of 0. This year we decided to not penalize an agency for having no volunteers, as it may not be practical for all agencies to do so. We have thus given agencies a N/A rating for having no volunteers.

Score calculations illustrated

An illustration may help you understand how the scores were calculated and thus how to interpret your agency's scores. Assume that there are six agencies in this hypothetical example, and that we are evaluating cost per program-hour. Table 3 summarizes the data for the six agencies. In this example, Agency D is the best performing agency at a cost of $50 per hour of programming and therefore receives a score of 10. Agencies B and E are the lowest-ranked agencies at a cost of $125 per hour of programming and receive a score of 0. The remaining agency scores are standardized to fall within the range of 0 to 10.

Two special cases: Staff and volunteers

In order to illustrate score differences, table 4 summarizes the statistical information for the Staff and Volun-

Table 3: Cost Per Program-Hour

Agency	Number of Program Hours	Total Cost	Cost per Program hour	Score
Agency A	1,000	$100,000	$100	3.3
Agency B	2,000	$250,000	$125	0.0
Agency C	2,000	$200,000	$100	3.3
Agency D	4,000	$200,000	$50	10.0
Agency E	4,000	$500,000	$125	0.0
Agency F	4,000	$300,000	$75	6.7

Table 4: Statistical Performance Summary

Performance Area	Low Score	High Score	Mean (Average)	Median (Middle Score)
Staff	0.0	8.0	3.4	3.1
Volunteers	0.0	7.5	3.0	2.7
Income Independence	0.0	10.0	6.9	7.4
Financial Management	1.0	8.7	6.3	6.5

teers criteria as well as for two other criteria (Income Independence and Financial Management). The mean and median scores for the Staff and Volunteers performance areas are fairly low on the 0 to 10 scale.

The low scores for both Staff and Volunteers show that agencies should focus on the mean (average) and median (middle score) statistics. Although the figures are low in absolute terms on the scale (0 to 10), the key to assessing your agency's performance is your score *relative* to the mean (average) and median (middle score).

Performance is relative

It is important to note that your agency is being assessed against other participating agencies, not the non-profit sector as a whole. The pool of applications, from which the data is taken, is subject to a self-selection bias. This occurs when agencies self-assess their own competitiveness and decide whether they should or should not submit an application. For instance, when completing the application it is evident whether an agency is competitive or not in performance categories such as Financial Management and Volunteers. Those agencies with poor financial performance, or those not maintaining or using volunteers, for example, will realize they are not competitive in these areas as they complete their applications, and thus may not send in their application. The pool of applications and the scores received, therefore, represent the very best of social services agencies in the country.