**Introduction**

Founded in 1998, GLG is a New York City-based company that connects its clients, via a proprietary technology platform, with subject matter experts across every industry to inform business decisions. Subject matter experts, called “Council Members,” constitute a remarkably diverse group of 500,000 individuals, from C-suite executives to former government employees. Clients—investors, professional services firms, and more—seek professional learning and insights into organizational development.

In 2013, Jen Field was hired as the company’s first-ever Director of Social Impact. Cognizant of the potential benefits that GLG’s unique service offering could provide social entrepreneurs—individuals using the techniques of start-up companies to design solutions to social and environmental issues—GLG launched its Social Impact Fellowship in 2014. Rachel Wald was hired in 2014 to further drive the development and operationalization of the Fellowship, in addition to other responsibilities.

Now in its third class, the GLG Social Impact Fellowship aims to select social entrepreneurs whose organizations are at “inflection points,” and for whom GLG’s professional learning network would support their development in achieving their respective goals. The Fellowship provides free, unlimited access to GLG’s Council Members, educational in-person convenings, brand augmentation through GLG’s marketing outreach, and an internal advocate—typically Rachel—who provides ongoing, personalized support and guidance in navigating GLG’s offerings. The Fellowship also affords GLG platform access to the staff members of Fellows’ organizations.
When the Fellowship was piloted in 2014, the program’s duration was one year. Learning from that experience, GLG extended the Fellowship by an additional year in 2015 and 2016, providing Fellows with additional time to grasp and take advantage of GLG’s resources, as well as to develop as a cohort. Another strategic structural modification was made in 2016, decreasing the size of the Fellowship class from 12 to 6, thereby providing a greater degree of individualized attention to Fellows.

From hundreds of applications and nominations received to date, 30 impressive individuals have been named GLG Social Impact Fellows as of early 2017. Their enterprises address issues as varied as health inequity in the United States and the lack of capital available to entrepreneurs in Sub-Saharan Africa. As GLG looks to recruit its fourth class of Fellows, the company has engaged an outside evaluator, New York City-based Social Strategy Associates, to assess and better understand the impact of the Social Impact Fellowship on its Fellows and the enterprises they lead.
Methodology

In order to better understand the impact of the GLG Social Impact Fellowship on both Fellows and their respective organizations, a 5-step methodology was employed, as illustrated in the graphic below.

First, evaluators from Social Strategy Associates met with Jen Field and Rachel Wald for an in-depth discussion to clarify the Social Impact Fellowship’s objectives and structure, as well as to conceptualize and collaborate on the evaluation framework to be utilized. Then, GLG provided the evaluators with internal materials about the Fellowship that sought to provide evaluators with additional color and context around the program and GLG more broadly.

The first two steps laid the foundation for the third: designing an interview guide for the purpose of collecting relevant and consistent information from Fellows. Questions contained in this interview guide were structured to address four primary areas:

1. **The Fellowship application process;**
2. **The onboarding process;**
3. **Fellow and organizational engagements with GLG; and**
4. **Reflections on the GLG Social Impact Fellowship experience and impact.**

In scoping this evaluation, it was determined that the evaluators would attempt to speak with all Fellows of the 2015 and 2016 cohorts, but would not attempt to speak with Fellows of the 2014 pilot cohort.
This is because the Fellowship changed considerably in the years after the pilot, so the 2014 Fellowship experience was interpreted as not adequately reflecting the current Fellowship experience.

There were slight differences between the interview guides developed for the 2015 and 2016 cohorts because, at the time of the interviews, 2016 Fellows were just seven months into their Fellowship experience. Another interview guide, again containing similar questions, was developed for “power users”—staff members who Fellows identified as frequent users of the GLG platform.

After sign-off on the interview guides from GLG, Rachel Wald individually emailed all 2015 and 2016 Fellows to inform them that an evaluation was to take place and to request their participation in a 30-minute interview with a third-party evaluator. The evaluation team then followed up on these emails to schedule interviews with Fellows and, when appropriate, their Power Users. Fellows and Power Users were informed that their responses would remain anonymous to the extent possible (i.e., cohort sizes are small and Fellows’ and Power Users’ responses often reveal unique traits about their organizations) and aggregated into a broad analysis of all interview feedback.

Evaluators interviewed a total of 19 participants, as detailed in the table below. In total, four Fellows—all from the 2015 cohort—declined or were unable to participate in the interviews. Ultimately, all six 2016 Fellows, nine of the 12 2015 Fellows, and five Power Users participated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Social Impact Fellows</th>
<th>Fellow Name</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Power User</th>
<th>Interview Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Arnoldy**</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Monica Landy</td>
<td>March 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Auerbach</td>
<td>Sanergy</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 07, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donnel Baird</td>
<td>Bloc Power</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2015 Social Impact Fellows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellow Name</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Power User</th>
<th>Interview Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanya Balakrishna</td>
<td>The Future Project</td>
<td>Zachary Hill</td>
<td>March 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Ballard</td>
<td>TreeHouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 02, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Barasch</td>
<td>Lowline</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Dalwai</td>
<td>Open Medicine Project</td>
<td>Yaseen Khan</td>
<td>March 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangu Delle</td>
<td>Golden Palm Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erine Gray</td>
<td>Aunt Bertha</td>
<td>Margo Johnson</td>
<td>March 02, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Riva</td>
<td>Compass Working Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 06, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Scharpf***</td>
<td>SHE</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca van Bergen</td>
<td>Build a Nest</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016 Social Impact Fellows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellow Name</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Power User</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Bush****</td>
<td>Global Health Corps</td>
<td>Mera Boulus</td>
<td>April 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minhaj Chowdhury</td>
<td>Drinkwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 03, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Donaldson</td>
<td>D-Rev</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Liu</td>
<td>Bayes Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misan Rewane</td>
<td>WAVE Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 12, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Wood</td>
<td>Team Rubicon</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interview dates listed refer to the dates on which Fellows were interviewed; Power Users were interviewed separately on other dates. Fellows for whom “N/A” is marked in this column did not participate in the evaluation.

**Mark Arnoldy did not participate in the interview process, but his Chief of Staff and identified power user, Monica Landy, did. In this case, the interview date listed refers to the date on which Monica Landy was interviewed.
The fifth step in this process—analysis of interview responses—comprises the bulk of the evaluation before you. By asking many of the same questions across interviews, evaluators were able to aggregate data and present findings in a relatively straightforward manner. The aggregation of quantitative information is frequently presented in bar chart format herein. Select quotes have been called out to add additional emphasis to findings. The recommendations presented at the conclusion of this evaluation are based on the sum of learnings gleaned from the 5-step process, as well as the professional expertise of the evaluators.

The body of this evaluation is organized by “areas of impact,” or Fellowship component, in keeping with the structure of the interview guides. Key findings are outlined in orange at the end of each section.

Finally, it’s worth noting that, by request and design, this evaluation focuses just on the impact of the Fellowship on its external participants (i.e., Fellows) and the organizations they lead. This evaluation does not consider the internal impacts of the Fellowship program on GLG itself.
Evaluation

A. Application Process

Fellows learn of the GLG Social Impact Fellowship in one of three ways: 1. Through Jen Field or Rachel Wald directly; 2. Through another fellowship or prize program with which they, the Fellows, are associated; or 3. Through a colleague, sometimes a previous GLG Social Impact Fellow. It’s of note that no Fellow indicates hearing about the program through a Google search or similar means of exploration. This speaks to GLG’s recruitment process, which has become increasingly targeted over the years. The application process itself is, as one Fellow puts it, “blessedly straightforward.” Most Fellows use the word “simple,” while others have difficulty recalling the process at all—a sign that it wasn’t particularly onerous. One Fellow appreciates how GLG kept her informed of her status and standing throughout the application process. All Power Users responded that they were either not involved in the application process (i.e., did not assist the Fellow in the application process) or could not remember the application process.

Interestingly, most Fellows indicate that at the time of applying they did not understand exactly what to expect from the Fellowship. Fellows were typically unfamiliar with GLG and did not understand the full value that the Social Impact Fellowship could provide them. Fellows articulate knowing that the Fellowship would “offer access to mentors,” as one Fellow put it, but, again, lacked insight into the specific supports offered through the Fellowship experience. Just four Fellows—those who knew a previous program participant—communicated a fuller understanding of the program prior to their participation in it. This suggests that including previous Fellows in the recruitment efforts may be a valuable component of the application process.

“I knew that the Fellowship could be helpful by connecting me with potential advisors and experts, but I didn’t really understand the extent of its helpfulness in terms of concrete impact.”

“I don’t think I knew how useful the Fellowship would be, to be honest. What drew me to apply for the Fellowship was my enormous respect for Jen Field.”
That said, all interviewees report that the Fellowship met or exceeded their expectations—however vague or limited those initial expectations were.

Key Findings:

❖ Successful applicants typically first learn about the Fellowship through word-of-mouth with professional contacts and through individual outreach conducted by Jen Field and Rachel Wald.

❖ Fellows describe and compliment the application process as being relatively simple and straightforward.

❖ An opportunity exists to further educate prospective applicants during the recruitment and application processes; Fellows recall having limited or vague understanding of the program prior to their matriculation.

B. Onboarding and Convening

A cornerstone of the design of the GLG Social Impact Fellowship is the intentional selection and inclusion of organizations that are deemed to be at an inflection point. Offerings provided by GLG seek to facilitate Fellows’ progression forward, helping them to overcome obstacles to organizational growth and sustainability and, overall, better positioning them to successfully navigate this pivotal moment. Fellows agree that their organizations were at inflection or turning points when they began the Fellowship. Nearly all Fellows were in the process of scaling or expanding their organization’s footprint or programmatic offerings. In one case, a Fellow describes her inflection point as a
turn towards concentrating on the long-term sustainability and health of her organization. Power Users support this notion that organizations were at a critical inflection point tied primarily to “growth.”

To kick off the Fellowship, GLG hosts a fall convening in New York at which Fellows meet one another and GLGers, both the Social Impact team and other GLG staff members. The convening provides Fellows with access to workshops, exercises, and learning opportunities.

At Fellows’ first fall convening, **GLG collaborates with The Bridgespan Group to host an exercise called the “Pre-Mortem Agenda” in which Fellows participate together.** The exercise encourages participants to project several years into the future and to reflect on the reasons their organizations have failed. The objective of this exercise is to identify those key issues facing an organization and, further, to think through how the Fellowship can support the organization in tackling said issues. **Most Fellows find this exercise valuable.** Indeed, all but one of the 2016 Fellows describe the exercise as “very helpful.” Similarly, five of the seven 2015 Fellows—one Fellow did not participate in her first fall convening—describe the exercise in the 2015 fall convening as “very helpful.” All other Fellows who participated in their respective first fall convening describe the exercise as “somewhat helpful.”

> “It allowed us to think about the future,” which proved meaningful because the Fellow “never gets the luxury” of time to plan for the future.

> “Exercises like that are a bit challenging because they are done quickly and the people participating don’t have knowledge about the organization.”
Although a majority of Fellows are enthusiastic about the value added by the Pre-Mortem Agenda exercise, just two Fellows—both of whom belonged to the 2015 cohort—cite the activity as their greatest takeaway from the convening. The remainder cite other components of the convening as their greatest takeaway, including the real-time, in-person opportunities to:

❖ Meet and interact with other Fellows;
❖ Access GLG staff members and better understand how to utilize the GLG platform; and
❖ Gain tangible skills and on-the-spot mentorship.

Another stated objective of these in-person convenings is to foster a sense of community amongst Fellows, as well as between Fellows and GLGers, and to provide Fellows with access to other workshops, exercises, and learning opportunities. All 2016 Fellows indicate that GLG achieved these goals. The responses of 2015 Fellows, however, varied: six of seven Fellows who attended the convening say that a sense of community was fostered between Fellows and GLGers, and four say a sense of community was fostered amongst one another.

“The actual thinking involved in the exercise was moderately helpful, because it was such a short session and it wasn’t a particularly rigorous process.”

“The exercise allowed me to zero in on where our biggest areas of risk were.”

“The exercise was good, but not excellent.”

“The experience helped structure thinking about how to prioritize what needs to be done.”
Sense of Community Fostered Between Fellows & GLG Staff at Convenings

- **Yes**: 12 Fellows
- **No**: 1 Fellow
- **N/A**: 1 Fellow

Sense of Community Fostered Between Fellows at Convenings

- **Yes**: 10 Fellows
- **No**: 3 Fellows
- **N/A**: 1 Fellow
### Key Findings:

| ✧ The central narrative of the GLG Social Impact Fellowship—that it selects Fellows whose organizations are at an inflection point—is accurate. Further, the nature of this inflection point is nearly unanimous across cohorts: Organizations were about to significantly scale their efforts. |
| ✧ The in-person fall convening is a valuable onboarding experience for Fellows. It allows these individuals to better understand the capabilities and uses of GLG’s professional learning platform, to reflect on critical organizational issues so as to focus their Council Member requests, and to connect with GLG staff members and one another. |
| ✧ The Pre-Mortem Agenda exercise conducted by The Bridgespan Group at the fall convening is generally well-received by Fellows. |

### C. Fellowship Engagement

It’s now been established that through the Fellowship’s onboarding process, and specifically the fall convening, both GLG and Fellows identify critical challenges that each organization is experiencing and the most effective ways in which GLG can provide strategic support. The remainder and bulk of the Fellowship period is dedicated to leveraging GLG’s professional learning platform and other services to the benefit of Fellows’ organizations. The Fellowship’s various components—connections facilitated by GLG staff members between Fellows and Council Members; strategic project support from Rachel, Jen, and other GLGers; and broader learning opportunities—seek to ultimately help Fellows successfully navigate through their stated inflection points. Once Fellows have onboarded, they—and their staff—may use the GLG platform as often as they please at no cost.

*"I tell my staff…if you got a question you can’t answer, use GLG.”*
Most Fellows explain that they think to use GLG as a resource when they have a specific, strategic question they want answered or are looking to gain knowledge or expertise around a particular subject matter. Fellows tend to consult GLG when, as one Fellow put it, they are facing “wicked challenges” as opposed to “day-to-day, basic challenges.” Another Fellow remarks that her team has learned to integrate GLG into the early stages of “every single project,” during which time the organization benefits from additional expertise and learning. Most Fellows sought expert perspectives and in-depth related to expansion and/or transitioning, market entry, data collection, survey design, partnership building, and product and infrastructure design. Three Fellows—two from the 2015 cohort and one from the 2016 cohort—add that GLG has also proven a resource in “offering leadership development opportunities,” helping staff achieve “professional development goals.”

“GLG offers incredible leadership development opportunities for my team that are unlike any other fellowship I’ve done. Like an all-you-can-eat buffet, there are no limits.”

Interestingly, the majority of Power Users do not note GLG’s role in offering professional development opportunities; in fact, most agree with 2015 and 2016 Fellows who think to utilize the platform when their organizations seek expertise around a particular subject matter area and/or are addressing significant challenges.

One Fellow, however, notes that he rarely thinks to use GLG as a resource. This Fellow explained that because “start-ups are ‘fire-fighting’ all the time,” her organization has difficulty finding time to utilize the GLG platform. This sentiment was echoed by other Fellows who express their concern that the nature of running daily organizational operations sometimes prevents them from taking full advantage of the Fellowship’s offerings. One Fellow adds that in the first year of the Fellowship, her organization did not engage GLG as often as she would have liked because of a lack of understanding amongst staff about...
“how the platform worked” and an impression that staff could only bring forth to GLG “the biggest strategic questions.”

“If anything, we have struggled to take full advantage of GLG because we are busy with everything else.”

Another Fellow notes that although she frequently used the GLG platform, she has difficulty getting her staff to leverage the Fellowship because of cultural and language barriers. This Fellow explains that because English is not the native language of most of her staff, her staff is reluctant to reach out to GLG. Similarly, because her organization is based in another continent, the Fellow worries that a lack of geographical and cultural context, particularly among Council Members, hinders her organization’s ability to leverage the Fellowship to its fullest potential.

Despite these constraints, 13 Fellows describe the frequency of interaction between GLG and their organization as either “very often” or “often.” The remaining Fellow—who belongs to the 2016 cohort—describes the frequency of interaction between her organization and GLG as “seldom,” but nevertheless perceives this level of frequency as fitting, considering her organization’s unique needs and her own scheduling conflicts. Interestingly, all Fellows say that the level of engagement between their organizations and GLG has been appropriate and helpful. As one 2016 Fellow remarked: “We sometimes don’t have specific areas that we’re looking to explore.”

Fellows are not the sole contacts who engage GLG, however. In most cases, Fellows act as the primary user of the GLG platform, with limited interaction between their staff members and GLG. In a handful of cases, though, Fellows have formally shifted the opportunity to engage with the GLG platform to a senior member of their team. In such cases, this decision is usually the result of a Fellow’s busy schedule or the recognition that a staff member could, given the nature of her role, benefit more substantially from the focused learning that the
GLG platform provides. Most Power Users interviewed described the level of engagement between them, specifically, and their organizations as “often,” a level of engagement that they, too, feel is appropriate and meaningful. Several Fellows indicate that they would like their staffs to engage more frequently with GLG, but it could be difficult given language barriers (typically in cases where Fellows are based in other countries), time constraints, and/or lack of understanding about how to effectively leverage the GLG platform.

Engagements between GLG and Fellows often take the form of the unique learning opportunities offered by GLG. These learning opportunities offered by GLG contribute to much of the Fellowship’s value. These opportunities include:

1. In-person convenings;
2. Phone calls with Rachel, Jen, and/or GLGers;
3. In-person meetings with Rachel and/or GLGers;
4. In-person meetings and/or phone calls with Council Members; and
5. Special events, including virtual webinars and/or in-person conferences, but excluding the in-person convenings.

An overwhelming majority of Fellows describe the learning opportunities offered by GLG as always or often relevant. Only one Fellow—who belonged to the 2015 cohort—says the learning opportunities are seldom relevant.

To rate the value of these learning opportunities, Fellows were asked to use an ordinal scale of:

- Very valuable
- Somewhat valuable; and
- Not valuable.
The below table breaks down Fellows’ ratings of each learning opportunity offered, and further includes the breakdown of findings by cohort year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Opportunity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>No. of Fellows</th>
<th>Breakdown by Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person Convenings</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Valuable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Valuable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls with Rachel and/or GLGers</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Valuable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Valuable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person Meetings with Rachel and/or GLGers</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Valuable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Valuable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person Meetings and/or Phone Calls with Council Members</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Valuable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Valuable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events (Virtual and/or</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Valuable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order of rank, the most popular learning opportunities offered include:

- **In-person meetings and/or phone calls with Council Members;**
- **Phone calls with Rachel and/or GLGers; and**
- **In-person meetings with Rachel and/or GLGers.**

The first two learning opportunities mentioned above—in-person meetings and/or phone calls with Council Members and phone calls with Rachel and/or GLGers—are tied for the most popular learning opportunity offered. The least popular learning opportunity offered is special events, broadly defined to include all virtual and in-person events but not convenings. **Among Power Users, the most popular learning opportunity offered is in-person meetings with Rachel and/or GLGers.**

Considering the high value placed by Fellows on time spent communicating with Council Members—the crux of the Fellowship’s service offerings—it is not surprising that **most Fellows described their engagements with these subject matter experts as “high quality.”** In fact, all 2016 Fellows said that their engagements with Council Members have been high quality. Five of eight 2015 Fellows said the same; two 2015 Fellows said the connections were “medium quality” and the remaining Fellow said that the connections made were “somewhere between high quality and medium quality.” Most Power users agreed that engagements with Council Members were “high quality”; the remaining Power Users described the engagements as “medium quality.”

*“Sometimes you click with the Council Member and sometimes you don’t.”*
Fellows cite that Council Member engagements are most valuable when:

1. Council Members prepared for meetings with Fellows by conducting their own background research on Fellows’ organizations;
2. Council Members prepared for meetings with Fellows by obtaining contextual information related to Fellows’ organizations’ geographic locations and populations served; and
3. Council Members’ expertise hit right at the heart of the issues being addressed in the engagements.

The least valuable engagements for Fellows and Power Users were those that lacked the aforementioned attributes. Particularly, engagements facilitated by GLG between Fellows and Council Members were deemed less valuable when Fellows had to “spend a lot of time” providing Council Members with context and background before diving in to the matter at hand. One Fellow expresses concern about Council Members’ lack of relevant cultural or geographic knowledge.

“All Fellows and Power Users agree that the duration of engagements with Council Members is appropriate and meaningful. In most cases, these engagements are not proceeded by additional conversations. In one case, however, a Fellow describes deliberately scheduling follow-up conversations with a Council Member. To make the engagements even more valuable, Fellows and Power Users recommend increased “context improvement”; that is, ensuring that Council Members are provided with background knowledge on the Fellow’s organization and the nature of her work. One Fellow suggests GLG “prepare a five-minute brief” highlighting the organization’s activities and internal structures to be given to Council Members prior to engagements. Other Fellows add that connections could be more valuable if GLG expands its network of Council Members to include a larger number of experts from..."
different continents and those who have worked for or with smaller nonprofit or nonprofit-like organizations. Finally, one Fellow from the 2015 cohort suggests a pre-connection briefing between GLG and the Fellow to “prep” the Fellow about what questions would be most helpful to pose to the Council Member.

If the engagements between Fellows and Council Members represent the crux of the Fellowship’s value, the ability to help Fellows confront their organizations’ inflection points represents the heart of the Fellowship experience. GLG is particularly interested in helping Fellows’ organizations achieve their critical goals identified at the start of the Fellowship. Evaluating the success of the Fellowship in achieving this goal is more relevant in the case of the 2015 cohort considering that these Fellows are approaching the end of their Fellowship experience; in contrast, 2016 Fellows have just begun to use GLG as a resource and, to some extent, are still considering how best to integrate GLG into their organization’s workflow.

The 2015 Fellows agree that the Fellowship has assisted them in addressing at least one of the organizational challenges or issues they deemed important from the onset of the Fellowship. Whilst none of the 2015 Fellows would say that their organizations were fully past their inflection points, all cite that the Fellowship has provided important resources, support, and guidance for advancing their objectives.

Interestingly, Fellows express a wide range of diverse roles that GLG played in helping their organizations address key challenges:

- **The stature of the Fellowship alone gave credibility and validation to their organizations, which in turn has led to other opportunities**;

- **Engagements with GLGers and Council Members have afforded Fellows and their staff with opportunities to advance goals in different functions or departments in Fellows’ organizations**;

- **Engagements with GLGers and Council Members have provided Fellows with professional learning that aids in addressing both strategic and operational questions**; and
In select cases, GLG provided mentorship to leadership-level staff in Fellows’ organizations, which one Fellow describes as contributing to Fellows’ ability to “build a good bench.”

“There are very few parts [of the organization] that don’t have GLG fingerprints on it.”

Although the 2016 Fellows are less than a year into the Fellowship, they, too, have expressed that GLG has already played a significant role in helping them to address critical organizational issues.

“Every step of the way, GLG experts have been able to give advice.”

Most Fellows of both cohorts agree that GLG is well-integrated into the work of their organizations. As addressed earlier in this section, all Fellows agree that the level of engagement between GLG and their organizations is helpful, but many still wonder if they themselves are doing enough to reach out to integrate GLG into their organizational workflow.

Interestingly, 2016 Fellows were more likely than their 2015 counterparts to express that they did not think GLG could or should do more than it is already doing in regards to providing proactive support through the Fellowship. Still, two 2016 Fellows and one 2015 Fellow said it would be helpful if GLG informed Fellows of the addition of a new Council Member to its network who could potentially serve as an appropriate connection for Fellows. Two Fellows—one belonging to the 2016 cohort and the other to the 2015 cohort—suggest GLG “embed” a GLGer in Fellows’ organizations to ensure that access to the GLG platform remains top-of-mind for staff. Both Fellows note that this recommendation is logistically unrealistic, but isn’t worth entirely dismissing; perhaps GLG staff could conduct short site visits to Fellows’ offices after the fall convening to share best practices with their teammates.
The notion that the Fellowship is not always top-of-mind for non-Fellow staff in busy organizations is an especially common theme among 2015 Fellows. Although most Fellows previously explain they feel GLG does all it can for its Fellows, they nevertheless have recommendations for how GLG could better or more effectively integrate the Fellowship into the work of their organizations. These recommendations focus narrowly on GLG providing more regular updates on “solutions,” “engagement tools,” and, more broadly, “resources.” One Fellow adds that GLG could provide more value by developing a “more rigorous way of diagnosing the big issues” organizations’ top leaders are working to address. Several Fellows recommend that GLG provide regular trainings for Fellows’ staffs to ensure that they are not only engaged in the Fellowship but aware of the resources available to them through the Fellowship.

Key Findings:

❖ Fellows tend to utilize the GLG platform when they have strategic organizational questions (i.e., how to best enter a new market or introduce a new product) or wish to gain knowledge about a specific subject matter (i.e., data collection methodologies or supply chain models).

❖ Fellows appreciate that the GLG platform is accessible by their staff members, and believe it is an important potential leadership development tool for them.

❖ Amongst the many Fellowship components, Fellows most value interactions with Council Members and GLGers

❖ Engagements facilitated by GLG between Fellows and Council Members are believed to be most valuable when Council Members possess both context on the organization’s work, activities, and geographic location and expertise in the specific area in which the Fellows are seeking insight.
D. Measuring Fellowship Impact

Fellows generally possess a good sense of the Fellowship’s impact on their organizations, but none have formally or quantitatively measured this impact. Indeed, two Fellows recommend that GLG provide or collaborate with an outside organization to develop a surveying tool that would allow Fellows to more effectively capture and measure the impact of the Fellowship on their organizations. Most Fellows and Power Users say that their current sense of the Fellowship’s impact is informed by anecdotal evidence. One 2015 Fellow surveys her staff to receive feedback on the Fellowship’s helpfulness and “the impact of the knowledge gained.” Other 2015 Fellows have informally created “buckets” or areas in which they have measured and assessed, qualitatively, the impact of the Fellowship. These areas of impact are tied to the particular areas of strategy or operations in which GLG has provided support and professional learning.

“The service that GLG provides is harder to find than money.”
All Fellows indicate that whilst they could look to their boards, professional networks, and even family and friends for expertise or outside advice, those methods would likely be inefficient or ineffective. The access to these Council Members is of greatest value to most of the Fellows of the 2015 and 2016 cohorts, as well as to the majority of Power Users. Other Fellows noted the fall convenings and the opportunity presented to network with other Fellows and to learn about the “more in-depth projects” on which GLG and other organizations have previously collaborated add value to the Fellowship and provide upfront examples of how to best utilize GLG’s programmatic offerings. Several 2015 Fellows—and one Power User—add that a great value of the Fellowship for their organizations, as they perceive it, is the access to “mentorship” for senior staff members within their organizations. One 2016 Fellow says that the Fellowship increased morale in her organization, because the Fellowship feels like a “differentiating factor” of which the entire team can be justifiably proud.

That “differentiating factor” is echoed by all Fellows who indicate that they had participated in other social impact-focused fellowships. Notably, most Fellows have previously been recognized by at least one of the following three organizations:

1. The Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation;
2. Echoing Green; and
3. TED Fellows Program.

Consequently, a number of Fellows from the same cohort knew each other and even Fellows belonging to different cohorts knew each other prior to the start of their GLG Social Impact Fellowship. Of the Fellows who participated in other social impact-focused fellowships, all agreed that the uniqueness of the GLG Social Impact Fellowship is the access it provides to a rich network of experts. Fellows were not asked to rank the GLG Social Impact Fellowship
against other social impact-focused fellowships, but several suggest there may be value in studying other models—particularly that of the TED Fellows program—as another way to benchmark the attributes of the program.

“It feels like a luxury: this is a great example of investing in yourself.”

Fellows overwhelmingly share that the Fellowship experience has been positive, as indicated by their unanimous agreement that they would recommend the GLG Social Impact Fellowship to other social entrepreneurs. Power Users, too, unanimously agree that they would recommend the Fellowship to other social entrepreneurs. Most Fellows and Power Users agree that “mid-stage” organizations—those that are no longer in scrappy, start-up mode, but have yet achieved significant social impact—would benefit most from the resources and opportunities that the Fellowship provides to its Fellows. Several Fellows specified that organizations anticipating “wicked problems” or striving towards “hairy goals” will likely reap the most value from their engagement with GLG. Other Fellows added that mid-stage organizations with the willingness and capacity to learn are more likely to “know when and where to leverage GLG.”

Key Findings:

❖ No Fellow has formally or quantitively measured the impact of the Fellowship on her organization; most fellows’ understanding is informed by anecdotal evidence.

❖ Most Fellows have previously participated in other social impact-focused fellowships and say that the GLG Social Impact Fellowship is unique and valuable because of the access it provides to its network of experts.

❖ Fellows overwhelmingly recommend the Fellowship to other social entrepreneurs. They see mid-stage organizations soon to be tackling large, strategic questions—and led by individuals with an appetite for learning—as the profile of an organization that would benefit most from the Fellowship.
Conclusion

Recommendations

Recommendations provided herein are based on the analysis of all interview responses. Specifically, the key findings identified in each area of impact serve as the premises upon which corresponding recommendations are made. Recommendations seek to enhance the Fellowship experience by addressing areas in which Fellows interviewed expressed opportunity for improvement and value-add.

Ultimately, the analysis of all interview responses supports four key notions about the Fellowship. The GLG Social Impact Fellowship is:

1. **True to its word that it is successfully identifying and selecting Fellows whose organizations are at an inflection point;**
2. **Providing value to Fellows and their organizations in several different forms, but primarily through access to its Council Members network and interaction with GLGers;**
3. **Facilitating Fellows’ achievement of strategic and operational goals; and**
4. **Providing valuable learning and professional development opportunities for Fellows’ staffs.**

Other findings shed light on areas in which GLG may enhance the Fellowship to ensure it provides maximum value to Fellows and their organizations. These findings include:

1. Fellows tend to lack, especially during the application process, a comprehensive understanding of the work that GLG performs and the value that the Fellowship intends to have on Fellows and their organization;
2. Fellows believe that the current level of engagement between their organizations and GLG is appropriate and helpful, but nevertheless worry that they are not able to take full advantage of the Fellowship’s offerings. This is, in part, because GLG is not top-of-mind for staff leaders within Fellows’ organizations.

3. Fellows consider the engagements facilitated by GLG with Council Members valuable, but suggest that these connections could be enhanced by ensuring that Council Members are well-briefed and prepared for these discussions; and

4. Fellows appreciate the opportunity to network with others in their cohort, but feel that the fall convenings and the Fellowship itself may not completely foster the fullest sense of community possible.

Based on these findings, the evaluators have developed the following recommendations, organized by area of impact.

1. Application Process

Refine recruitment process and associated marketing collateral to further clarify and illustrate the distinguishing features of the GLG Social Impact Fellowship. Integrate current and past Fellows into the recruitment and application processes, when possible.
2. Onboarding & Convening

Explore the creation of dedicated educational opportunities about the GLG platform for Fellow’s senior staff member.

Dedicate time to the question of how best to foster community amongst Fellows at the fall convenings.

Develop an exercise that requires Fellows and GLG to collaborate on briefing, pamphlet-like material that highlights key activities of and crucial context on Fellows’ organizations to be shared with Council Members in advance of engagements.

3. Fellowship Engagement

Formalize a check-in schedule between GLG and all Fellows so as to provide Fellows an opportunity to update the briefings they originally developed at their first fall convenings.

Ensure that Council Members are provided with adequate briefing materials about Fellows and their organizations in advance of engagements. Inform Fellows when new, highly relevant Council Members join the GLG platform.

Explore formalizing and further promoting the leadership development opportunity afforded to Fellows’ staff members who engage with GLG Council Members.

Increase the number of touchpoints amongst Fellows throughout the year in order to foster an even greater sense of community.

4. Measuring Fellowship Impact

Develop and distribute a survey instrument by with which Fellows may begin to measure the impact of the Fellowship within their respective organizations. Alternatively, encourage engagement of Fellows with evaluation experts on the GLG platform for the express purpose of codifying Fellows’ thinking on this point.
Closing Statement

The GLG Social Impact Fellowship is a meaningful program for social entrepreneurs whose organizations seek to scale impact, make difficult but important decisions, and accelerate their learning curves. Now in its third year, the value of the Fellowship has proven, through the insights provided by Fellows, to be comprehensive and far-reaching. Indeed, the Fellowship’s value-add extends beyond the connections facilitated by GLG between Fellows’ organizations and Council Members to include the opportunities provided for continuous learning, professional development, and guidance.

Opportunities for improvement exist, however. This evaluation highlights the areas in which GLG can enhance the Fellowship to ensure that Fellows obtain the maximum value of its programmatic offerings.

This evaluation also underscores the notion that GLG has successfully identified not only Fellows and, subsequently, organizations poised to take greatest advantage of the Fellowship, but also the areas and ways in which it can most effectively service them. Through the Fellowship, GLG has assumed a worthwhile undertaking to advance the footprints of mission-driven, social impact-focused organizations around the globe.
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