

REFLECTION PAPER - COMPETENCY 3E

Andrews University
School of Education

A Reflection Paper for Competency 3e: Evaluation and Assessment
Pursuant to the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in Leadership

by

Steven D. Reece

March 30, 2020

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
CHAPTER 1	5
THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	5
Definitions of Key Terms	5
Background.....	7
Evaluation and Assessment.....	8
Informal and Formal Evaluation.....	9
Methodology of Evaluation	11
Programs and Policies.....	11
Stakeholders.....	14
Difference between Research and Evaluation	15
Formative and Summative Evaluations	15
Evaluating the Effectiveness of Non-Profit Boards.....	16
Summary	17
CHAPTER 2	19
APPLYING THEORY TO PRACTICE.....	19
Constructive Tension	19
Assessing TMF Programs and Policies.....	21
Assessing TMF Board of Directors (BOD)	22
TMF Cultural Norms and Values	23
Strengths of TMF's Board and Skill Set.....	24
An Example of TMF Board Effectiveness.....	25
Summary	26
CHAPTER 3	28
KEY LEARNINGS AND SERVING OTHERS	28
TMF Program and Policy Assessment.....	28
Jewish Cemetery Project Evaluations.....	28
Jewish Cemetery Project Selection Process.....	30
Volunteer Selection Process	31
Serving Others	33
Stakeholders.....	33
Planned Activity: Develop Board Self-Assessment Tool.....	35

Conclusion	35
Documentation of Competency	38
REFERENCE LIST	39

Introduction

I am the founder and president of [The Matzevah Foundation, Inc.](#) (TMF), which is a 501 (C)(3) nonprofit organization (NPO) incorporated in the State of Georgia of the United States. In 2010, along with a group of Baptist-Christian friends we established TMF to care for and restore Jewish cemeteries in Poland, and to educate the public about the Shoah. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has classified TMF as a public charity. Consequently, we are public servants and the mission of TMF serves the public, principally the Jewish diaspora of Polish origins.

TMF grew out of my twelve-year ministry as a Baptist pastor in Poland. One day, in 2004, I met a Polish woman of Jewish descent who suggested that I visit a nearby Jewish cemetery in her community. Her suggestion changed my life, and placed me on the path of discovery as to why that particular Jewish cemetery to her was important, as well as, why Jewish cemeteries were important to Jews. In time, God led me to speak to the injustice of the Shoah by caring for and restoring Jewish cemeteries in Poland, which became a pathway for me as a Christian to seek dialogue and reconciliation with Jews.

Over the past ten years, TMF has grown from its infancy in 2010 to a maturing organization in 2020, which has become a leader in the field of Jewish cemetery restoration, and Jewish-Christian dialogue and reconciliation. We evaluate and assess the work of TMF annually; however, we do not use a formal approach. In this paper, I will investigate several academic theories concerning the evaluation and assessment, principally of the programs and policies of NPOs and their boards. Additionally, I reflect upon these theories and how I have applied these theories and their implementation to the work of TMF.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Definitions of Key Terms

Assessment. The common definition of assessment is the “evaluation or estimation of the nature, quality, or ability of someone or something.” Assessment is tantamount to evaluation.

Competency 3d: Evaluation and Assessment. The Andrews University Leadership Department advances a set of leadership competencies, which require students to have “theoretical knowledge and practical application” within a set of “core [leadership] competencies” of which the “leadership through organizations” is one group of competencies (*Leadership Handbook*, 2011, p. 36). The third group of leadership competencies addresses “the organizational aspects of leadership. Leadership sets direction in ways that facilitate achievement of organizational goals” (*Leadership Handbook*, 2011, p. 36). Regarding the competency of evaluation and assessment, “*Leadership uses appropriate evaluation and assessment tools to make decisions about programs and plans*” (*Leadership Handbook*, 2011, p. 37).

Evaluation. A dictionary definition of evaluation is “the making of a judgment about the amount, number, or value of something; assessment.” As noted by Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2011), “among professional evaluators, there is no uniformly agreed-upon definition of

precisely what the term ‘evaluation’ means” (p. 6). Concurring with researchers in the field such as Scriven in 1967, Mark, Henry, and Julnes in 2000, and others, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) define evaluation as

determining the worth or merit of an evaluation object (whatever is evaluated). More broadly, we define evaluation as the identification, clarification, and application of defensible criteria to determine an evaluation object’s value (worth or merit) in relation to those criteria (p. 7).

Matzevah. The term *matzevah* (מצבה) is Hebrew and means a memorial stone or monument; a matzevah is erected in memory of a significant event or placed at the head of the grave of a deceased person. In Jewish cemeteries, the headstone or matzevah signifies remembering and honoring the dead and ensures that the grave will not be desecrated. The Matzevah Foundation uses the iconography of the matzevah because its mission is to honor the memory of the Jewish community of Poland by caring for and restoring Jewish cemeteries in Poland as a means to reconcile Jews and Christians.

Jewish Cemetery. A Jewish cemetery in Hebrew is known by several names. It is referred to as *Beit Chaim*—“the house of the living,” *Beit Keverot*—“the house of graves or tombs,” or *Beit Olam*—“the house of the world or eternity.” Cemeteries are considered to be holy places by the Jewish community.

Policy. A policy is “generally refers to a broader act of a public organization or a branch of government” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8). According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), all organizations function based on policies related to recruiting and hiring practices, compensation, interacting with the media and clients or customers of the organization. In contrast, they argue that governmental bodies, such as “legislatures, departments, executives, and others—also pass or develop policies;” however, these policies could “be a law or a regulation” (Fitzpatrick et al.,

2011, p. 8). Evaluation aims at judging “the effectiveness of those policies just as they conduct studies to evaluate programs” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8).

Program. In 1980, according to Cronbach et al., a program may be defined as a “standing arrangement that provides for a . . . service,” and also, in 1994, these researchers state that “the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation defined program simply as ‘activities that are provided on a continuing basis’” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7).

Shoah. Unless citing a source which uses the term Holocaust, I will use the Hebrew term, *Shoah* (catastrophe or destruction) to define the events of what many refer to as the Holocaust. I make this distinction for two reasons. Firstly, as Manosevitz (2010) emphasizes, the term Shoah is “used by modern scholars in reference to that event” and secondly, the word, Holocaust, is a Greek word that means “burnt offering,” which according to Manosevitz extends some type of “religious significance” to the event, adding that “there was nothing religious about Hitler's ‘Final Solution’” (p. 55).

Background

I have some previous experience in the evaluation of individuals, organizations, and programs. As a pastor, I did annual reviews of people that I led, and I also conducted debriefing interviews with people that I supervised at the end of their service, or with short-term volunteers. My first and most extensive evaluation project in which I participated was while serving as a pastor in Poland. In 2005, our mission organization, the International Mission Board (IMB) conducted a regional evaluation project examining its church planting initiatives across Central and Eastern Europe.

I served on the Central and Eastern European (CEE) evaluation team. My role was to prepare interview questions, conduct interviews with field personnel, and analyze the interview

data (**Artifacts:** [Face to Face Interview Questions](#) and [Case Study Survey For Second Generation Church](#)). I also participated in statistical analysis by running reports using MS Access. I had no formal training in coding or data analysis, at the time, but I learned. Rather intuitively, I discovered trends in both the numerical and textual data. Finally, I was one of the two writers of the final report that we submitted to regional leadership team in January 2006 (**Verification:** [Evaluation Report 01-06-06](#)). Sadly, the report was shelved, and no action was taken on any of the recommendations made as a result of the study.

Despite my experience, I lack a conceptual and theoretical knowledge base regarding this competency of evaluation and assessment. I desire to grow and continue to develop as a leader who is capable of assessing and evaluating the work of TMF. As noted, I have experience, but I lack knowledge regarding theoretical approaches for evaluating and assessing programs and policies of TMF. Likewise, I do not have an understanding of the parameters used to evaluate organizational effectiveness. My objective, therefore in this competency, is to improve my understanding and practice of the evaluative processes in the development of the organizational programs and policies of TMF.

Evaluation and Assessment

Potůček (2017) posits that evaluation is a common occurrence in everyday life; he states, “whether knowingly or unwittingly, one evaluates all the time” (p. 147). For example, we make determinations about things we do, choices we make, and “life’s most fundamental decisions,” he reasons (p. 147). Additionally, values influence the evaluation process, which “is reflected in the choice of instruments,” along with how “it affects problem delimitation and recognition” (Potůček, 2017, pp. 147-148). Likewise, Potůček (2017) contends that evaluation “plays an important role in the choice between policy options” (p. 148). Finally, he points out that

evaluation “cannot be avoided when assessing the critical factors of implementation, monitoring its course and ultimately evaluating finalized programs ex post” (p. 148).

Blamey and Mackenzie (2007) indicate that based on Pawson’s and Tilley’s research in 1997, and Weiss’s 1998 work, even with considerable financial resources from government and philanthropic entities “the history of evaluation” demonstrates that earlier efforts to evaluate and “learn about the success or failure of social programmes [*sic*] have resulted in disappointingly inconclusive findings (p. 440).

According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), “policy makers need good information about the relative effectiveness of programs” (p. 4). For this reason, these researchers suggest that answering questions about program performance and policy effectiveness “is the major task of program evaluation” (p. 4). When considering which procedures to use, or what criteria or methods to employ, Potůček (2017) considers that policy evaluation will depend upon “a range of policy options” that are available (p. 148).

On the other hand, Potůček (2017) reasons that “for existing public policies” and programs, evaluators will need to determine “to what extent their planned goals were accomplished, . . . how many resources were spent, and how effectively . . . the goals [were] accomplished” (p. 148). Furthermore, evaluators will need to discover, “what kind of unexpected problems or complications arose in the implementation process” (p. 148). Evaluators will also need to determine if “the policy design was adequate, . . . the implementation was managed well, and whether they ought to be modified” (p. 148).

Informal and Formal Evaluation

As indicated in the previous section, people make evaluations about their lives daily. Such “informal evaluations,” as posited by Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), “can result in [either] faulty

or wise judgments;” nonetheless, such a binary conclusion—an either-or choice, is possible since these types of evaluations “lack systematic procedures and formally collected evidence” (p. 5). These authors reason that we have limited sources of information. Consequently, the lack of data creates for us, difficulty in “making judgments” because we cannot observe what is going on in specific situations and settings (p. 5). When the lack of information is coupled with our experience, these two realities influence and bias the judgments that we do make (p. 5).

Moreover, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) assert that “informal evaluation does not occur in a vacuum;” all of us possess instinct, life experience, and also, we are able to reason and generalize about situations and events (p. 5). These factors directly affect “the outcome of informal evaluations,” which could be “the basis for sound, or faulty, judgments” (p. 5). In conducting informal evaluations, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) postulate that “we are less cognizant of these limitations” (p. 5). Nonetheless, when it is not possible to conduct formal evaluations, informal evaluations will suffice, if carried out “by knowledgeable, experienced, and fair people” (p. 5). It is not possible, and it is “unrealistic to think any individual, group, or organization could formally evaluate everything it does” (p. 5), because frequently pursuing an informal evaluation is the only practical approach” (p. 6).

Finally, both dimensions of evaluation create a range of possibilities for assessing policies and programs of an organization. In 2001, Schwandt suggested that “evaluation is not simply about methods and rules,” and it recognizes “the importance and value of everyday judgments” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 6). Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) conclude that “evaluation . . . is a basic form of human behavior;” at times it can be “thorough, structured, and formal,” but frequently, it can be “impressionistic and private” (p. 6).

Methodology of Evaluation

According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), evaluation involves the use of “inquiry and judgment methods,” which include the following parameters (p. 7):

1. Determining the criteria and standards for judging quality and deciding whether those standards should be relative or absolute,
2. Collecting relevant information, and
3. Applying the standards to determine value, quality, utility, effectiveness, or significance.

Additionally, evaluation produces recommendations whose intent is “to optimize the evaluation object in relation to its intended purpose(s),” or to assist the “stakeholders determine whether the evaluation object is worthy of adoption, continuation, or expansion” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7). Primarily, evaluation of this type is considered in the US to be program evaluation, while in Europe and other countries, “evaluators often use the term ‘policy evaluation’” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7). Researchers, in the program or policy evaluation field, are not “concerned with evaluating personnel or the performance of individual people or employees,” for the reason that, this aspect of evaluation is within the realm of human resource management (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7).

Programs and Policies

In 1980, according to Cronbach et al., a program may be defined as a “standing arrangement that provides for a . . . service,” and also, in 1994, these researchers state that “the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation defined program simply as ‘activities that are provided on a continuing basis’” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7). Furthermore, in

2010, the Joint Committee determined “that a program is much more than a set of activities,” and stated that a “program is” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8) defined as follows:

1. A set of planned systematic activities
2. Using managed resources
3. To achieve specified goals
4. Related to specific needs
5. Of specific, identified, participating human individuals or groups
6. In specific contexts
7. Resulting in documentable outputs, outcomes and impacts
8. Following assumed (explicit or implicit) systems of beliefs (diagnostic, causal, intervention, and implementation theories about how the program works)
9. With specific, investigable costs and benefits.

As indicated by Blamey and Mackenzie (2007), since context describes a specific situation, it must be understood as being “multifaceted,” operating “at a variety of levels,” such as those found in political and community settings, or situated in “organizational and individual dimensions” (p. 441). These researchers, furthermore, assert that “measuring or accounting for contexts is a difficult process in such evaluations” (p. 441).

Notwithstanding, Blamey and Mackenzie (2007) argue that context “must be considered as part of the evaluation and can be key to uncovering the circumstances in which, and the reasons why a particular intervention works” (p. 441). They attribute the importance as being that particular “contexts can enhance or detract from programme [*sic*] effectiveness and that such contexts may include factors that are within or outside the control of programme [*sic*] implementers” (p. 441). Consequently, Blamey and Mackenzie (2007) conclude that having a

solid grasp of context is “vital in relation to attributing cause,” and it is essential for “replicating the intervention in any future setting or in learning about possible generalizable causal pathways” (p. 441).

A policy is, by definition not a program, but it “generally refers to a broader act of a public organization or a branch of government” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8). According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), all organizations function based on policies related to recruiting and hiring practices, compensation, interacting with the media and clients or customers of the organization. In contrast, they argue that governmental bodies, such as “legislatures, departments, executives, and others—also pass or develop policies;” however, these policies could “be a law or a regulation” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8). Evaluation aims at judging “the effectiveness of those policies just as they conduct studies to evaluate programs” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8).

Oftentimes, determining the difference between a policy and a program may be indistinct. Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) state,

Like a program, a policy is designed to achieve some outcome or change, but, unlike a program, a policy does not provide a service or activity. Instead, it provides guidelines, regulations, or the like to achieve a change (p. 8).

Furthermore, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) indicate that scholars, in the arena of public policy, tend to define policy more generally. For example Peters, who in 1999 asserted that “public policy is the sum of government activities, whether acting directly or through agents, as it has an influence on the life of citizens” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8).

Potůček (2017) states that in 2003, William Dunn introduced a basic theoretical construct that “helps us better understand the process of policy evaluation” (p. 148). Dunn’s framework makes “a distinction between policy inputs that enter the policy process and are transformed into

policy outputs, short-term policy out comes and long-term policy impacts” (p. 148). Potůček (2017) reasons that “policy outputs may consist of laws, public services, financial or material products,” while outcomes of policy “include the change of actors’ behaviors, attitudes or life situations” (p. 148).

Stakeholders

Stakeholders is a term frequently applied by evaluators to describe an assortment of groups and individuals “who have a direct interest in and may be affected by the program being evaluated or the evaluation’s results” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9). In 2005, Greene identified “four types of stakeholders” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9):

1. People who have authority over the program including funders, policy makers, advisory boards
2. People who have direct responsibility for the program including program developers, administrators, managers, and staff delivering the program
3. People who are the intended beneficiaries of the program, their families, and their communities
4. People who are damaged or disadvantaged by the program (those who lose funding or are not served because of the program).

Stakeholders have a collective “a stake in the future direction of that program even though they are sometimes unaware of their stake,” and for this reason, “evaluators typically involve at least some stakeholders in the planning and conduct of the evaluation” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9). Lastly, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) conclude that the participation of stakeholders “can help the evaluator to better understand the program and the information needs of those who will use it” (p. 9).

Difference between Research and Evaluation

Research is not the same as evaluation. Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) advise that “the primary purpose of research is to add to knowledge in a field, to contribute to the growth of theory” (p. 9). Additionally, they consider that the intent of a “good research study is . . . to advance knowledge” (p. 9). While, on the other hand, based on what Mark, Henry, and Julnes suggested in 2000, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) state that “an evaluation study may contribute to knowledge development;” however, this outcome “is a secondary concern in evaluation” (p. 9). Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) posit that the most important purpose of evaluation “is to provide useful information to those who hold a stake in whatever is being evaluated . . . often helping them to make a judgment or decision” (p. 9).

Moreover, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) conclude that “research seeks conclusions; evaluation leads to judgments” (p. 10). Distinguishing between the two approaches of inquiry may be clarified by asking “whether the inquiry being conducted would be regarded as a failure if it produced no data” regarding the subject “being studied” (p. 10). In response to such a query, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) reason that “a researcher answering strictly as a researcher will probably say no” (p. 10). Finally, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) state that research “typically [seeks] to explore and establish causal relationships;” however, the purpose of evaluation is “to examine and describe a particular thing and, ultimately, to consider its value” (p. 10).

Formative and Summative Evaluations

In this section, I will review the difference between formative and summative evaluations. Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) consider for an evaluation is to be formative, the “primary purpose [of the evaluation] is to provide information for program improvement” (p. 20).

Frequently, they reason that these types of evaluations “provide information to judge the merit or worth of one part of a program” (p. 20). Additionally, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) state,

In contrast to formative evaluations, which focus on program improvement, summative evaluations are concerned with providing information to serve decisions or assist in making judgments about program adoption, continuation, or expansion. They assist with judgments about a program’s overall worth or merit in relation to important criteria (p. 20).

Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) refer to Scriven’s 1991 definition in which he characterized summative evaluation as “evaluation done for, or by, any observers or decision makers (by contrast with developers) who need valutive conclusions for any other reasons besides development” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 21). According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), “it should be apparent that both formative and summative evaluation are essential” (p. 22). Subsequently, they argue that decisions need to be made “during the developmental stages of a program” regarding its strengthening and improvement, and once more “when [the program] has stabilized,” so that evaluators, might be able “to judge [the program’s] final worth or determine its future” (p. 22).

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Non-Profit Boards

When evaluating the performance of a nonprofit board, it is important to have criteria by which to assess its performance. Glassey (2003) points to one of the studies conducted early on in the 1990’s by Chait, Holland and Taylor, who assessed the work of CEOs and board members of numerous organizations. Glassey (2003) reports that Chait, Holland and Taylor uncovered a set of “competencies that characterized an effective board,” which include the following dimensions: contextual, educational, interpersonal, analytical, political, and strategic” (p. 6). Additionally, I will explicitly convey how Glassey (2003) defined each one of these evaluative dimensions of a nonprofit board of directors (p. 6):

1. The *contextual dimension* means that the board understands and takes into account the culture and norms of the organization it governs.
2. The *educational dimension* means that the board takes the necessary steps to ensure that board members are knowledgeable about the organization, the profession, and the board's roles, responsibilities, and performance.
3. The *interpersonal dimension* means that the board nurtures the development of trustees as a working group, attends to the board's collective welfare, and fosters a sense of cohesiveness.
4. The *analytical dimension* means that the board recognizes the complexities and subtleties of issues and accepts ambiguity and uncertainty as healthy preconditions for critical discussion.
5. The *political dimension* means that the board accepts as a primary responsibility the need to develop and maintain healthy relationships among constituencies.
6. The *strategic dimension* helps the organization envision a direction and shape a strategy.

Summary

Potůček (2017) posits that evaluation is a common occurrence in everyday life; he states, “whether knowingly or unwittingly, one evaluates all the time” (p. 147). For example, we make determinations about things we do, choices we make, and “life’s most fundamental decisions,” he reasons (p. 147). Potůček (2017) contends that evaluation “plays an important role in the choice between policy options” (p. 148). Likewise, Potůček (2017) points out that evaluation “cannot be avoided when assessing the critical factors of implementation, monitoring its course and ultimately evaluating finalized programs ex post” (p. 148).

According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), “policy makers need good information about the relative effectiveness of programs” (p. 4). For this reason, these researchers suggest that answering questions about program performance and policy effectiveness “is the major task of program evaluation” (p. 4). “Informal evaluations,” as posited by Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), “can result in [either] faulty or wise judgments;” nonetheless, such a binary conclusion—an either-or choice, is possible since these types of evaluations “lack systematic procedures and formally collected evidence” (p. 5). The lack of data creates for us, difficulty in “making judgments” because we cannot observe what is going on in specific situations and settings (p. 5). When the lack of information is coupled with our experience, these two realities influence and bias the judgments that we do make (p. 5).

A policy is, by definition not a program, but it “generally refers to a broader act of a public organization or a branch of government” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8). Evaluation aims at judging “the effectiveness of those policies just as they conduct studies to evaluate programs” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8). Oftentimes, determining the difference between a policy and a program may be indistinct. Stakeholders is a term frequently applied by evaluators to describe an assortment of groups and individuals “who have a direct interest in and may be affected by the program being evaluated or the evaluation’s results” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9).

Research is not the same as evaluation. Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) advise that “the primary purpose of research is to add to knowledge in a field, to contribute to the growth of theory” (p. 9). Moreover, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) conclude that “research seeks conclusions; evaluation leads to judgments” (p. 10). Distinguishing between the two approaches of inquiry may be clarified by asking “whether the inquiry being conducted would be regarded as a failure if it produced no data” regarding the subject “being studied” (p. 10).

CHAPTER 2

APPLYING THEORY TO PRACTICE

Constructive Tension

A few years ago, I read an article by Nettleton (2016) in which he writes,

We have lost, somehow, the ability to merge our differences over issues into solutions that are better because of those differences. We have lost the ability to use the strengths that can come from diverse perspectives and have no modern Abraham Lincoln to glue opposing views together. Today, the public leaders of each side say “we are right” and attempt to destroy their opponents politically if they can’t achieve or avoid change in their own way (para. 4).

When making decisions about programs or policies, it seems that leaders have reduced the world of options to either-or choices, or what is technically known as binary decision—a choice between two alternatives. Tolerating a situation, in a program or a policy that needs to be changed, does not lead to solutions; it leads to accepting the status quo as it is, whatever that may be in the given situation. God has given us, as human beings, the ability to think critically, consider options, and make decisions. Although Nettleton (2016) was writing about the divide between the two major opposing political parties, I think that he is speaking about three elemental issues that concern leadership. It seems to me that leaders have lost the ability:

1. To address differences amongst differing viewpoints to develop "better" solutions,
2. To recognize diversity as a strength,

3. To link opposing views and create solutions.

This last aspect of linking opposing ideas and creating solutions is an interesting concept. In 2011, I read a book that introduced me to an interesting concept, which is called the “opposable mind.” Martin (2007) coined the term, the opposable mind, which describes the brain's ability “to hold two conflicting ideas in constructive tension” (p. 7). Martin examined successful CEOs and wrote of their abilities to entertain solutions that were not either/or options but were able to produce solutions from contradictory ideas.

Subsequently, I think that leaders are to be the ones, who work “to glue opposing views together” (Nettleton, 2016, para. 4). When considering the mission of TMF, its primary program is caring for and restoring Jewish cemeteries in Poland. The goal of TMF’s mission is to work toward Jewish-Christian dialogue and reconciliation. As a leader, my role is that of a reconciler, one who seeks to reconnect Jews and Christians. By linking the opposing views of Jews and Christians toward each other relative to the person of Jesus Christ and bringing them together to work together in a Jewish cemetery restoration project, Jews and Christians may experience reconciliation.

Reconciliation, therefore, is a process that holds “two conflicting ideas in constructive tension” (Martin, 2007, p. 7), and it produces an unexpected solution--dialogue. My conclusion is based on my qualitative investigation of the work of TMF. Notwithstanding, since academic research is not evaluation or assessment, how do we, as TMF, assess or evaluate our most basic program, i.e., our Jewish cemetery restoration projects in Poland? How does the board of directors (BOD) understand TMF’s mission of restoration and reconciliation? What are the fundamental values of the BOD? I will consider these question in the next few sections, where I

will discuss TMF's programs and policies, its BOD values, strengths, skill sets. I will close Chapter 2 with an example of how effective our BOD has become in its program development.

Assessing TMF Programs and Policies

In 1980, according to Cronbach et al., a program may be defined as a “standing arrangement that provides for a . . . service,” and also, in 1994, these researchers state that “the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation defined program simply as ‘activities that are provided on a continuing basis’” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7).

A policy is “generally refers to a broader act of a public organization or a branch of government” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8). According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), all organizations function based on policies related to recruiting and hiring practices, compensation, interacting with the media and clients or customers of the organization. Evaluation aims at judging “the effectiveness of those policies just as they conduct studies to evaluate programs” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 8).

Evaluation produces recommendations whose intent is “to optimize the evaluation object in relation to its intended purpose(s),” or to assist the “stakeholders determine whether the evaluation object is worthy of adoption, continuation, or expansion” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7). Primarily, evaluation of this type is considered in the US to be program evaluation, while in Europe and other countries, “evaluators often use the term ‘policy evaluation’” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 7).

Frequently, as Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) reason, determining the difference between a policy and a program may be indistinct. They state,

Like a program, a policy is designed to achieve some outcome or change, but, unlike a program, a policy does not provide a service or activity. Instead, it provides guidelines, regulations, or the like to achieve a change (p. 8).

Therefore, a program is an output of an organization, while a policy is the guidelines concerning how the organization puts into action its programs.

From its mission, TMF has developed three basic programs: Jewish cemetery restoration projects, mass grave commemorations, and education. Generally, TMF considers a policy to be what we call a process. For TMF, this means a process describes how we organize, structure, and conduct our work. Consequently to this end, we have developed policy guidelines for our processes. To date, TMF has developed seven processes, i.e. policies, to guide its three programs. These policies are: (1) governance, (2) volunteer selection, (3) project selection, (4) media, (5) decision making, (6) data storage/access policy, (7) financial (**Artifact:** [TMF Processes](#)). In Chapter 3, I will focus my attention upon how we evaluate and assess our program of Jewish cemetery restoration projects, and our project and volunteer selection process (policy).

Assessing TMF Board of Directors (BOD)

Glassey (2003) points to a study conducted early on in the 1990's by Chaitt, Holland and Taylor, who assessed the work of CEOs and board members of numerous organizations. Glassey (2003) reports that Chaitt, Holland and Taylor uncovered a set of “competencies that characterized an effective board,” which include the following dimensions: contextual, educational, interpersonal, analytical, political, and strategic” (p. 6). Of these six dimensions, I will elaborate on the contextual and educational dimensions in the following sections. First, the contextual dimension “means that the board understands and takes into account the culture and norms of the organization it governs,” (Glassey, 2003, p. 6). Second, “the educational dimension means that the board takes the necessary steps to ensure that board members are knowledgeable about the organization, the profession, and the board's roles, responsibilities, and performance” (Glassey, 2003, p. 6).

TMF Cultural Norms and Values

Values, as Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (2012) define them, are “constructs representing generalized behaviors or states of affairs that are considered by the individual to be important” (p. 152). Likewise, they point out that leadership difficulty arises from “misalignment between personal and organizational values” and “dissimilar values may be exactly what some organizations need to drive change and become more effective” (p. 172). Alignment means that our values (what we believe) and behaviors (what we do) agree with each other. We call this integrity. Concerning integrity, Hughes et al. (2012) state:

The core ideology cannot be a mere set of boardroom plaques or other exhortations to behave well. The core ideology must be a part of the fabric of every level and unit in the organization (p. 177).

In other words, we can say that we believe in unity but not practice it. We can place the word unity before us but act without unity, being divided and contentious with each other and desiring to go our own way. Clearly, when this occurs, we have a value mismatch because there is misalignment between our values and behaviors.

How do I assess the values and behaviors of TMF? Practically, I have sought to do this from time-to-time in various ways. For example, before TMF was formally incorporated, the executive board reviewed and discussed TMF’s initial vision, mission, and objectives statements (**Artifact:** [Agenda 14 November 2010 RTF](#) and **Verification:** [Executive Board Meeting 11142010](#)). This effort was my first attempt to enunciate TMF’s vision, values, and mission statement. I wanted to assess how our executive board viewed these statements, so I asked for them to provide feedback. Within two years, I had written a code of ethics for TMF and incorporated into the TMF’s vision and mission statements (**Artifact:** [TMF Vision, Mission, and JCR Projects](#)).

In 2013, I wanted to determine organizationally how our ethical values and behaviors reflect how we do what we do. One of the practical outflows of my coursework in LEAD-645 was to explore the values held by TMF board members. Before our March 2013 board meeting, I sent an email in which I asked to board and our primary volunteers to consider their values (**Artifact:** [Email 2013 March TMF Board Meeting](#)). I asked three questions to guide their consideration:

1. Write down the five most important things (what you value most) in your life?
2. What personal values do you bring to The Matzevah Foundation?
3. What core values do you expect The Matzevah Foundation to possess?

In our board meeting, we discussed ethics and values and how as TMF we must maintain ethical standards (**Artifact:** [2013 March Agenda for TMF Board Meeting](#)). We also considered the value statements among the TMF board and tabulated and discussed the values held by the BOD (**Verifications:** [2013 March Minutes for TMF Board Meeting](#), and [TMF Member Value Statements](#)).

Strengths of TMF's Board and Skill Set

One of the first things that TMF did collectively was to assess the strengths of our board that we had in our midst and how to best employ them in the mission of TMF. To this end, we planned an exercise in which we assessed our strengths and also did a DISC Assessment—which I will not discuss (**Artifact:** [DISC](#)). In an email, I sent out our plan for our board meeting (**Artifact:** [Agenda Mar 2012](#)). In my email, I wrote about how “we have been increasingly and methodically developing and shaping what we are doing. Now we are to the point of defining tasks and functions.” I also wrote that our secretary, JoAnn Siegienski, would organize and lead this discussion “in order for us to see how we are gifted to help us begin developing roles and

functions on the team.” I also wrote that “this exercise will help us know and understand our personalities and strengths as a means to enable us to work more effectively together as a team” (**Artifact:** [Email Agenda Mar 2012](#)).

JoAnn, the secretary of TMF, sent an email outlining what we were to do in the online assessments (**Artifact:** [TMF Action Required](#)). To assist JoAnn, I sent her what I had from my orientation to the Leadership Program at Andrews for the Strength Finders Assessment (**Artifact:** [Strengths Finder Resource](#)). From these resources, JoAnn prepared an extensive and detailed summary of our strengths embedded within the people of TMF (**Verifications:** [StrengthsFinder Team Summary](#) and [TMF Strengths Chart](#)). In 2018, in an effort to learn more about who we are as an organization, we also conducted an Enneagram Assessment of our BOD and its volunteer staff (**Artifact:** [Enneagram Types](#) and **Verification:** [TMF Members and Description of Enneagram Types](#)).

From these assessments of the BOD and its volunteer staff, we have learned more about who we are, our strengths, and tendencies as an organization. By assessing our organization, we have a better idea about who we are organizationally, and thus, are better able to organize and structure the programs and policies of TMF. Consequently, as a board, we have applied our strengths and skillsets to our advantage in the implementation of TMF programs.

An Example of TMF Board Effectiveness

In 2019, Rachel McRae, the Director of Communications, led and organized, in Brentwood, TN, the screening of the documentary film, [The Presence of Their Absence](#), in which I play a role. You may view a trailer of the film on [YouTube](#) (I appear in the trailer about minute 2:17). We viewed this film screening as part of our educational program, since the film’s topic was the story of a son of survivors of the Shoah.

We held the film screening at the Brentwood Public Library. For TMF, it was a monumental opportunity for us as an organization to engage both the Jewish and Christian communities. TMF partnered with the Nashville Jewish Film Festival for the screening, and approximately 100 Jews and Christians attended the screening of the film. Our Treasurer, Kevin Little, introduced the film, while, Rachel McRae, TMF's Director of Communications, moderated the Q&A following the film. Board members, JoAnn Siegienski, Elaine Brown, and volunteer Cindy Jones along with other volunteers, supervised the donation, information, and snack tables.

Following these two film screenings, Rachel produced content from these events for two of our newsletters (**Verifications:** [A Monumentally Fun Week TMF Newsletter](#) and [Nashville screening TMF Newsletter](#)). I am incredibly proud of what our board members did in leading and organizing the Brentwood film screening since it was in the community where they reside. I had no leadership role in fulfilling in the planning or implementation process. Collectively, we used this opportunity to screen this film as vehicles to communicate to the public the mission of TMF. We do not yet know the outcome of our efforts; nonetheless, we did receive good verbal feedback following this film screening. In time, we will see what fruit emerges when it comes to financial contributions or physical participation in our work.

Summary

A program is an output of an organization, while a policy is the guidelines concerning how the organization puts into action its programs. From its mission, TMF has developed three primary programs: Jewish cemetery restoration projects, mass grave commemorations, and education. Generally, TMF considers a policy to be what we call a process. For TMF, this means a process describes how we organize, structure, and conduct our work. Consequently, to this end,

we have developed policy guidelines for our processes. To date, TMF has developed seven processes, i.e., policies, to guide its three programs. These policies are: (1) governance, (2) volunteer selection, (3) project selection, (4) media, (5) decision making, (6) data storage/access policy, and (7) financial.

Glassey (2003) reports that Chaitt, Holland and Taylor in the 1990's uncovered a set of "competencies that characterized an effective board," which include the following dimensions: contextual, educational, interpersonal, analytical, political, and strategic" (p. 6). For my discussion, I considered, first, the contextual dimension, which "means that the board understands and takes into account the culture and norms of the organization it governs," (Glassey, 2003, p. 6). Second, I examined the educational dimension," which implies that "the board takes the necessary steps to ensure that board members are knowledgeable about the organization, the profession, and the board's roles, responsibilities, and performance" (Glassey, 2003, p. 6).

Hence, I have led TMF to examine its cultural norms and values, which we accomplished through a TMF BOD and volunteer staff value assessment. We have also evaluated our strengths and skillsets as an organization by using the Strengths Finder, DISC, and Enneagram Assessments. From these assessments of the BOD and its volunteer staff, we have learned more about who we are, our strengths, and tendencies as an organization.

By assessing our organization, we have a better idea about who we are organizationally, and thus, are better able to organize and structure the programs and policies of TMF. Consequently, as a board, we have applied our strengths and skillsets to our advantage in the implementation of TMF programs. I think that TMF has become effective as NPO in assessing, evaluating, and executing its programs and policies.

CHAPTER 3

KEY LEARNINGS AND SERVING OTHERS

TMF Program and Policy Assessment

Glassey (2003) considers that “the job of the board is to govern,” i.e., to develop and “formulate policies and plans and employ, support and evaluate . . . to ensure that adequate resources are available for implementation” (p. 6). Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) posit that the most important purpose of evaluation “is to provide useful information to those who hold a stake in whatever is being evaluated . . . often helping them to make a judgment or decision” (p. 9). Additionally, they state that the purpose of evaluation is “to examine and describe a particular thing and, ultimately, to consider its value” (p. 10). TMF’s principal methods of assessing and evaluating its programs and policies are its Jewish cemetery restoration project reviews and volunteer feedback, Jewish cemetery selection process, and volunteer selection process.

Jewish Cemetery Project Evaluations

Before 2016, TMF had conducted no more than three Jewish cemetery restoration projects in Poland during a single summer. Project evaluation was carried out in our fall board meetings. Beginning in 2016, the number of projects grew to six and we determined to develop a way to evaluate our work in the field. At first we used word documents for each project;

however, the project evaluations were not centralized and easily accessible (**Artifact:** [Markuszów - July 2016 Final Report](#)). In 2017, we shifted to using Google Docs and then in 2018 we produced a standardized form for evaluating projects (**Evaluation:** [Wawolnica 2018 Recap](#)). We continue to use this reporting and evaluation system for each project (**Verifications:** [Przerośl 2019 Project Report](#), and [Czestochowa 2019 Project Report](#)).

Since 2015, we have collected volunteer feedback, or testimonials from select volunteers (**Verification:** [Volunteer Testimonials](#)). We have discussed but not yet developed a standardized evaluation form or mechanism for volunteer feedback and evaluations. I will share a few examples of the types of volunteer feedback and evaluations that we have received over the past few years. In 2016 during the Nasielsk Project, Kasia Sosnowska made a short [YouTube video](#) (**Artifact**) about our work. Jay Osborn wrote a very detailed evaluation of our work in Nasielsk in a blog post on Rohatyn Jewish Heritage (**Evaluation:** [Nasielsk Cemetery Clearing with The Matzevah Foundation](#)), which was later shared in a post on [Jewish Heritage Europe](#).

Additionally, I asked Jay and Marla Osborn, and Glenn Kurtz, the lead descendant of the Nasielsk descendant's group, to share with me their reflections of the Jewish cemetery restoration project in Nasielsk, Poland, July 2016 (**Verifications:** [2016 Nasielsk TMF Report](#)). In 2019, Hatte Blejer and Hank Mishkoff shared on Facebook their feedback for the Przerośl project (**Verification:** [Przerośl 2019 Project Report](#)—please see section: Meaningful Outcomes). Finally, typically in our fall TMF board meetings, we will recap and assess each Jewish cemetery restoration project of that year along with lessons learned or meaningful outcomes from each project (**Verifications:** [2016 Oct Meeting Minutes Project Recap and Celebration](#) and [2016 Oct Meeting Minutes Best Practices](#)—**Please Note:** Relevant sections are highlighted in each artifact). In our fall board meetings, we discuss

and select our projects for each of our programs in the coming year (**Verification:** [2016 Oct Meeting Minutes 2017 Project Selection](#)—**Please Note:** Relevant sections are highlighted in each artifact). I will discuss our Jewish cemetery project selection process in the following section.

Jewish Cemetery Project Selection Process

Concerning project inquiries, we typically have a high volume of Jewish cemetery project inquiries, so we have developed a project selection process that includes a general query response (**Artifact:** [RE Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)). Most Jewish cemetery project queries come to us by word of mouth, or via our website through a special email address, contact@matzevah.org. TMF uses three primary criteria by which we assess any potential Jewish cemetery restoration project. We concentrate our selection efforts on projects that meet the following criteria:

1. Projects that involve the community in and around the Jewish cemetery
2. Projects that allow us to partner with Jewish individuals and/or organizations
3. Projects that involve education

TMF is organizing 11 projects across Poland in 2020: nine Jewish cemetery restoration projects and two mass grave commemoration projects (**Verification:** [2020 Project Grid](#)).

Typically, when we receive initial project inquiries from a Jewish descendant or someone wishing to for TMF to take on a Jewish cemetery project, we walk them through several issues including project goals, outcomes, and budget preparation (**Artifact:** [RE Cemetery restoration Basic Budget](#)). I have been the primary contact for Jewish cemetery project inquiries since 2011; however, this practiced has changed and we now use our website to handle [Volunteer Project Inquiries](#) (**Artifact**).

Regardless of how we receiving project inquiries, it is important to handle the response well (**Artifact:** [RE Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)—**Please Note**, the relevant points regarding budget preparation are highlighted). Kevin Little, TMF Treasurer, shared with me his feedback regarding how I handle such inquiries:

I continue to be amazed at how you’ve grown as our president. The email outline below is well versed and understandable with a very personal touch – not cold and robotic. Thank you for continuing to follow the Lord in leading our organization. It is a true joy to serve with you (**Evaluation:** [Kevin RE: Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)).

I always blind copy the BOD on all such email Jewish cemetery restoration project inquiries. I do so for two primary reasons. First, so that the BOD will be aware of all such inquiries, and second, I include the members of the board in such responses so that I may maintain accountability to the BOD.

Volunteer Selection Process

In 2020, TMF is celebrating its tenth year of service. Recently, I wrote a brief article about TMF’s first nine years of operation in TMF’s 2019 Year End Newsletter (**Artifact:** [The Matzevah Foundation 2019 Year End Report](#)). In my reflection, I captured how we go about organizing and coordinating our work with seven board members and volunteers.

Additionally, I explained the cyclical nature of our operations and how we gather information, consider, plan, develop, and implement our projects annually. I referred to our [volunteer recruitment](#) process, which includes an [Volunteer Application](#) and [Volunteer FAQs](#) (**Artifacts**). I also included how we handle [Jewish Cemetery Project Inquiries](#) (**Artifact**). I will discuss further project inquiries in the section “Jewish Cemetery Inquiries and Budgeting Process.” Both of these processes have grown out of the necessity to develop our volunteer process and to handle project inquiries.

Volunteers who approach us through our website are vetted and reviewed. Volunteer applicants must submit an application and references. We have a team who reviews each applicant and their references. Once the review process is complete, one of our board members will interview the applicant and make a recommendation to the board as to whether to select the volunteer applicant or not.

If the applicant is approved, when began their preparation using an administrative tool, we call the [Offsite Orientation Tracker 2016](#) (**Artifact**). Volunteers are walked through the steps of project selection, what to bring, costs, etc. and then we begin the volunteer orientation and training process (**Artifacts:** [Orientation and Culture May 2019](#), [TMF Volunteer Commitment Packet 2016](#), [TMF Volunteer Interest Packet 2016](#), and [TMF Volunteer Intro Packet 2017](#)).

We seek to develop our first-time volunteers and work toward engaging them in future projects. One such frequent and faithful volunteer, Rachael Romero shared these words about her experience with me and TMF:

Steven and the Matzevah Foundation have changed my life in huge and wonderful ways. I feel like I'm fulfilling both an ethical and religious commitment through the cemetery projects I've participated in over the years, and made friends with a diverse group of people. Steven himself always models positive leadership; he is dedicated to serving the needs of descendants and local communities, and navigates difficult situations in a way that demonstrates cultural understanding, empathy, and competence. I see him as both a role model and a friend (**Evaluation:** [Rachael Romero Re Feedback](#)).

Additionally, we seek feedback from our project volunteers following nearly every Jewish cemetery restoration project that we conduct in Poland. We share their reflections via quarterly newsletters or on TMF's webpage: [Volunteer Testimonies](#) (**Verification**).

Serving Others

Stakeholders

Stakeholders is a term frequently applied by evaluators to describe an assortment of groups and individuals “who have a direct interest in and may be affected by the program being evaluated or the evaluation’s results” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9). In 2005, Greene identified “four types of stakeholders,” one of which is relevant for my discussion and that is the “people who are the intended beneficiaries of the program, their families, and their communities” (cited in, Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9). Furthermore, Stakeholders have a collective “a stake in the future direction of that program even though they are sometimes unaware of their stake,” and for this reason, “evaluators typically involve at least some stakeholders in the planning and conduct of the evaluation” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9). Lastly, Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) conclude that the participation of stakeholders “can help the evaluator to better understand the program and the information needs of those who will use it” (p. 9).

For TMF the people who we serve and who benefit the most from the work we do in caring for and restoring Jewish cemeteries are primarily Jews. I consult frequently with Jewish descendants regarding Jewish cemetery restoration projects. As I indicated above, we involve them in the Jewish cemetery project selection process by seeking their input regarding the project. Their response aids us in evaluating whether or not we can take on their particular project.

For example, since 2016, I have been consulting with Dr. Bill Brostoff and his family about restoring their ancestral Jewish cemetery in Trzciannie, Poland (**Artifact:** [RE: Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)). About three years after first contacting me, Dr. Brostoff contacted me once more; however, this time he wanted to invite me to participate in the 2020 International

Association of Jewish Genealogical Society (IAJGS) Conference What is relevant at this point is what he stated about me and my work. He wrote in his email,

I wanted to thank you for all the work you are doing in Poland. Even though you aren't directly participating in my particular project, the Trzcianne Jewish cemetery, all of your work elsewhere does provide invaluable indirect help (**Verification:** [Re Trzcianne cemetery](#)).

Even though I have never met Dr. Brostoff face-to-face, I see my relationship with him as an outgrowth of the influence that TMF has developed as a means to change the landscape in the relationship between Jews and Christians. Bill's inquiries and his invitation to me are an outflow of my work with other Jewish descendants with whom I am working.

Finally, Dr. Brostoff has authored a guidebook which he wrote to assist other Jewish descendants navigate the complex terrain of Jewish cemetery restoration projects in Poland (**Verification:** [Guidebook for Jewish Cemetery Restoration](#)). His guidebook is by no means comprehensive, but he provides enough structure and detail regarding his experience and what he has learned in his journey. He considers TMF to be one of the "important players" in the field of Jewish cemetery restoration in Poland. About TMF he stated,

The Matzevah Foundation (TMF): TMF is a U.S. based, volunteer, non-profit organization. Their primary mission is to mobilize volunteers to restore Jewish cemeteries and seek to reconcile Jews and Christians. Each year, they are involved with several cemetery restoration projects in Poland. Sites for restoration are selected competitively by a board; thus they are not a "for hire" service, but rather develop and focus on projects that engage descendants, volunteers, and the local Polish community (Brostoff, 2020, p. 11).

Dr. Brostoff's words are an affirmation to me regarding how far TMF has come in the last ten years. I began caring for and restoring Jewish cemeteries nearly 16 years ago. Although, there are there are Poles who have been doing this much longer than me, I am probably one of the only ones attempting to link Polish-Jewish descendants to local communities in their ancestral homes in Poland. Brostoff (2020) posits,

As little as a decade ago, Jewish cemetery restoration in Poland was uncharted territory. With the dedicated individuals and teams, particularly FODŻ and The Matzevah Foundation, and their respective funders; tremendous progress has been made toward making the process more routine, thus producing a critical mass of experience (Brostoff, 2020, p. 13).

I agree with Dr. Brostoff. We are at the point of critical mass and TMF has been a part of leading this shift. Thus, in order to impact the future, we must change the present and engage Jews and Christians working together to care for and restore Jewish cemeteries in Poland as a pathway for dialogue and reconciliation.

Planned Activity: Develop Board Self-Assessment Tool

In the past ten years, we have never evaluated the board of TMF to determine its effectiveness objectively. We have to some extent subjectively evaluated our performance via feedback from volunteers and others. Glassey (2003) asserts that “evaluating the efficacy of the board of directors serves as basis for continuous board development” (p. 18). She states that evaluations of this type may be “a formal self-assessment or informal self-reflection;” however, she argues that “evaluation ensures that the board stays on the right track” and to ensure that they are doing the best job possible” (p. 18). I would like for us to evaluate the BOD of TMF at its upcoming fall board meeting. Glassey (2003) states that “evaluation can take many forms” and has provided six samples in the appendices of her article (pp. 38-47) (**Artifact:** [Appendices Mamas Kitchen](#)). To this end, Glassey (2003) advises for the board to call into existence “a board development committee,” which will take “on the governance responsibility,” and thus, “will develop mechanisms for evaluation of board members” (p. 18).

Conclusion

Glassey (2003) considers that “the job of the board is to govern,” i.e., to develop and “formulate policies and plans and employ, support and evaluate . . . to ensure that adequate

resources are available for implementation” (p. 6). Fitzpatrick et al. (2011) posit that the most important purpose of evaluation “is to provide useful information to those who hold a stake in whatever is being evaluated . . . often helping them to make a judgment or decision” (p. 9). Additionally, they state that the purpose of evaluation is “to examine and describe a particular thing and, ultimately, to consider its value” (p. 10).

TMF uses the term process instead of policy for determining its guidelines for its programs. TMF’s principal methods of assessing and evaluating its programs and policies are its Jewish cemetery restoration project reviews and project specific volunteer feedback, Jewish cemetery selection process, and volunteer selection process. TMF Board meetings have been the venues in which we typically assess and evaluate our work.

TMF did not have a way to assess or evaluate its Jewish cemetery restoration projects before 2016. This reality was due to the fact that TMF had not conducted any more than three Jewish cemetery restoration projects in Poland during a single summer. Hence, we conducted our project evaluations during our fall board meetings. In 2016, TMF conducted six projects and the BOD realized that it needed to change its method of evaluation. Thus, each project coordinator submitted a project report via a MS Word document; however, the reports were not centrally located and accessible. In 2017, the BOD decided to switch to using Google Docs, and then in 2018, it produced a standardized form for evaluating Jewish cemetery restoration projects.

Since 2016, TMF has used this approach to evaluate its Jewish cemetery restoration program, and uses this information to assess its Jewish cemetery work and mass grave commemorations. Additionally, TMF uses the information from these program assessments to guide its decisions concerning future work related to these programs.

TMF has also developed two processes to guide its Jewish cemetery restoration project selection and for selecting the volunteers, who will staff these projects. Both of these processes have been incorporated into TMF's website to aid Jewish descendants and potential volunteers to understand how TMF determines which projects it selects and how volunteers might participate.

Furthermore, since TMF is a public charity, it serves the public; however, more so it serves the Jewish community of Polish heritage. Hence, the Jewish community is one of our principal stakeholders in our work. Stakeholders is a term frequently applied by evaluators to describe an assortment of groups and individuals "who have a direct interest in and may be affected by the program being evaluated or the evaluation's results" (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011, p. 9). I consult frequently with Jewish descendants regarding Jewish cemetery restoration projects, and we involve them in the Jewish cemetery project selection process by seeking their input regarding the project. Their response aids us in evaluating whether or not we can take on their particular project.

Finally, Glassey (2003) asserts that "evaluating the efficacy of the board of directors serves as basis for continuous board development" (p. 18). She states that evaluations of this type may be "a formal self-assessment or informal self-reflection;" however, she argues that "evaluation ensures that the board stays on the right track" and to ensure that they are doing the best job possible" (p. 18). It is important to TMF for us to evaluate the effectiveness of our BOD and how it conducts its work. Thus, I would like to recommend that at its upcoming fall board meeting.

Documentation of Competency

Artifacts

1. [Face to Face Interview Questions](#)
2. [Case Study Survey For Second Generation Church](#)
3. [TMF Processes](#)
4. [Agenda 14 November 2010 RTF](#)
5. [TMF Vision, Mission, and JCR Projects](#)
6. [Email 2013 March TMF Board Meeting](#)
7. [2013 March Agenda for TMF Board Meeting](#)
8. [DISC](#)
9. [Agenda Mar 2012](#)
10. [Email Agenda Mar 2012](#)
11. [TMF Action Required](#)
12. [Strengths Finder Resource](#)
13. [Enneagram Types](#)
14. [Markuszów - July 2016 Final Report](#)
15. [YouTube video](#)
16. [RE Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)
17. [RE Cemetery restoration Basic Budget](#)
18. [Volunteer Project Inquiries](#)
19. [RE Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)
20. [The Matzevah Foundation 2019 Year End Report](#)
21. [Volunteer Application](#)
22. [Volunteer FAQs](#)
23. [Jewish Cemetery Project Inquiries](#)
24. [Offsite Orientation Tracker 2016](#)
25. [Orientation and Culture May 2019](#)
26. [TMF Volunteer Commitment Packet 2016](#)
27. [TMF Volunteer Interest Packet 2016](#)
28. [TMF Volunteer Intro Packet 2017](#)
29. [RE: Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)

Verifications and Evaluations

1. [Evaluation Report 01-06-06](#)
2. [Executive Board Meeting 11142010](#)
3. [2013 March Minutes for TMF Board Meeting](#)
4. [TMF Member Value Statements](#)
5. [StrengthsFinder Team Summary](#)
6. [TMF Strengths Chart](#)
7. [TMF Members and Description of Enneagram Types](#)
8. [A Monumentally Fun Week TMF Newsletter](#)
9. [Nashville screening TMF Newsletter](#)
10. [Wawolnica 2018 Recap](#)
11. [Przerośl 2019 Project Report](#)
12. [Czestochowa 2019 Project Report](#)
13. [Volunteer Testimonials](#)
14. [Nasielsk Cemetery Clearing with The Matzevah Foundation](#)
15. [2016 Nasielsk TMF Report](#)
16. [2016 Oct Meeting Minutes Project Recap and Celebration](#)
17. [2016 Oct Meeting Minutes Best Practices](#)
18. [2016 Oct Meeting Minutes 2017 Project Selection](#)
19. [2020 Project Grid](#)
20. [Kevin RE: Matzevah Foundation project selection](#)
21. [Rachael Romero Re Feedback](#)
22. [Volunteer Testimonies](#)
23. [Re Trzcianne cemetery](#)
24. [Guidebook for Jewish Cemetery Restoration](#)

REFERENCE LIST

- Blamey, A., & Mackenzie, M. (2007). Theories of change and realistic evaluation: Peas in a pod or apples and oranges? *Evaluation*, 13(4), 439-455. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.cc.andrews.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=coah&AN=47456311&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Brostoff, W. (2020). Guidebook for Jewish Cemetery Restoration. In. Berkley, CA.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2011). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (Kindle ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Education.
- Glassey, E. A. (2003). The board of our dreams: A plan to build a dynamic board of directors for Mama's Kitchen. *Governance*(3), 22. Retrieved from <https://digital.sandiego.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=npi-bpl-governance>
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (2012). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience*: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Leadership Handbook*. (2011). Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University.
- Manosevitz, C. H. (2010). Brethren again: Personal witness to a search for healing. *New Theology Review*, 23(2), 55-68. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=49814299&site=ehost-live>
- Martin, R. L. (2007). *The opposable mind: How successful leaders win through integrative thinking*. Retrieved from <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0719/2007021447.html>
- Materials specified: Table of contents<http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0719/2007021447.html>
- Nettleton, C. (2016, Dec 06, 2017). The uncivil war where politics count more than country. *Politics*. Retrieved from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/the-uncivil-war-where-pol_b_12765132?guccounter=1
- Potůček, M. (2017). Public interest and public policy. In *Public policy: A comprehensive introduction* [eBook] (pp. 15-27). Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.cc.andrews.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1699409&site=ehost-live&scope=site>