CREATING A

FUNDABLE NONPROFIT

Building the Organizational Condition That Creates Funder Confidence



Hugh Ballou

Transformational Leadership Strategist™

SYNERVISION PUBLISHING

CREATING A
FUNDABLE NONPROFIT

Building the Organizational Condition That Creates Funder Confidence

Hugh Ballou

Transformational Leadership Strategist™

SYNERVISION PUBLISHING

Creating a Fundable Nonprofit

Building the Organizational Condition That Creates Funder Confidence

Copyright © 2026 Hugh Ballou

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without prior written permission from the copyright holder, except for brief quotations used in reviews, articles, or other uses permitted by copyright law.

This book is intended for educational and informational purposes. The author's leadership, governance, fundraising, and organizational-development observations are offered as practical guidance and should be adapted to the specific circumstances of each organization. Nothing in this book constitutes legal, accounting, tax, investment, or other professional advice. Readers should consult appropriate qualified professionals when such advice is required.

Published by SynerVision Publishing

ISBN: 978-0-9772148-9-1

Printed in the United States of America

First edition, 2026

CONTENTS

PART I · THE SHIFT FROM FUNDRAISING TO FUNDABILITY

Chapter 1. The Fundraising Trap 3
Chapter 2. Fundability: The Condition Behind the Ask 13
Chapter 3. What Funders Are Really Evaluating 25
Chapter 4. Start With the Problem, Not the Program 37

PART II · STRATEGIC CLARITY

Chapter 5. The Solution: How Change Actually Happens 49
Chapter 6. Alternatives, Options, and Strategic Choice 51
Chapter 7. Your Unique Value Proposition 61

PART III · THE INTERNAL ARCHITECTURE FUNDERS CAN TRUST

Chapter 8. Impact: From Activity to Outcomes 77
Chapter 9. Collaborations That Expand Capacity and Credibility 93
Chapter 10. Budget: The Strategy Expressed in Numbers 109
Chapter 11. Leadership: Who Can Carry the Promise? 123
Chapter 12. Governance That Creates Confidence 135
Chapter 13. Reliable Systems and Processes 147
Chapter 14. Execution: Turning Strategy Into Visible Progress 163
Chapter 15. Financial Integrity and Transparency 175
Chapter 16. Sustainability and Revenue Resilience 187

PART IV · DEMONSTRATING FUNDABILITY

Chapter 17. Build the Investment Case Before You Build the Pitch 201
Chapter 18. One Story, Many Funder Conversations 215
Chapter 19. Evidence, Reporting, and the Stewardship Loop 229

PART V · FROM DIAGNOSIS TO ACTION

Chapter 20. Diagnose Your Current Fundability 243
Chapter 21. Prioritize the Highest-Leverage Gaps 255
Chapter 22. The 90-Day Fundability Action Plan 271
Chapter 23. Sustain the Condition, Not Just the Campaign 283
Conclusion: Steward the Promise 297

BONUS MATTERIAL

90-Day Fundability Action Plan 307
Six Funder-Confidence Conditions Scorecard 308
The Eight-Part Solution Map 309
Annual Fundability Review Checklist 309
Glossary of Canonical Terms 310
Resources 312

PREFACE

I have spent more than three decades in rooms where nonprofit leaders were asking the same question in different words: How do we raise more money? It is a fair question, and this book does not dismiss it. But after enough of those rooms, a different pattern became impossible to ignore. The organizations that struggled to raise money were rarely short on effort. They were short on something else — a condition, not a campaign.

That condition is fundability: the clarity, leadership, evidence, and stewardship that make a funder, a donor, or a partner confident enough to invest before the appeal is ever made. Fundraising is the ask. Fundability is what makes the ask credible. Confuse the two, and an organization can work harder every year without becoming any easier to fund.

This book is built around that distinction, using the eight-part Solution Map and the six Funder-Confidence Conditions as a working architecture rather than a theory. Each chapter pairs a short diagnostic idea with a practical tool — a worksheet, a checklist, a scorecard — meant to be used with a leadership team or board, not read alone and set aside.

You do not need to be in a funding crisis to benefit from this work. The organizations that build fundability before they need it are the ones that can move quickly when an opportunity — or a challenge — arrives without warning. My hope is that these chapters give your organization exactly that kind of readiness.

Hugh Ballou

PART I

THE SHIFT FROM FUNDRAISING TO FUNDABILITY

Fundraising is the activity. Fundability is the condition.

The first shift is not about asking better. It is about becoming an organization that inspires confidence before the ask is ever made.

CHAPTER 1

The Fundraising Trap

Working harder at fundraising does not automatically make an organization easier to fund.

The Familiar Problem

I have worked with nonprofit leaders for decades, and I have seen a familiar pattern repeat itself. The organization needs more money. The board is concerned. The staff is stretched. Programs are important, demand is growing, and everyone knows that additional resources would help. So the natural response is to do more fundraising.

Add another event. Send another appeal. Apply for more grants. Start a giving campaign. Find a new donor database. Hire a development person. Ask board members to introduce us to people with money. Post more frequently on social media. Rewrite the case statement. Schedule more donor meetings.

None of those activities is inherently wrong. Many of them are necessary. The trap is believing that more fundraising activity will solve a problem that fundraising did not create.

This is one of the most important distinctions in this book: fundraising is the activity; fundability is the condition. Fundraising is what we do to invite resources into the mission. Fundability is the organizational condition that gives another steward confidence that placing resources in our care is a wise and responsible decision.

When leaders confuse those two ideas, the organization can become very busy without becoming more credible. The calendar fills up. Staff members work harder. Board members are asked to do more. Volunteers get recruited for events. Grant applications multiply. Yet the underlying condition of the organization may not have changed at all.

> *That is the fundraising trap.*

Activity Is Visible. Confidence Is Deeper.

Fundraising activity is easy to see because it produces motion. We can count the number of appeals sent, grants submitted, meetings scheduled, events held, calls made, and proposals written. Activity creates the reassuring feeling that we are doing something.

Fundability is less obvious because it lives beneath the activity. It is reflected in the clarity of the strategy, the credibility of the leadership, the reliability of the systems, the evidence of outcomes, the integrity of the finances, and the consistency of execution. Those conditions are not created by sending another appeal.

A prospective donor may never use the word fundability, but that donor is still evaluating it. A foundation program officer may not ask for a fundability score, but the questions in the application are designed to discover it. A corporate partner may be interested in community impact, but before committing resources the company is also evaluating whether the organization can deliver what it promises. A board member deciding whether to make a significant personal gift is doing the same thing.

They are asking, in one form or another: Do I understand what this organization is trying to accomplish? Does the leadership appear capable? Are the finances trustworthy? Is there evidence that the work produces meaningful results? Are there systems in place? Will my resources be stewarded well?

> *Those are questions of fundability.*

Why More Fundraising Does Not Automatically Create More Confidence

It is possible to become more skilled at fundraising without becoming more fundable. An organization can improve its appeal letters, create a beautiful website, hire a professional grant writer, and host an impressive event while still leaving a prospective funder uncertain about the organization itself.

The message may be polished, but the strategy may be unclear. The story may be emotional, but the outcomes may be undefined. The budget may look professional, but it may not clearly connect

resources to priorities. The executive director may be compelling, but the board may be disengaged. The organization may have a strong mission, but its internal processes may depend on one heroic leader holding everything together.

This is why communication cannot compensate for weak architecture. Better words can clarify what is already true. They cannot create organizational credibility where the underlying conditions are missing.

There is a leadership lesson here that reaches beyond fundraising. In my work with leaders, I often use the metaphor of the conductor. A conductor does not make beautiful music by working harder than every musician in the orchestra. The conductor creates clarity, alignment, timing, accountability, and coordinated execution so that the whole ensemble can perform. Nonprofit leadership works the same way.

If the organization is not aligned, the answer is not simply to increase the volume. More activity can actually make the noise louder. The work of the leader is to strengthen the system so that effort produces results.

The Hidden Cost of Treating Fundraising as a Department

One of the most damaging assumptions in nonprofit leadership is that fundraising belongs to the development department. It may be assigned there operationally, but fundability belongs to the entire organization.

A development director cannot compensate for an unclear strategy. A grant writer cannot manufacture measurable outcomes that the program team has never defined. A major gifts officer cannot create financial integrity. A fundraising consultant cannot make an uninvolved board become a credible governing body. A compelling storyteller cannot fix inconsistent execution.

When fundraising is treated as a specialized function disconnected from the rest of the organization, leaders unintentionally create a dangerous divide. One group is asked to raise money while everyone

else continues operating as usual. The development team is then expected to translate organizational ambiguity into a persuasive case for support.

That is an unfair assignment, and it is usually unsustainable.

Fundability is organizational. Strategy contributes to fundability. Leadership contributes to fundability. Governance contributes to fundability. Financial management contributes to fundability. Program design contributes to fundability. Measurement contributes to fundability. Communication contributes to fundability. Execution contributes to fundability.

This is why the shift from fundraising to fundability is so important. It moves the conversation from, 'How do we raise more money?' to a more useful question: 'What must be true about our organization for responsible stewards to have confidence in placing resources in our care?'

Stewards Speaking to Stewards

I prefer to frame this conversation through stewardship. A nonprofit leader is a steward. Board members are stewards. Staff members and volunteers are stewards of the mission, the relationships, the reputation, and the resources entrusted to the organization.

The donor is also a steward. So is the foundation. So is the corporation. So is the government agency. They have resources to deploy, and they have a responsibility to deploy those resources wisely.

When we understand this, fundraising changes. We are not trying to extract money from someone who has it. We are inviting one steward to consider placing resources with another steward in order to create measurable mission impact.

> *The ask matters, but the condition behind the ask matters first.*

When the Problem Is Fundability, Not Technique

How can you tell when the real problem is fundability rather than fundraising technique? There are several warning signs.

You may be working harder every year while revenue remains unpredictable. You may receive positive comments about your mission but few commitments. Grant applications may repeatedly reach the point where funders ask for information the organization struggles to provide. Board members may say they support fundraising while remaining unable to explain the strategy, outcomes, or investment case. Donors may give once but fail to deepen their relationship with the organization. The executive director may carry most of the important relationships because the organization has not built a broader culture of stewardship.

Another signal is internal inconsistency. Ask five leaders to explain the problem the organization exists to solve, and you may receive five different answers. Ask what measurable change the organization creates, and the answers may shift to activities: how many people attended, how many meals were served, how many classes were offered, how many counseling sessions were delivered. Those are useful measures, but they describe activity and output, not necessarily the outcome or impact.

Financial questions can reveal the same problem. If the budget is treated as a historical accounting document rather than the strategy expressed in numbers, a funder may struggle to understand what additional resources will actually accomplish. If financial reports are late, unclear, or disconnected from program results, confidence declines even when the mission itself is compelling.

Leadership dependence is another warning sign. If everything important passes through one person, the organization may be effective today but fragile tomorrow. Funders notice fragility. They notice when the board does not understand its role, when succession has never been discussed, when systems live in one person's head, or when relationships disappear if one leader leaves.

These are not fundraising failures. They are organizational conditions that affect fundability.

The Six Conditions Behind Confidence

Throughout this book we will return to six conditions that strengthen funder confidence: clarity of strategy, strong leadership, reliable processes, measurable outcomes, financial integrity, and consistent execution.

Notice that none of these is a fundraising tactic. Together they form the organizational environment in which fundraising can work. When these conditions are strong, fundraising effort has something credible to communicate. When they are weak, even excellent fundraising techniques eventually encounter resistance.

Clarity tells people what problem you are solving and why your approach matters. Strong leadership demonstrates that the organization can carry the promise. Reliable processes show that success does not depend on improvisation. Measurable outcomes provide evidence that the work creates meaningful change. Financial integrity demonstrates disciplined stewardship. Consistent execution shows that the organization can turn plans into visible progress.

These conditions do not make every prospective funder say yes. They do something more fundamental: they make the organization easier to understand, easier to trust, and easier to evaluate.

The Cost of Staying in the Trap

The fundraising trap has a cost, and the cost is not only financial. It consumes leadership energy. It creates frustration between the board and staff. It can cause the development function to become the place where organizational weaknesses are exposed but never addressed.

It can also encourage short-term thinking. When cash is tight, the urgent need for revenue can push leaders toward the next event, the next grant deadline, or the next appeal before asking whether the organization is actually prepared to scale, sustain, and steward what it is requesting.

The result is often a cycle: urgency creates activity; activity produces some revenue; the underlying organizational gaps remain; the next shortage creates more urgency. Over time, leaders can become exhausted and conclude that fundraising is simply getting harder.

Sometimes fundraising is harder because the environment has changed. But sometimes the organization is trying to solve an internal confidence problem with external fundraising activity.

That distinction matters.

A Different Starting Question

The purpose of this book is not to discourage fundraising. Quite the opposite. I want your fundraising to become more productive because it is supported by stronger organizational architecture.

So instead of beginning with, 'How can we raise more money?' begin with a different question: 'What does a prospective funder see before hearing our appeal?'

That question changes the conversation.

The prospective funder sees your website, but also the clarity or confusion behind it. The funder sees your financial statements. The funder sees whether the board appears engaged. The funder sees how you describe outcomes. The funder notices whether your story, strategy, budget, leadership, and evidence fit together. The funder may speak with someone who has worked with your organization. The funder may search for public information. The funder may observe how promptly and professionally your team responds.

In other words, the funder is forming an opinion about the organization before the formal ask ever arrives.

This is not about pretending to be perfect. No nonprofit is perfect. Small organizations often operate with limited staff and imperfect systems. Fundability does not require size, polish, or bureaucracy. It requires coherence, credibility, stewardship, and evidence appropriate to the organization and its stage of development.

A small nonprofit with a clear strategy, engaged leadership, honest finances, disciplined processes, meaningful outcomes, and consistent execution can inspire substantial confidence. A much larger organization can weaken confidence if those conditions are absent.

From More Effort to Better Architecture

Leadership is not the art of doing more things. Leadership is the discipline of building the conditions in which the right things can happen consistently.

That is the shift we will make in this book. We will move from fundraising activity to fundability architecture. We will examine the problem you solve, the solution you offer, the alternatives in the landscape, your unique value, your outcomes, collaborations, budget, and leadership. We will connect those elements to governance, processes, execution, financial integrity, sustainability, communication, and stewardship.

The goal is not to create a prettier pitch. The goal is to become a stronger steward.

> *When that happens, fundraising changes from a desperate search for money into a disciplined invitation to partnership.*

READER SELF-CHECK

Where Are We Working Harder Without Becoming More Credible?

A board reflection–not a score, but a signal check.

- ❑ More activity, not more confidence?
- ❑ Can leadership explain our impact clearly?
- ❑ Does our budget reflect our priorities?
- ❑ Do we show outcomes, not just activity?
- ❑ Are financial reports timely and clear?
- ❑ Do key systems depend on one person?
- ❑ Is fundability everyone's job?
- ❑ Is our evidence ready, or scrambled?
- ❑ Do we ask for trust we haven't earned?
- ❑ Where are we busy but not credible?

REFLECTION

What Does a Prospective Funder See Before Hearing Our Appeal?

Before your next appeal, view the organization as an outside steward would.

❑ Strategy: Problem and solution clear?	❑ Leadership: Leader and board aligned, credible?
❑ Processes: Reliable systems, not improvisation?	❑ Outcomes: Real results, not just activity?
❑ Financial Integrity: Finances transparent, trustworthy?	❑ Execution: Plans become accountable results?

> *The first fundraising question is not, "How do we ask?" It is, "What condition are we asking someone to invest in?"*

In the next chapter, we will define fundability more precisely and establish the condition behind the ask–the combination of confidence, coherence, evidence, and stewardship that makes fundraising more productive because the organization itself is ready to be funded.

CHAPTER 2

Fundability: The Condition Behind the Ask

Fundraising is the activity. Fundability is the condition that makes the activity credible.

The Question Behind the Question

When nonprofit leaders tell me, 'We need to raise more money,' I understand the urgency. Payroll is coming. Programs are growing. The community need is real. A grant did not renew. A major donor moved away. The board wants a plan. In that moment, fundraising can feel like the obvious answer because money is the visible need.

But the visible need is not always the root need. Sometimes the organization does need better fundraising. Sometimes the appeal is weak, the donor strategy is undeveloped, or the board has not learned how to open doors. Those things matter. Yet there is a deeper question that must come first: What condition is the organization in when it makes the ask?

> *That is the question of fundability.*

Fundability is the organizational condition that creates confidence that resources placed with the organization will be used wisely, aligned with a clear purpose, translated into meaningful results, and stewarded with integrity. It is not a campaign. It is not a grant-writing technique. It is not a development plan. It is the condition beneath all of those activities.

This distinction is the central thesis of this book: fundraising is the activity; fundability is the condition. When the condition is strong, fundraising has something solid to stand on. When the condition is weak, even excellent fundraising can feel like pushing a heavy object uphill.

Fundraising Is What You Do. Fundability Is What You Have Built.

Fundraising consists of actions. We identify prospects. We build relationships. We tell the story. We make the case. We submit proposals. We hold conversations. We invite investment. We thank donors. We report results. Those are activities, and good organizations should learn to do them well.

Fundability is different. Fundability is the accumulated result of leadership choices made across the organization. It is reflected in the clarity of your strategy, the strength of your leadership, the reliability of your processes, the quality of your outcome evidence, the integrity of your finances, and the consistency of your execution.

A fundraising activity can be scheduled on a calendar. Fundability is built over time.

A fundraising appeal can be written by one person. Fundability cannot. It requires the executive leader, board, program team, finance function, volunteers, and development team to contribute to a coherent whole.

This is why an organization can become very active in fundraising and still remain difficult to fund. The activity is increasing while the condition is unchanged. More motion does not automatically create more confidence.

What a Funder Is Actually Evaluating

A prospective funder may begin with your proposal, your website, or a conversation with a board member, but the evaluation rarely stops with the words you present. Responsible stewards look for signals about the organization behind the message.

They want to know whether the problem is clearly understood. They want to see whether the solution makes sense. They look for evidence that leadership is capable and aligned. They want to know what results have been achieved and how those results are measured. They examine whether the financial story is understandable. They notice whether commitments are followed through consistently.

In other words, funders are evaluating organizational architecture, not merely the quality of the appeal.

Think of a building. A beautiful front door can make a strong first impression, but no responsible buyer evaluates a building only by the front door. The questions go deeper. Is the foundation sound? Are the systems reliable? Does the structure fit its intended purpose? Has it been maintained? Can it support what is being asked of it?

> *The fundraising message may open the door, but fundability is what the funder discovers once the door is open.*

The Architecture of Confidence

Throughout this book, we will return to six funder-confidence conditions: clarity of strategy, strong leadership, reliable processes, measurable outcomes, financial integrity, and consistent execution.

These conditions are not separate from fundraising. They are what make fundraising believable.

Clarity of strategy tells a funder that the organization knows what problem it is solving, why its approach matters, and where it is going. Strong leadership signals that capable people can carry the promise. Reliable processes show that the work can be repeated without depending on crisis management or one heroic individual. Measurable outcomes provide evidence that effort produces meaningful change. Financial integrity demonstrates that resources are handled responsibly. Consistent execution proves that plans become action, commitments become deliverables, and learning leads to adjustment.

Each condition strengthens the others. Weakness in one area can undermine confidence in the whole. Strong outcomes can be discounted when financial reporting is unreliable. A compelling strategy can lose credibility when the board is disengaged. Excellent leadership can become a risk when the organization depends too heavily on one person. A clean budget is not enough if no one can explain how the dollars connect to results.

Fundability is therefore not one department doing one thing well. It is the organization becoming coherent.

Four Words That Define Fundability

I find it useful to describe fundability through four words: confidence, coherence, evidence, and stewardship. These words give leaders a practical way to test what their organization is communicating to a prospective funder.

Confidence means the funder can reasonably trust the organization to carry out what it says it will do. Confidence does not require perfection. It requires credibility. The leader can explain the strategy. The board understands its role. Financial information is available. Commitments are tracked. Results are discussed honestly. Problems are not hidden. Confidence grows when what the organization says and what the organization does are consistent.

Coherence means the parts fit together. The mission connects to the problem. The solution connects to the mission. Programs connect to the solution. Outcomes connect to the programs. The budget connects to the priorities. Leadership connects people and resources to the work. Communication then tells one integrated story rather than a collection of disconnected claims.

Evidence means the organization can demonstrate what it knows. Evidence can take many forms. For a small nonprofit it may be simple, but it should still be meaningful: participation data, completion rates, stories connected to defined outcomes, pre- and post-assessments, financial reports, partner feedback, documented milestones, or other indicators of progress. Evidence moves the conversation from 'Trust us, we do good work' to 'Here is what we are learning and accomplishing.'

Stewardship means the organization accepts responsibility for what has been entrusted to it. Money is part of stewardship, but stewardship is larger than money. We steward mission, people, relationships, reputation, time, opportunities, data, facilities, partnerships, and community trust. A fundable nonprofit demonstrates that it understands this responsibility.

Stewards Speaking to Stewards

This stewardship frame changes the emotional posture of fundraising. It moves us away from begging and toward responsible partnership.

The nonprofit leader is a steward of mission and opportunity. The board is a steward of governance and public trust. Staff and volunteers are stewards of the work. The donor, foundation, corporation, or government agency is also a steward. Those funders have resources to deploy, and they have their own responsibility to place those resources where they can create value consistent with their purpose.

The fundraising conversation, then, is not simply one person asking another person for money. It is one steward saying to another: Here is the problem we are committed to addressing. Here is the solution we have built. Here is the evidence we can show. Here is the leadership and structure carrying the work. Here is what additional resources can make possible. Would you consider stewarding resources with us toward this outcome?

> *That is a very different conversation from, 'We need money.' Need alone does not establish readiness. Stewardship does.*

Worthy of Support Is Not the Same as Ready for Support

This may be one of the more difficult distinctions for leaders who care deeply about their mission: being worthy of support is not the same as being ready to receive and steward support.

Many organizations serve important causes. Many leaders are sincere. Many teams work sacrificially. Many programs touch lives. Worthiness matters, but a funder must make a different decision. The funder is asking whether this organization, in its current condition, can responsibly convert additional resources into the promised value.

A mission can be worthy while the strategy remains unclear. A program can be compassionate while outcome measurement is weak. A founder can be gifted while the organization remains overly dependent on that founder. A board can care deeply while failing to provide effective governance. Financial records can be honest while still being late, confusing, or incomplete.

None of those conditions makes the organization bad. They simply identify the work required to become more fundable.

This is an important leadership posture. Fundability is not a judgment of moral worth. It is an assessment of organizational readiness and credibility. Once leaders understand that distinction, the conversation becomes less defensive and more useful. We can identify gaps without diminishing the mission. We can strengthen the organization without pretending that good intentions are enough.

The Funder Is Asking, "What Happens Next?"

Every significant contribution carries an implied question: What happens next?

If we provide this grant, what will change? If we fund this position, what capacity will be created? If we underwrite this program, who will be served and what outcome will improve? If we make a major gift, how will the board and leadership steward it? If we expand our partnership, can the organization execute at a larger scale?

Those questions reveal why fundability is an organizational condition. The funder is not only evaluating what has happened in the past. The funder is considering whether the organization can responsibly carry the next promise.

This is also why the budget is more than a set of numbers. It should express strategy. Leadership is more than a biography. It should demonstrate capacity. Outcomes are more than annual-report statistics. They should show meaningful change. Governance is more than a board roster. It should show stewardship and accountability.

When these elements reinforce one another, the answer to 'What happens next?' becomes much easier to trust.

Coherence Is a Leadership Responsibility

In my work with leaders, I frequently return to the conductor metaphor. The conductor does not create the music by personally playing every instrument. The conductor creates the conditions in which many distinct contributors can produce one coherent result.

Fundability works the same way. The executive leader does not personally perform every task that creates funder confidence. The leader must ensure that the organization functions as an integrated system. Strategy, governance, finance, programs, communication, development, and measurement cannot operate as unrelated sections of the orchestra.

When those sections are disconnected, the funder hears the dissonance. The grant proposal says one thing while the budget suggests another. The executive director describes one priority while board members describe another. The website celebrates activity while the evaluation report cannot define outcomes. The strategic plan names priorities that never appear in meeting agendas or resource decisions.

Coherence is not cosmetic. It is evidence of leadership. The organization is easier to fund when the parts tell the same story because the parts are actually working from the same strategy.

Evidence Without Bureaucracy

Some nonprofit leaders hear the word evidence and imagine a large research department, expensive software, or complex reporting systems. That is not what I mean.

Fundability should be appropriate to the size and stage of the organization. A small nonprofit does not need to imitate the bureaucracy of a national institution. It does need to know what success looks like and collect enough information to demonstrate whether progress is happening.

The question is not, 'Do we have sophisticated data?' The question is, 'Do we have credible evidence for the claims we make?'

If the organization says students improve reading skills, what evidence supports that claim? If a ministry says families become more stable, how is stability defined and observed? If an arts organization says community engagement is increasing, what indicators support that statement? If a workforce program says participants become employable, what outcomes are tracked after training?

Evidence does not eliminate story. Stories make the impact human. Evidence makes the story credible. Strong fundability uses both.