

**STRATEGY PAPERS
COMMITTEE**

Joshua Einhorn, Ed.D.
Editor

Allison Greenwell, GPC
GPA Publications
Committee Chair

GPA Strategy Papers offer practical solutions to current and emerging issues facing grant professionals. The GPA Strategy Papers Committee accepts concept proposals on a quarterly basis and uses a double-blind peer review process.

Members and nonmembers may submit concept proposals and have electronic access to approved papers.

Articles in this publication represent the opinions and views of the author(s) only.

www.grantprofessionals.org

Professional Judgement Under Pressure: Ethical Grant Practice in Politically Volatile Funding Environments

Rikki Lee Pfeiffer-Carr, M.Ed.

Manager, Strategy, New Growth Group, LLC

GPC Competencies:

- 06. Nationally Recognized Standards of Ethical Practice by Grant Developers
- 02. Organizational Development as it Pertains to Grant Seeking

Abstract

Grant professionals are working in a moment shaped by political polarization, declining public trust, and funding instability. While nationally recognized ethical standards guide professional conduct, current conditions place additional pressure on grant writers to make complex professional judgments under shortened timelines and uncertain policy contexts.

Drawing on contemporary research in political polarization, nonprofit accountability, and crisis governance, this paper examines how political volatility functions as an ethical risk multiplier within grant development practice. Common tensions—such as overstating organizational readiness, adapting program narratives to shifting policy priorities, and selectively framing evaluation data—are explored through the lens of ethical decision-making and organizational capacity.

Ultimately, this paper argues that ethical judgment should not be treated as a reactive safeguard to changing political landscapes, but as a core element of organizational readiness. Embedding ethical deliberation into grant development processes strengthens institutional credibility, supports long-term sustainability, and reinforces public trust in nonprofit organizations seeking public and philanthropic funding.

Introduction

Historically, when a new US Federal administration enters office, policy priorities shift—sometimes subtly and sometimes dramatically—and funding priorities adjust to mirror those goals. In recent years, these shifts have felt particularly abrupt, with shortened grant timelines, revised program priorities, and uncertainty regarding the stability of federal funding streams. Federal funding instability further compounds uncertainty. The U.S.

**STRATEGY PAPERS
COMMITTEE**

Joshua Einhorn, Ed.D.
Editor

Allison Greenwell, GPC
GPA Publications
Committee Chair

GPA Strategy Papers offer practical solutions to current and emerging issues facing grant professionals. The GPA Strategy Papers Committee accepts concept proposals on a quarterly basis and uses a double-blind peer review process.

Members and nonmembers may submit concept proposals and have electronic access to approved papers.

Articles in this publication represent the opinions and views of the author(s) only.

www.grantprofessionals.org

Government Accountability Office continues to identify numerous federal programs as high-risk areas requiring sustained oversight and accountability (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2023). At the same time, international governance research emphasizes that institutional resilience and trust become especially important during periods of policy instability and administrative transition (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2021).

Under these conditions, ethical challenges rarely appear as obvious dilemmas. They do not arrive with a villain's cape unfurling in the breeze and a clear "go/no-go" decision. Instead, they appear in moments of pressure: submit now to meet the shortened runway and address readiness later; adjust language to mirror emerging priorities; emphasize the strongest metrics while quietly setting aside weaker ones.

None of these actions are illegal, and many may appear pragmatic, but the line between practical adaptation and ethical compromise can blur under pressure. This paper argues something simple but consequential: in politically volatile environments, ethical judgment becomes structural to institutional resilience.

Political Volatility as an Ethical Risk Multiplier

Grant professionals increasingly operate in a funding environment shaped by political polarization and declining public trust. Research from the Pew Research Center (2022) documents partisan hostility and unfavorable views of the opposing party in the United States, and the Edelman Trust Barometer (Edelman, 2024), an annual global research study conducted by Edelman that measures public trust in government, business, media, and nongovernmental organizations across dozens of countries, reports persistent skepticism toward government, nonprofit institutions, and leadership. Political volatility does not remain abstract - it affects funding continuity, public oversight, and reputational risk.

Political science research has documented the rise of affective polarization in the United States, where partisan identities increasingly shape perceptions of opposing political groups and institutions (Iyengar, Lelkes, Levendusky, Malhotra, & Westwood, 2019). Survey research from the Pew Research Center similarly finds widening ideological divides among Americans (Pew Research Center, 2022), while global surveys such as the Edelman Trust Barometer report persistent skepticism toward governments, nonprofit organizations, and institutional leadership (Edelman, 2024).

**STRATEGY PAPERS
COMMITTEE**

Joshua Einhorn, Ed.D.
Editor
Allison Greenwell, GPC
GPA Publications
Committee Chair

GPA Strategy Papers offer practical solutions to current and emerging issues facing grant professionals. The GPA Strategy Papers Committee accepts concept proposals on a quarterly basis and uses a double-blind peer review process.

Members and nonmembers may submit concept proposals and have electronic access to approved papers.

Articles in this publication represent the opinions and views of the author(s) only.

www.grantprofessionals.org

Political volatility does not remain abstract; instead, it shapes funding continuity, public oversight, and reputational risk for organizations seeking public or philanthropic funding.

Research on nonprofit accountability suggests that external funding environments generate heightened expectations for transparency, evaluation, and measurable outcomes (Benjamin, Ebrahim, & Gugerty, 2023; Ortega-Rodríguez C., Licerán-Gutiérrez, A., & Moreno-Albarracín, A. L. (2020). These dynamics function as ethical risk multipliers: scarcity intensifies competition, scrutiny heightens reputational stakes, and policy shifts create pressure to adapt organizational narratives, priorities, and program framing.

Governance research further emphasizes that resilience and institutional trust are central components of sustainable public and nonprofit systems (OECD, 2021). For grant professionals working at the intersection of funding, policy, and organizational capacity, ethical decision-making becomes essential to maintaining that resilience.

Ethical Decision-Making Under Political Pressure

How should practitioners respond when the grant environments themselves amplify ethical risk?

Public administration scholarship emphasizes that, during periods of crisis and instability, leadership requires careful attention to legitimacy, transparency, and long-term public trust (Boin, 't Hart, Stern, & Sundelius, 2016). Ethical competence in this context is not simply reactive compliance. Instead, it involves structured deliberation, clear documentation of decision rationales, and attention to long-term institutional credibility rather than short-term competitive advantage.

Behavioral ethics research also suggests that uncertainty can subtly shape moral judgment. Under conditions of pressure or ambiguity, individuals may shift attention away from ethical considerations toward instrumental goals such as performance or organizational survival—a phenomenon sometimes described as ethical fading (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004).

When timelines shorten, outcomes are uncertain, and stakes are high, professionals may rationalize decisions that would otherwise invite closer scrutiny. It is not that grant writers lack integrity - far from it; rather, volatile environments can change how decisions are framed and evaluated. In this context, ethical frameworks serve as cognitive scaffolding. They slow decision processes enough to ask critical questions: Are we being accurate? Are we aligned with organizational capacity? Are we

**STRATEGY PAPERS
COMMITTEE**

Joshua Einhorn, Ed.D.
Editor
Allison Greenwell, GPC
GPA Publications
Committee Chair

GPA Strategy Papers offer practical solutions to current and emerging issues facing grant professionals. The GPA Strategy Papers Committee accepts concept proposals on a quarterly basis and uses a double-blind peer review process.

Members and nonmembers may submit concept proposals and have electronic access to approved papers.

Articles in this publication represent the opinions and views of the author(s) only.

www.grantprofessionals.org

communicating honestly? Structured ethical reasoning then functions as a safeguard against reactive decision-making.

Ethical Tensions in Practice**Readiness Inflation**

In competitive environments shaped by funding instability, organizations may consider pursuing high-profile opportunities despite incomplete infrastructure or staffing capacity. Most grant professionals have encountered this moment: a promising opportunity appears, but readiness remains uncertain.

Reduced timelines and fewer funding opportunities can intensify the temptation to “sand the corners” so that square organizational realities fit into round funding priorities.

Nonprofit accountability research demonstrates that institutional pressures, evaluation demands, and transparency expectations shape how organizations communicate their capacity and performance, with implications for stakeholder confidence and organizational credibility (Benjamin et al., 2023; Ortega-Rodríguez et al., 2020). Ethical readiness requires honest assessment of organizational capacity and development needs.

Mission Drift in Polarized Contexts

Political priorities shift—that is a normal feature of democratic governance. Strategic adaptation is not inherently unethical; it is often necessary for organizational survival.

However, in polarized environments, rapid policy changes may incentivize organizations to reframe programs to align with evolving political narratives. Accountability research shows that external funding pressures can shape nonprofit strategic behavior and program framing (Benjamin et al., 2023).

Transparent internal deliberation and cross-functional review therefore become ethical tools rather than bureaucratic obstacles.

Data Framing Under Scrutiny

There is a quieter tension. Heightened oversight increases pressure to demonstrate impact clearly and persuasively. Yet persuasive communication and selective representation are not the same.

**STRATEGY PAPERS
COMMITTEE**

Joshua Einhorn, Ed.D.
Editor
Allison Greenwell, GPC
GPA Publications
Committee Chair

GPA Strategy Papers offer practical solutions to current and emerging issues facing grant professionals. The GPA Strategy Papers Committee accepts concept proposals on a quarterly basis and uses a double-blind peer review process.

Members and nonmembers may submit concept proposals and have electronic access to approved papers.

Articles in this publication represent the opinions and views of the author(s) only.

www.grantprofessionals.org

Leadership research on crisis governance emphasizes that transparency and truthfulness are essential to sustaining institutional legitimacy (Boin et al., 2016). When oversight is heightened, even small distortions in data framing can carry amplified consequences.

Integrating Ethics into Grant Readiness and Organizational Development

We think of grant readiness as technical: policies, budgets, registrations, and compliance checklists. Shouldn't readiness also include ethical infrastructure?

Governance research emphasizes that proactive risk management and transparency strengthen institutional stability and public trust (OECD, 2021). From this perspective, ethical deliberation is not separate from organizational development—it is part of it.

Embedding ethical review into grant readiness processes through structured deliberation, documentation, and cross-functional discussion strengthens both accountability and organizational capacity.

Recommendations: Slowing it Down to Get it right

When the funding environment is mercurial and intensely pressurized, speed is a Siren Song that is difficult to resist. However, taking the time now to conceptualize and build procedures to integrate ethical reasoning into grant readiness and organizational risk management processes will ease the burden when funding opportunities arise. Specific recommendations are listed below:

1. Standardize deliberately structured ethical reviews before politically sensitive submissions - create an internal scoring rubric
2. Instigate cross-functional conversations about capacity and reputational risks
3. Engage leadership and partners in proactive ethical deliberation and document rationale for alignment shifts
4. Monitor funding stability and legislative developments to anticipate ethical risk

Conclusion: Ethics as Infrastructure

When polarization increases, trust declines, and funding continuity wavers, grant professionals find themselves at the crossroads of public dollars and public narratives - and that intersection is not neutral.



STRATEGY PAPERS COMMITTEE

Joshua Einhorn, Ed.D.
Editor

Allison Greenwell, GPC
GPA Publications
Committee Chair

GPA Strategy Papers offer practical solutions to current and emerging issues facing grant professionals. The GPA Strategy Papers Committee accepts concept proposals on a quarterly basis and uses a double-blind peer review process.

Members and nonmembers may submit concept proposals and have electronic access to approved papers.

Articles in this publication represent the opinions and views of the author(s) only.

www.grantprofessionals.org

Research across political science, nonprofit governance, and public administration suggests that political polarization, accountability pressures, crisis leadership demands, and governance resilience converge in moments of institutional instability. Within these contexts, grant professionals must navigate complex decisions about organizational readiness, mission alignment, and the responsible presentation of program outcomes.

Political volatility does not create new ethical principles. Instead, it tests whether existing systems support ethical judgment when pressure rises.

Embedding standardized, structural ethical judgement into grant readiness and organizational development processes strengthens resilience and enables long-term legitimacy which is crucial to sustaining trust. Trust is one of an organization's most valuable assets—and one of the most difficult to rebuild once it has been compromised. By embedding ethical practices, transparency, and accountability into organizational systems, institutions strengthen their legitimacy with funders, partners, and the communities they serve. Sustaining this trust positions organizations to navigate changing political and funding environments while remaining competitive for future funding opportunities and advancing their mission over the long term.

References

- Benjamin, L. M., Ebrahim, A., & Gugerty, M. K. (2023). Nonprofit organizations and the evaluation of social impact: A research program to advance theory and practice. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 52(1_suppl), 313S–352S. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08997640221123590>
- Boin, A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2016). *The politics of crisis management: Public leadership under pressure* (2nd ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316339756>
- Edelman. (2024). *2024 Edelman Trust Barometer*. <https://www.edelman.com/trust/2024/trust-barometer>
- Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., & Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-073034>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Government at a Glance 2021*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1c258f55-en>



STRATEGY PAPERS COMMITTEE

Joshua Einhorn, Ed.D.
Editor
Allison Greenwell, GPC
GPA Publications
Committee Chair

GPA Strategy Papers offer practical solutions to current and emerging issues facing grant professionals. The GPA Strategy Papers Committee accepts concept proposals on a quarterly basis and uses a double-blind peer review process.

Members and nonmembers may submit concept proposals and have electronic access to approved papers.

Articles in this publication represent the opinions and views of the author(s) only.

www.grantprofessionals.org

Ortega-Rodríguez C., Licerán-Gutiérrez, A., & Moreno-Albarracín, A. L. (2020). Transparency as a key element in accountability in nonprofit organizations: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, 12(14), 5834. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145834>

Pew Research Center. (2022, August 9). *As Partisan Hostility Grows, Signs of Frustration With the Two-Party System*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2022/08/09/as-partisan-hostility-grows-signs-of-frustration-with-the-two-party-system/>

Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Messick, D. M. (2004). Ethical fading: The role of self-deception in unethical behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 17(2), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SORE.0000027411.35832.53>
U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2023). High-risk series. <https://www.gao.gov/high-risk-list>

Author Biography

Rikki Lee Pfeiffer-Carr is Manager, Strategic Initiatives; New Growth Group, LLC. She can be contacted at rcarr@newgrowthgroup.com.