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The face of philanthropy is changing. Throughout history, the word “philanthropy” has been used almost exclusively to describe the generous giving of large sums of money—typically by millionaires and billionaires. It’s no surprise, then, that philanthropy came to be perceived as the elite turf of the wealthy. Sure, “everyday” people might read about philanthropy in the headlines. They might even benefit from its generosity in direct or indirect ways. But they weren’t the subject of the sentence. They weren’t perceived as the doers of philanthropy.

Well, that was the old philanthropy. In recent years, the definition of philanthropy has begun to widen to include a larger swath of human generosity. Under this budding definition, “philanthropy” encompasses any-size contributions not just from the wealthy, but from people of every income bracket. It includes donations not just of money but of time and know-how. And its practitioners aren’t just the elite and the white. They are nurses, plumbers, hairdressers, and civil servants. They are African American, Latino, Native American, Arab American, and Asian American. And rather than practice their philanthropy in isolation, these everyday philanthropists are pooling their money—in increasingly organized ways—for greater impact.

This groundbreaking movement to activate and organize giving within and on behalf of America’s communities of color—known as identity-based philanthropy—is the subject of this report. In the early 1990s, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation became one of the first major foundations to study and support this emerging field. Since then, we have become the largest single funder of identity-based funds in the country. Much of that funding has been organized through one key program—Cultures of Giving—the strategies and lessons of which are described in the pages that follow.

Our founder, Will Keith Kellogg, believed that people have the inherent capacity to help themselves. Cultures of Giving is an extension of that belief. But our work is not done. Identity-based philanthropy is still a seedling within the larger field of philanthropy. Yet everything we’ve seen and experienced tells us that supporting this emerging area of philanthropy is essential for any foundation, funder, or donor who wants to drive social change.

This report shares our journey so that others might learn from both our successes and our mistakes. It also challenges fellow funders to consider new ways to collaborate with and advance the impact of identity-based philanthropy: by providing seed support and other forms of assistance; by embracing identity-based funds as critical partners in the sector and forging stronger connections with philanthropic leaders and other change agents within communities of color; by diversifying the leadership of mainstream philanthropy to reflect our nation’s changing demographics; and by shifting our practices to reflect what communities of color are teaching us about the future of giving and how we can positively impact our country’s most vulnerable children and families.

We also hope that this report inspires everyday givers—of all backgrounds, genders, races, and ethnicities—to embrace their power as philanthropists.

Warm regards,

Sterling K. Speirn
President and CEO
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Alandra Washington
Deputy Director
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

TO FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THE W.K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION OR THE CULTURES OF GIVING PROGRAM, PLEASE VISIT WWW.WKKF.ORG.
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If you happened to be strolling the halls of the Hilton Riverside in Wilmington, NC, in early May 2011—specifically the hallway outside the Camellia-Azalea ballrooms—you might have felt a little puzzled. A sign in the lobby said there was a conference taking place here, organized by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and titled “Every Gift Counts: Celebrating Our Cultures of Giving.” But this did not look like your typical conference. And it certainly didn’t resemble the somber healthcare supply chain management meeting kicking off in another hotel ballroom upstairs.

For starters, this hallway vibrated with music. A local Native American flutist serenaded the gathering conference-goers with traditional tribal songs; later, an immigrant from the Ivory Coast would beat out mesmerizing rhythms on his jembe drum. The hall also burst with color. Multi-hued exhibits and TV screens glimmered along both walls, each sharing a story of groundbreaking work done or inspired by this group—as individuals, as organizations, and as a collective—over the last several years.

Most striking of all, the 147 people walking this hall were exceptionally diverse. They hailed from 23 states plus Washington, DC. They held wide-ranging positions in the world of philanthropy—from volunteer, program officer, and consultant to founder, executive director, and board member. The majority were African American, Latino, and Native American, many were Asian American and Arab American, and only a handful identified as white. Most were women.

Upstairs, the healthcare supply chain managers were quietly shaking hands and murmuring in low conference-toned voices. But down here, people

---

**Grantee**

The **AMERICAN INDIA FOUNDATION**, based in New York, is the largest diaspora philanthropy organization focused on India and based out of the United States. AIF is devoted to catalyzing social and economic change in India. Since inception, AIF has benefited more than 1.5 million people, implementing programs through more than 115 Indian NGOs.

www.aif.org
buzzed with fellowship and excitement. For every handshake, there were at least five bear-hugs. “I didn’t know you’d be here, sweetheart!” one woman shouted to another, her eyes bright with joy. “Get over here and tell me how you’ve been!” As people moved from hallway to ballroom, the volume lifted even higher. There were more hugs and more reunions. Some flew into networking mode, listening to a proposed project, offering examples and pointers from their own, and helping one another across race, ethnicity, tribe, age, and gender lines. Business cards flashed from hand to hand.

“This group hasn’t met in three years, but it feels like only a month,” said Mac Legerton, executive director of the North Carolina-based Center for Community Action and a member of the conference’s organizing committee, raising his voice above the din. “We’ve just picked up where we left off. But then we’re talking about people who have come to know one another and share a common practice.”

That common practice is identity-based philanthropy—a growing movement to democratize philanthropy from the grassroots up by activating and organizing its practice in marginalized communities, particularly communities of color. And they’d come to know one another because for years they have gathered together as part of the Cultures of Giving network, a vibrant community of identity-based philanthropy’s leading practitioners catalyzed by the work described in this report. Now they were together again to further fortify this network—and to plan their collective next steps for turning their movement into a full-on revolution.

“The people in this room represent the future of philanthropy,” Alandra Washington, deputy director for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the convener of this conference, would later say. But for now she stood at the front of the ballroom, beaming. She leaned into the microphone. “I am so happy to be back among the amazing leaders in this room!” boomed Washington. One hundred forty-seven people answered with claps, whistles, and a few “amens.” And soon after that, they got down to business.

**A FIELD THAT IS GAINING MOMENTUM**

For many people, the word “philanthropy” probably triggers images of billionaire moguls gripping huge cardboard checks, front-page news stories heralding eight-figure donations, or people in suits slicing giant ribbons with giant scissors to dedicate schools or stadiums now bearing their names. The individuals in these images are usually very rich, and most of them are white. While their philanthropy is vital, it is not the only kind.

What if instead the word “philanthropy” also conjured images of Hmong women in Minnesota meeting to discuss where to direct their giving circle’s next grant? Or recent Arab American immigrants in New York City learning how to navigate thorny legal documents through a program funded and supported by hundreds of Arab Americans giving modest donations? Or
IDENTITY-BASED PHILANTHROPY is a growing movement to democratize philanthropy from the grassroots up by activating and organizing its practice in marginalized communities, particularly communities of color. Simply described, identity-based philanthropy is the practice of raising and leveraging resources by and from a community on its own behalf, where “community” is defined not by geography but by race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation.

While we believe strongly in the philanthropic work being done by all identity-based communities, the primary focus of Cultures of Giving was the sizeable subset of identity-based philanthropy conducted in communities that define themselves by race, ethnicity, or tribe only—also known as COMMUNITIES OF COLOR. In the United States, identity-based philanthropy is active in but not limited to the African American, Latino, Asian American, Arab American, and Native American communities.

Just as identity-based philanthropy serves many groups, it also gets organized and formalized through many different giving vehicles, some of which vary by community. Currently, identity-based funds—which themselves take many forms—are the primary vehicle through which this philanthropy gets expressed. IDENTITY-BASED FUNDS work by pooling together solicited donations and contributions from community donors and then redistributing those funds (through grants) to individuals or organizations doing work in that community to promote social change. Because these funds are organized and run by community members, they aggregate and generate not just dollars but donor knowledge, enthusiasm, expertise, activism, and pride.

We should also note that one of this field’s greatest challenges is its ever-shifting lingo. Cultural philanthropy, community philanthropy, and social change philanthropy on the one hand, and diversity funds, community change funds, social change funds, and population-focused funds on the other, are just a few of the terms elbowing for dominance. These terms all carry subtle nuances that differentiate them in certain contexts, and some are more accepted than others. For clarity, we use only the bolded terms in this report.

Native Americans in Arizona pooling their time, money, and know-how to help preserve traditional tribal languages?

These are the kinds of philanthropy that the 147 leaders who gathered in Wilmington, NC—and thousands beyond them—are galvanizing across the United States. Individually and collectively, they are innovating and incubating new methods and approaches to engaging everyday people in the practice of organized philanthropy—and, in so doing, expanding the capacity of whole communities to develop the resources, access, and support they need. Historically, communities of color have been underrepresented in mainstream giving institutions and underserved by their philanthropic dollars. Identity-based philanthropy arose to address that gap by empowering communities to tap into their own rich traditions of giving and harness that generosity as collective, community philanthropy. Through this work, communities of color are breaking new ground—and changing the face of philanthropy in the process.

**Grantee**

The ARAB COMMUNITY CENTER FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SERVICES, based in Dearborn, MI, is a nonprofit agency committed to advocating for and empowering the Arab American community and beyond. In 2006, it launched the Center for Arab American Philanthropy, the only philanthropic service provider of its kind in the country.

www.accesscommunity.org
And their efforts are gaining momentum. Identity-based funds—the primary but not only vehicle through which this philanthropy gets expressed—now raise and distribute nearly $400 million each year, which is roughly equivalent to what a foundation with $8 billion in assets would grant out annually. Much of that $400 million is coming from donors of color—many of them new to formal philanthropy—whose generosity and desire to help elevate their communities are being tapped in increasingly organized and successful ways.

We believe that understanding and supporting this emerging area of philanthropy is becoming increasingly essential for any foundation, funder, or donor who wants to effect social change in the future. Arguably, this is truer now than it has ever been. Because while the needs served by identity-based philanthropy have always been present and always been great, several strong trends are converging to make this a critical moment for the field to rise in visibility and importance—and gain the support it needs to grow to full potential.
Communities of color are growing in size. Most ethnic and racial groups are growing faster than the overall American population. From 2000 to 2010, the total U.S. population increased 9.7 percent. During that same decade, the African American population increased 12.3 percent; the Asian American population, 39.4 percent; the Native American population, 18.4 percent; the Arab American population, at least 38 percent; and the Latino population, an incredible 43 percent. Meanwhile, the number of Americans identifying their race as “white alone” grew at just 1 percent. This diversification will accelerate in the coming decades. Currently 16.3 percent of the U.S. population is Latino; it will be 30 percent by 2050. Also by that time, just 47 percent of the U.S. population will identify as white (versus 67 percent in 2005).

Communities of color are growing in assets. In many communities of color, average income still hovers below the overall American average—but that gap is closing. While there is still staggering poverty on Native American reservations, per capita income is climbing three times more rapidly for Native Americans than for Americans more broadly. Over the last two decades, the number of Latino households earning more than $100,000 a year has risen more than 126 percent. Meanwhile, median income for Asian American families trumps the national average, increasing more than 10 percent between 2000 and 2009. Average Arab American income is 25 percent higher than the national average, giving this group a buying power of more than $100 billion.

Communities of color are giving at increasing rates and levels. Almost across the board, communities of color are intensifying their charitable giving. Sixty-three percent of Latino households now make charitable donations. Nearly two-thirds of African American households donate to organizations and causes, to the tune of $11 billion each year. Indeed, aggregate charitable giving by African Americans is increasing at a faster rate than either their aggregate income or aggregate wealth. On average, Asian American households give away a larger percentage of their income per year than whites. So do African Americans—25 percent more. And this doesn’t even account for the ample contributions of time and know-how being poured back into communities of color, which can’t be monetized but are often more valuable than dollars.

There has been a slow increase of Native people in mainstream philanthropy, but a big jump in Native people engaged in their own philanthropy, including tribal foundations and charitable giving programs.”

Joy Persall
FORMER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
NATIVE AMERICANS IN PHILANTHROPY

Grantee
The ASIAN AMERICAN FEDERATION OF NEW YORK is a membership organization dedicated to advancing the civic voice and well-being of Asian Americans by collaboratively fostering philanthropy in the community, undertaking research to inform policies, and providing support to community service organizations, including its member base of more than 40 organizations.

www.aafny.org
Across communities, the need for such giving is also rising. Historically, communities of color have received a very small percentage of mainstream philanthropic dollars despite an often disproportionate need. For example, Native Americans have the highest poverty rates in the United States (25.7 percent) yet receive just 0.2 percent to 0.3 percent of available philanthropic funds. The statistics are similarly low for other communities of color. Meanwhile, the global economic crisis continues to put a profound strain on public funding, precipitating deep cuts to essential social programs just when their services are most required—thereby further increasing the need and the call for private dollars to help fill in the gaps. In response, community donors are directing their contributions inward, building their advocacy skills to draw services to their communities and partnering with local government, business, and others to address critical needs.

Together, these trends are propelling the field of identity-based philanthropy forward, enabling and empowering people of color to take a stronger leading role in addressing both urgent issues and long-term social change in their communities. In other words, as identity-based philanthropy expands, it is also amplifying minority voices, increasing their ability to close widening gaps of power and resources through the strength of their own collective efforts.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

Since 1996, acting both alone and in partnership with other major foundations—including the Ford Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, The California Endowment, and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation—we have been exploring ways to help support and grow philanthropy by and for communities of color throughout the United States. What started as a single experiment quickly snowballed into a massive 15-year initiative that now stands as one of the most ambitious in our history.

As you’ll read in this report, there were roughly two phases to our journey. The first phase, launched in 1996, featured exploratory efforts designed to increase our understanding of the emerging field of identity-based philanthropy and how best to approach funding it. The second phase, launched in 2005, was a pilot grantmaking and field-building strategy known as Cultures of Giving. The centerpiece of that program was our effort to seed and grow a community of practice among leaders in the field—the very same community that reassembled with such energy in May 2011.

To be clear, our work in this field is not over. But after 15 years and multiple phases of effort we wanted to pause to reflect on all that we, our partners, and our grantees have learned throughout the journey thus far—and how it might shape our support of identity-based philanthropy moving forward. As you might imagine, the number of details, stories, examples, and insights...
WHY THIS WORK, WHY US, AND WHY NOW?

OUR BOARD OF TRUSTEES. Pictured from left to right: Hanmin Liu, San Francisco, CA; Ramón Murguía, Kansas City, KS; Roderick D. Gillum, Detroit, MI; Dorothy A. Johnson, Grand Haven, MI; Fred P. Keller, Grand Rapids, MI; Richard M. Tsoumas, Battle Creek, MI; Wenda Weekes Moore, Minneapolis, MN; Bobby D. Moser, Columbus, OH; Sterling K. Speirn, Augusta, MI; Joseph M. Stewart, Battle Creek, MI; Cynthia H. Milligan, Lincoln, NE

In 1996, when we launched our first targeted initiative to nurture and promote identity-based philanthropy, we knew we were entering largely uncharted territory. Yet we felt deeply called to this new terrain. Supporting vulnerable communities sits at the core of our mission—and the rich philanthropic efforts we saw blossoming within communities of color needed our support. Likewise, racial equity has been a guiding principle of our foundation since its founding. “W.K. Kellogg was the son of abolitionists and had a deep family understanding of social equity for people of color,” says trustee Fred Keller. “This work is part of our DNA.”

And in a very literal way, communities of color are our communities. “The seeds of Cultures of Giving were really planted 20 years ago when our board started to diversify,” says trustee Joseph Stewart. “We deliberately brought in different people with different lenses and views of the world in order to become a more diverse reflection of the communities we serve.”

Today, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s board is one of the most ethnically and racially diverse in the country.

Indeed, many of our trustees had firsthand experience in grassroots, identity-based philanthropy even before our major work in this field started. Dottie Johnson, for example, was a donor to the Michigan Women’s Foundation and helped a Native American group form its own identity-based foundation. Wenda Weekes Moore has served on the boards of the Association of Black Foundation Executives, Hispanics in Philanthropy, and the Women’s Funding Network, and Joseph Stewart founded several donor advised funds focused on helping minority and under-resourced populations through community foundations.

Ramón Murguía is chair of the Greater Kansas City Hispanic Development Fund, one of the first identity-based organizations we supported through our early exploratory initiatives.

Our personal connections to this work have created foundation-wide awareness of both the breakthroughs and challenges of identity-based organizations—and a determination to help them do their jobs well and at scale. “Mainstream philanthropy hasn’t respected the ability of these communities to help themselves, yet the work is so good and there are incredible stories to tell,” says Weekes Moore. “If you are concerned about vulnerable populations, supporting philanthropy in communities of color is critical. The more we can strengthen it, the better off we all are.”

“Cultures of Giving aligned four things we care about deeply: people; community and community building; the giving of time, talent, and treasure; and the practical application of knowledge,” says Johnson. “We believed it was critical for us to do this work. Not just to say it but to do it—and to produce useful materials from it so that other organizations and communities could enhance their work as well.”

Ultimately, we hope that the stories and lessons shared in this report illuminate for everyone—from individual donors who have yet to give to mainstream funders who are considering supporting this work—the deep anchors of giving that exist in communities of color and the incredible work being done to organize that giving to even greater effect. “We want Cultures of Giving to shine a spotlight in this country on what the words philanthropy and donor really mean—that it is not just the Gates, Kelloggs, and Rockefellers of the world,” says Stewart. “We want to make sure not just that there’s a level playing field in organized philanthropy for communities and groups who have been traditionally excluded—but that they have a chance to get on the field to play in the first place.”

“Cultures of Giving makes a statement about the direction we need to move as a foundation, as a field, and as a nation,” adds Keller. “This work is essential if we are ever going to demonstrate as a country our full ambition for what it means to celebrate diversity.”

Grantee

Founded in 1990, ASIAN AMERICANS/PACIFIC ISLANDERS IN PHILANTHROPY is a national membership and philanthropic advocacy organization dedicated to advancing philanthropy and AAPI communities. AAPIP supports and facilitates giving by and to AAPI communities—and incubates new approaches to social justice philanthropy—through 10 regional chapters.

www.aapip.org
that could be included in this report is mindboggling. Rather than be exhaustive or overwhelming with detail and process, we have organized it around one simple goal: to share the story of what we did and why we believe it matters.

Four chapters follow this introduction.

**Chapter 1** starts at the beginning, briefly revisiting our initial efforts to discover more about the field of identity-based philanthropy as it gets practiced in communities of color and what those explorations taught us. We then take a closer look at the field’s main characteristics, revealing data and findings from the first-ever inventory of identity-based funds in the United States, created by Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors with our funding support.

In 2005, based on what we had learned, we launched a series of efforts that became known collectively as the Cultures of Giving program. **Chapter 2** looks at each of the four funding strategies of this program in turn, explaining along the way why and how we shifted our strategic focus in response to what we were seeing and learning from the organizations and people we funded. In the spirit of transparency, we share not just what worked but what didn’t—and why.

**Chapter 3** shares high-level outcomes from the formal evaluation of Cultures of Giving, including many of our grantees’ key achievements. We also highlight some of the biggest challenges they encountered along the way and several field-level lessons that could prove critical to both large foundations and small nonprofits thinking about entering this field.

In **Chapter 4**, we consider the implications of this work for the field and for the future of philanthropy at large. We also explain how Cultures of Giving has helped inform our new foundation-wide strategic framework, and what that means for our support of identity-based philanthropy moving forward.

The many individuals who contributed to the efforts described in this report are listed, with great appreciation, in the **Thanks and Acknowledgments** section.

Finally, because it is our grantees that stand at the center of this work, we have made a point to include their voices and stories throughout. Over the years, stories have become the lingua franca of the Cultures of Giving network, the primary vehicle through which its members teach, learn, connect, and inspire. Our hope is that each section of this report, and each story, will inspire you, your organizations, and your communities to jump in and join up with this exciting area of philanthropy.
Grantee

The New York-based ASSOCIATION OF BLACK FOUNDATION EXECUTIVES holds the distinction of being the first Council on Foundations affinity group. Established in 1971, ABFE has grown into an independent membership organization comprising influential staff, trustees, and donors of grantmaking institutions promoting effective and responsive philanthropy in black communities.

www.abfe.org

Grantee

Through its More in the Middle Initiative and health disparities work, Baltimore-based ASSOCIATED BLACK CHARITIES OF MARYLAND is addressing critical issues affecting African Americans and the broader community by convening key stakeholders, advocating for new research and public policy change, and providing grants to programs and organizations with similar goals.

www.abc-md.org

Grantee

ASIAN IMMIGRANT WOMEN ADVOCATES, based in Oakland, CA, was founded in 1983 in recognition of the needs of low-income Asian immigrant women. Its mission is to empower low-income, limited-English-speaking Asian immigrant women workers to stimulate positive changes in their workplaces, communities, and broader society.

www.aiwa.org
Our journey to support identity-based philanthropy began in the early 1990s. At the time, we were fielding a growing number of grant requests from what were then called “cultural funds”—that is, funds representing racial, ethnic, and tribal communities. So were other foundations. In 1996, intrigued by the potential of these funds to both effect change in communities of color and bring unique resources to the philanthropic table, the Kellogg, Ford, and Packard foundations launched the Emerging Funds for Communities of Color (EFCC) initiative—the first major effort within mainstream philanthropy to acknowledge and support these funds as a field. “We made an institutional commitment to promote philanthropy in communities of color,” says Tom Reis, our former director of mission-driven investments and an early architect of this work. “It was an experimental role.”

But in order to promote it, we first had to understand it: just how big was the field of identity-based philanthropy—and how prevalent the identity-based funds that occupied its center? Who were the main players and what were the most pressing challenges? What were funds’ primary giving priorities, and how did they vary by community? To answer these questions, our three foundations launched an intensive round of research, including literature reviews, analysis of years of grant activity, and interviews with key leaders in communities of color. To push our learning still further, our foundation on its own commissioned a focus group of fund-development professionals as well as case studies of community and private foundations. We also funded a series of “learning grants” for identity-based organizations in order to get a more hands-on feel for how the field operates.

**Grantee**

The **BOSTON WOMEN’S FUND** supports community-based organizations run by women and girls in the Greater Boston Area. The Fund works with low-income women; women of color; women with disabilities; the LGBTQ community; immigrant women; and elder women and girls who are working to create a society based on racial, economic, and social justice.

[www.bostonwomensfund.org](http://www.bostonwomensfund.org)
Generosity comes in many forms, not all of them financial. We define philanthropy in the broadest sense: the giving of any-size donations of money, time, or know-how to help advance the common good. This wide definition shines light on the vibrant spectrum of giving alive in communities of color. Identifying and harnessing that full spectrum is what identity-based philanthropy is all about.

**MONEY:** All financial gifts count as philanthropy—regardless of their size. When a single mom making $20,000 a year and supporting three children gives $25 to an identity-based fund, it matters. And because these funds group donations into larger pools, the impact of all contributions, big or small, gets amplified.

**TIME:** Gifts of time are more than donated hours. They are gifts of presence, enthusiasm, and fellowship. Because time gifts are hands-on, they enable donors to make a personalized impact on the causes or organizations they support.

**KNOW-HOW:** A lawyer helping new immigrants understand legal papers, a communications expert volunteering to write a press release, a plumber fixing a leak in a community building for free: when people donate their skill and expertise, they help fill gaps in an organization’s capacity and boost its effectiveness.

Money, time, and know-how are also intrinsically related, with donations of one type often paired with or leading to donations of another. The more that donors feel their giving makes a difference, the more their gifts of all three tend to rise. And it’s that deeper level of involvement that identity-based funds are looking for.

“I find it critical to group money, time, and know-how together,” says Wenda Weekes Moore, trustee of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. “When communities of color give money, they are often also on the board or volunteer. They want to be at the table—and they bring their energy and their networks with them. As a result, the organization benefits as much from the giver as from the gift.”

Our foundation invested nearly $1 million in these early explorations—a commitment that yielded invaluable insights into philanthropic activities within communities of color and helped us set and sharpen our strategy for the major initiatives that followed. Two fascinating insights from that work stand out.

First, **philanthropy is being expressed in communities of color in a multitude of ways that are not always recognized, counted, or valued as philanthropy—but identity-based funds are starting to boost that visibility.** Communities of color have always organized to take care of their own, and in that respect identity-based philanthropy is neither a new field nor a new practice. Yet the many kinds of informal help and support that have long flourished in these communities—from assisting a neighbor to raising a family member’s child to providing private financial assistance—elude conventional methods of tracking philanthropic activity. Nor are they often acknowledged as philanthropy by the communities themselves. “Communities of color are overflowing with practices of philanthropy and giving, and have been for a long time,” says Alandra Washington, deputy director for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. “But very few people in communities of color define their traditions of giving as ‘philanthropy.’” Or as Ivye Allen, president of the Foundation for the Mid South, puts it: “Our grandmothers were doing philanthropy long ago. They just never called it that.”
MISSION

Founded in 1990, AAPIP is a national organization dedicated to advancing philanthropy in Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) communities. With 10 regional chapters across the United States, its members include foundations as well as staff and trustees of grantmaking institutions and nonprofits. AAPIP engages AAPI communities and philanthropy to address unmet needs; serves as a resource for and about AAPI communities; supports and facilitates giving by and to AAPI communities; and incubates new ideas and approaches for social justice philanthropy.

ADVOCACY | AAPIP produces reports, workshops, and trainings designed to highlight important and underreported trends and issues in AAPI immigrant and refugee communities. As it stands, AAPIP is the only national source of information on AAPI communities for the field of organized philanthropy. The organization uses its original research as a vehicle not just to inform the philanthropic field but as a call to action for donors and AAPI community-based organizations to join forces and address pressing issues. “Our reports are creating new knowledge about AAPI communities, their demographics, and their challenges,” says Peggy Saika, executive director of AAPIP. “Individuals and organizations can then turn that knowledge into a force for community action.”

GIVING CIRCLES | Giving circles are AAPIP’s primary vehicle for engaging diverse groups of AAPI donors and encouraging them to help address the disparity of institutional giving to AAPI organizations. Since 2005, AAPIP has helped establish 11 giving circles in nine cities, collectively involving more than 600 donors and $600,000 in pooled funds. The circles are as diverse as the AAPI community itself: there is a Hmong women’s giving circle in Minnesota; a multi-ethnic AAPI giving circle in Boston; and an Asian American club within the Oregon State Penitentiary that raised and donated money to build a school in Vietnam. “Giving circles are probably
CULTURES OF GIVING INVOLVEMENT

AAPIP received one Cultures of Giving grant:

- A two-year Expanding the Boundaries grant (2005) to build its giving circle model and increase the organization's capacity to effect social change for AAPI communities

AAPIP used its Cultures of Giving grant to tackle an ambitious list of goals. In addition to shoring up its own infrastructure with an eye toward long-term sustainability, AAPIP also aimed to increase, stimulate, and facilitate giving by AAPI individuals; incubate new models of community philanthropy of mutual benefit to both donors and AAPI community-based organizations; and educate the field of organized philanthropy about less visible but significant forms of philanthropy within AAPI communities.

During the two-year grant period, AAPIP completed its business plan; convened the first national meeting of all AAPIP chapters; launched a National Donor Circle of high-net-worth individuals to match local giving circle funds; strengthened its ability to serve as a connector to link organized philanthropy with community-based organizations; and developed a comprehensive bibliography on AAPI philanthropy documenting the history and patterns of AAPI giving, both informal and institutional. As part of its ongoing research on the needs and issues of AAPI communities, AAPIP released a report in June 2007 that examined giving to AAPI communities by the country’s 20 largest foundations.

But perhaps AAPIP’s greatest accomplishment was incubating and supporting the first ever giving circles among AAPI communities. During the grant period, AAPIP established giving circles in each of its chapters. As AAPIP quickly learned, the giving circle model is particularly well suited to AAPI communities because it builds upon their tradition of informal giving related to close family and social circles, as well as their strong sense of community and responsibility. Establishing a giving circle model for AAPI communities has created a new channel through which that generosity can be expressed. “Things have never been done in the Asian community the way we’re doing them at AAPI,” says Sandy Kajiyama. “We’re building a new way of giving from the ground up.”

FIRST MUSLIM CIRCLE | “Building these models in an Asian organization doesn’t mean we’re building them only for this community,” says Kajiyama. AAPIP recently incubated and launched a Muslim Women Giving Circle, which seeks to facilitate, stimulate, and increase giving by and for Muslim women in the San Francisco Bay Area. “Supporting the Muslim giving circle created an opportunity for a perceived ethnic organization to work out of its perceived ethnic self-interests,” says Saika. “At some point, organizations like ours should be looking at the broader community needs, and that’s what we think will happen. We want to work with other ethnic funds and groups engaged in philanthropic advocacy work.”

DIY CIRCLES | While AAPIP originally planned to develop a standardized template for its giving circles, it quickly learned to be flexibility based on each giving circle’s needs and goals. Each of its 10 regional chapters receive $5,000 each year to support their meet-the-grantmaker activities and professional development programs. “We create learning and sharing environments that help them create their own networks of individual donors and help people identify why they want to give, where they want to give, and how best to make an impact,” says Sandy Kajiyama, AAPIP’s director of program systems.

SOURCES: Kellogg Foundation interviews with Peggy Saika and Sandy Kajiyama; Cultures of Giving grant applications and final reports; the AAPIP website.
This now seems to be changing—thanks in large part to the rise of identity-based funds and other philanthropic vehicles that are capturing this abundant generosity in more structured and visible ways. “Identity-based funds are a new evolution of what has always been community-based giving,” says Katherine Fulton, president of Monitor Institute and a leading thinker on the future of philanthropy. And because they are designed to aggregate individual gifts—of time, know-how, or money, big or small—into larger pools of giving, identity-based funds are doing something particularly noteworthy: they are making it possible to count as philanthropy every kind of giver and every kind of gift.

“While Latinos have traditionally been givers, we have done so quietly, often through family and religious institutions. Now we’re asking people to stand up and be counted by doing their giving in a public, strategic, and collective way,” says Marcelina Rivera, onetime executive director of the Latino Community Foundation of Colorado.

“Not one Asian language has a word for ‘philanthropy’ in the way that it’s practiced in the United States,” says Peggy Saika, executive director of Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP). “We’re trying to build not just the practice of philanthropy in different communities but also the consciousness of it.” Allen, of the Foundation for the Mid South, agrees: “We are trying to expand the definition of philanthropy, taking it from a ‘top-down’ concept to showing how it’s accessible to all.”

Second, surprisingly little is known or understood about the scope, breadth, and depth of this field or how best to support it. Identity-based funds are still relatively new. Although some of the oldest funds were started near the turn of the last century (see “A Snapshot of the Field,” page 20) the vast majority were established far more recently, within the last few decades. “There is a general lack of information about identity-based funds and what they are accomplishing,” says trustee Ramón Murguía. “A lot of mainstream funders aren’t aware of what has happened in the last 10 years of development in this area; therefore, they don’t buy the power and potential of these funds.” Meanwhile, many of the foundations that have attempted to support the field report finding it far more complex and nuanced than they’d anticipated.

But as identity-based philanthropy continues to mature and expand, it follows that it will become increasingly imperative for the broader field of philanthropy to engage with this work.

---

**Grantee**

For 10 years, the Leadership Center at CARDINAL STRITCH UNIVERSITY, based in Milwaukee, WI, has build some of the most innovative leadership training programs for people of color in its region. The Center offers training seminars and retreat sessions to help nonprofit leaders of color deepen and strengthen their contributions to identity-based nonprofits and their communities.

www.stritch.edu

---

“The ‘mainstream’ of philanthropy isn’t institutional. It’s what we do in daily life.”

Suzanne Siskel

FORMER DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL JUSTICE PHIANTHROPY

FORD FOUNDATION
WHAT IS SOCIAL CHANGE?

The term **social change** is used throughout this report to describe the kinds of impact that all identity-based funds are attempting to achieve in communities through their work and their funding. In the broadest sense, it means in some way improving the status, wellness, and security of a community’s members by providing them with resources and opportunities that would not have existed for them otherwise. It also means addressing not just the outcomes of identity-based inequity but its very roots, thereby helping communities become stronger and more self-sufficient over time.

In general, social change initiatives support programs and services that improve community conditions; increase community access to resources and services; mitigate inequities; and empower communities to fully participate in civic life. Examples include providing basic services such as healthcare and legal aid; improving safety and economic security, emotional and spiritual health, and education and job opportunities; building and nurturing community-based institutions, such as ethnic media, and civic, religious, or labor organizations; improving material conditions; building political, social, or philanthropic leadership; creating greater civic participation and broader awareness of basic rights; and attempting to eliminate all forms of disparity, discrimination, economic deprivation, or invisibility that limit access and opportunity. Social change also includes the celebration or revival of practices and traditions that both reinforce and boost pride in community identity.

Philanthropy—as well as the communities who serve and are served by these funds—to understand what they are, why they matter, and how to nurture their growth. “Women’s, ethnic, and other identity-based funds have been quietly but steadily growing, and they will continue to grow in importance along with demographic shifts,” says Monitor Institute’s Fulton. “We need a deeper understanding and appreciation of the role these funds can and will play in the philanthropic landscape—and, we need the data.”

Back in the mid-1990s, when we launched the EFCC initiative, a smattering of partial surveys and scans of identity-based philanthropy existed. But there was no aggregate data on the size of the field and the range of giving vehicles and issues supported in each unique community. As our work deepened, it proved increasingly difficult to assess the field’s needs without knowing its full shape. We sensed the field was growing, but by how much and in what directions?

Eventually, we commissioned an assessment of the scope and capacity of identity-based funds in the United States that would establish baselines for the field as a whole. The result was the most comprehensive inventory ever created, researched and compiled by Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors with additional funding support from the Diversity in Philanthropy Project. Key findings from that inventory are shared below, after a brief explanation on how identity-based funds work and what they have in common.

IDENTITY-BASED FUNDS: A PRIMER

At its most basic, an identity-based fund is a collective investment in a community, by that community—with that investment coming in many forms, in many sizes, and from many individuals. These funds work by pooling together solicited donations and contributions from community donors and then redistributing them (through grants) to organizations and sometimes individuals doing work in that community to promote social change.

In essence, identity-based funds act as brokers between community donors and community nonprofits—strengthening both ends of that system simultaneously. On the one hand, they enable donors to have greater impact by pooling their contributions into collective grants and empowering them to direct their giving toward the causes and needs they care about. On the other hand, they create an easy route for keeping philanthropic dollars inside a community, facilitating the feeding of much-needed funds into the programs, services, and institutions creating social change in those communities.

Above all, it is this *connecting* role played by identity-based funds that makes them so powerful, because through this connecting they become, in effect, vehicles through which a community exercises its own self-determination. Social change becomes possible when those most invested in promoting that change get organized—and that is what identity-based funds enable. And because these funds are created, led, and supported by
“Potlatch” is the Chinook word for the Native spirit of gift-giving. True to its name, the organization works to expand and inspire philanthropy for and by Native American communities across four states in the Northwestern United States: Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana. Potlatch trains Native communities and tribes on the ins and outs of private philanthropy, helping them to create nonprofits that address community issues—and developing and energizing new Native leadership in the process. “We empower them to start to bring about the services that their communities need,” says Ken Gordon, Potlatch’s former executive director. Potlatch further supports Native nonprofits through small grants and continued trainings, and also educates mainstream foundations about opportunities in Indian country, brokering relationships between funders and Native organizations.

PHILANTHROPY 101 | The dearth of organizations with 501c3 or other tax exempt status in Indian country is a significant barrier to attracting much-needed funding to Native communities, says Gordon. To address this, Potlatch teaches Native leaders how to create such structures—and how to navigate the world of fundraising and nonprofit management once they do. Each year, more than 600 people attend Potlatch workshops on everything from launching a startup to budgeting to governance training. The expense is nominal ($20-$35 per workshop, held onsite in communities) but the learning is considerable. For example, at the end of Potlatch’s two-day “Journey to Successful Fundraising” workshop, participants have completed about 80 percent of a grant application. “It doesn’t matter if we have three people at a training or 30,” says Gordon. “We just want to them to know there are private foundations out there that want to give money to Indian country and would love to fund their projects.”

THE CASINO MISPERCEPTION | “Many people think that the tribes are rich because of the casinos and don’t need money from foundations or major donors—yet the exact opposite is true,” says Gordon. Most tribes don’t
have casinos, let alone profitable ones, and less than 10 percent of the charitable giving of gaming tribes goes to Native communities, a stat that baffles Gordon. “Most of these communities have dire needs and are also doing some amazing work,” he says. “They need some of the support that mainstream nonprofits often expect and rely on.”

**FUNDER FIELDTRIPS** | To that end, Potlatch organizes tours of Indian country for potential partners and funders, introducing them to community elders and nonprofit leaders and letting them learn firsthand about Native communities and their needs. “We try to broker and cultivate relationships between great projects and the foundations we think might be amenable to funding them,” explains Gordon. Following one such introduction, Longhouse Media, a nonprofit that uses media as a tool for Native self-expression and social change, received a major grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

**PLANTING SEEDS** | Potlatch also manages its own small grants program, last year giving away grants of about $120,000. “Our hope is that if we can be the first funder for a new or emerging project, it will lead to much more funding for those organizations,” says Gordon. Potlatch offers grants in three categories: canoe journeys, native arts, and community building. Even applicants who don’t receive grants learn something from the process. Thanks to quick turnaround and comprehensive feedback, “applying to Potlatch for a grant often serves as a lab or tutorial for groups seeking to apply for grants from much larger funders,” explains Gordon. “By giving feedback on community strengths and challenges, we open their eyes to the possibilities that exist with mainstream funders.”

---

**CULTURES OF GIVING INVOLVEMENT**

Potlatch received three rounds of Cultures of Giving funding:

- an Expanding the Boundaries grant (2005) to bolster efforts at leadership development, provide mini-grants to several emerging nonprofits, and improve Potlatch’s organizational capabilities
- an Innovation & Impact matching grant (2007) to expand the number and size of Potlatch’s community building grants
- a supplement to the original Innovation & Impact grant (2009) allowing Potlatch to increase the size of the challenge

The Expanding the Boundaries grant enabled Potlatch to extend its reach and widen the impact of its core activities. Perhaps more importantly, the funds prompted Potlatch to review its internal programming policies, restructure its board and committees, and develop a new strategic plan to guide its activities going forward. As a result, Potlatch reversed its financial stability, turning a deficit into a healthy fund balance.

Prior to receiving the Innovation and Impact grants, Potlatch relied entirely on funding from private and corporate foundations. Although aware of the potential of individual donors, it did not have the experience or the impetus to focus on them. “Working with donors from Indian country is much more expensive than working with non-Native donors,” explains Gordon. “It takes longer to build relationships and trust, and the transaction cost on each contribution is much higher because there is not the same wealth.” Kellogg Foundation funding enabled Potlatch to explore new approaches to cultivating individual Native donors and increasing the dollars they give to community causes. Its efforts paid off: Potlatch raised $287,897 from individual donors through the challenge grant, versus the $55,000 in private and corporate donations raised the previous year.

“We learned the lesson that a large number of small contributions can lead to a large amount of support,” says Gordon. “Our donors provide us money, support, credibility, and networks into ever expanding avenues. Honestly, we could not do what we do today without this base.”

**SOURCES:** Kellogg Foundation interview with Ken Gordon; Cultures of Giving grant applications and final reports; the Potlatch Fund website.
community members, they do far more than raise and distribute dollars: they also serve as aggregators—and creators—of community knowledge, enthusiasm, expertise, activism, and pride.

**CORE CHARACTERISTICS**

While identity-based funds serve different communities, range in age and size, and have a wide variety of structures, approaches, and missions, several basic underlying characteristics serve to bind them as a field. Identity-based funds:

- **Are funded by a mix of donors but for a shared purpose.** While many funds raise money from diverse sources, they are significantly funded by donors from the community. At the heart of each fund is a shared vision for how to help that community grow stronger, more visible, and more empowered.

- **Serve multiple critical roles in a community.** Identity-based funds are mechanisms not just for increasing philanthropy but for focusing resources on immediate needs, building community infrastructure, and identifying and nurturing leadership. Many funds also take on research and advocacy roles or even incubate social movements.

- **Are uniquely positioned to generate activism among donors.** Funds frequently have ties to donors who aren’t on the radar of mainstream funders and who can leverage their social, civic, and political capital to generate resources for community issues and organizations. Also, donors to identity-based funds tend to be highly involved in the grantmaking process, sitting on grantmaking committees or leading their own donor advised funds.

- **Focus on far more than fundraising.** Most identity-based funds conduct considerable outreach and education, convening workshops, seminars, and trainings not just to garner donations but to expand and deepen civic awareness and action—moving community members from check writing to more hands-on engagement.

- **Make changes “with” rather than “to” their communities.** Identity-based funds work in partnership with donors and local leaders to determine their grantmaking priorities. Some call this “responsive grantmaking”—a term that captures the nimbleness that characterizes these funds.

**We finally have a voice in setting our own priorities in our grantmaking. In the past, we had to convince others. Now we direct resources into our own community. There is a unique power in shifting the dynamic from grant seeker to grantmaker.”**

Ramón Murguía
TRUSTEE, W.K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION; CHAIR, GREATER KANSAS CITY HISPANIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

---

**Grantee**

The community-based CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ACTION promotes sustainable development and social justice in rural North Carolina through grassroots empowerment, racial inclusion, and multi-sector collaboration. Among its top goals: removing its county (Robeson) from the Dept. of Agriculture’s list of “Counties of Persistent Poverty,” a designation it’s had for 50 years.

www.communityactionpartnership.com
WHAT COUNTS AS AN IDENTITY-BASED FUND?

Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors used the following criteria in its inventory:

Identity-based funds include women’s funds, LGBTQ funds, and ethnic, tribal, or race-based funds that:

• Raise resources from community donors to give to community organizations and causes.
• Operate through a 501c3 organization, either their own or a sponsoring organization’s (e.g., a community foundation or a larger identity-based organization).
• Conduct their giving domestically.
• Do not raise funds exclusively or primarily for the activities of their own or their sponsoring organization.

Funds affiliated with Greek-letter organizations or civic organizations within an identity-based community; National Black United Funds; faith-based funds; and scholarship funds that met the above criteria were included.

EXCLUSIONS:

• Diaspora funds that conduct international grantmaking exclusively.
• Funds that operate informally, without a 501c3, which includes many church funds.
• Voluntary associations that run funds intermittently or fundraise only for their own organizations.
• Private and/or family foundations of individuals or family-owned businesses.

• Are uniquely equipped to identify and address community needs. Identity-based funds can often reach deeper into a community than mainstream funders because they are embedded within it and have inside knowledge of its needs and resources. This puts them in a position to recognize and fund innovation at an early stage, take grantmaking risks that other funders cannot, and play a leading role in shaping the emerging landscape of resources serving that community.
• Are situated within a larger ecosystem of giving. Communities of color give generously through donations of time, money, and know-how to churches and other religious, civic, or political organizations; through remittances sent overseas to their countries of origin; through contributions to mainstream associations and organizations; and in myriad informal ways. These various pathways for giving are not mutually exclusive, although they often compete for the same resources.

A SNAPSHOT OF THE FIELD: THE RPA INVENTORY OF FUNDS

Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors’ inventory of identity-based funds, completed in 2009, looked within and across communities to surface their often unique philanthropic priorities and practices. The inventory documented a total of 355 identity-based funds, representing the bulk of the field at that time. All numbers shared below are current through 2009.*

GROWTH OVER TIME

Identity-based funds began taking off in the 1970s in the wake of the civil rights movement and in tandem with other social and empowerment movements of the time, including the women’s movement, the Native rights movement, and the LGBTQ rights movement. The number of identity-based funds established in that one decade equaled the total number established over the prior 50 years. More growth followed. Nearly one-third of identity-based funds (103) were established in the 1990s, with the steepest growth in the field occurring between 1985 and 2005 (see Figure 2).

The origins of these 355 funds are nearly as varied as the funds themselves. Many developed independently and organically within communities. Some developed out of civic associations or community institutions, while others grew from culturally based giving practices that formalized over time. Some were the creations of wealthy individual donors, and some received seed support from mainstream philanthropy or from minority-owned businesses. In the 1990s, community foundations entered the picture, establishing and housing significant numbers of identity-based funds.

*Since completing this initial inventory of identity-based funds, commissioned by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation as part of Cultures of Giving, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors has continued its work to develop a comprehensive database of identity-based funds. At the time of publication, the updated database now includes more than 400 funds that collectively raise and distribute roughly $400 million annually. For more information on this evolving database, see http://www.d5coalition.org/tools/population-focused-funds/directory/.
Roughly 25 percent of the funds established in the 1990s and 43 percent of those founded in the 2000s are affiliated with community foundations.

The proliferation of identity-based funds reached a peak in the 1990s—although another peak may be coming, as new funds continue to emerge at significant rates. Across communities, growth rates have varied. African American funds have the most consistent growth over time, increasing modestly each decade since the 1970s. A majority of Latino funds and 45 percent of women’s funds were established in the 1990s, while almost half of Native American funds were founded after 1997. Asian American and Arab American funds are the newest among all funds; these communities have the most significant concentration of funds established after 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>All Funds</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian American and Arab American</th>
<th>Women’s</th>
<th>LGBTQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1970</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 100 percent of overall funds or funds in each category. The founding years of 52 funds could not be determined.

**Grantee**
As part of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, the CENTER ON PHILANTHROPY AND CIVIL SOCIETY links academic approaches to strengthening civil society with practitioner needs through education, research, and training. The Center is a leading resources on the patterns of giving and voluntarism by different religious, ethnic, racial, gender, and economic groups.

www.philanthropy.org
**BASIC STRUCTURE**

Currently, identity-based funds take one of two forms. They are either **independent funds** that have their own legal and financial status and make grantmaking their primary activity, or **affiliate funds** housed within a host institution that provides fiscal sponsorship. These host institutions are typically either community foundations or identity-based organizations that also provide other services and programs to a particular community. Independent funds are responsible for a majority (nearly two-thirds) of the grantmaking done by identity-based funds, followed by affiliate funds housed within identity-specific organizations. A much smaller portion of grantmaking (3 percent) is conducted by affiliate funds housed within community foundations.

The grantmaking structure of identity-based funds is far more varied. Some funds are organized as giving circles or collections of individual donor advised funds, both of which enable donors to direct their contributions toward particular organizations or causes by way of the nonprofits within which they are housed. Still other models include community funds, independent grantmaking programs, regrant programs, and scholarship funds. Many identity-based funds resemble community foundations with dedicated staff and standing grantmaking programs.

**GRANTMAKING CAPACITY**

Grantmaking data was available for 77 percent (273) of the 355 identity-based funds included in the 2009 inventory, and the total annual grantmaking of those 273 funds was approximately $188 million. Based on
this number, RPA estimated that the total annual grantmaking for the full 100 percent of funds would equal roughly $200 million (since adding to its inventory, RPA has updated that number to $400 million). Meanwhile, the amount granted out by these funds ranged widely—from $1,250 to $27 million annually. Ninety-one funds gave less than $50,000 per year, 150 gave less than $150,000 annually, and 16 funds gave more than $2 million annually. Median annual grantmaking was $100,000 (see Figure 3).

For the most part, funds are raised each year for grantmaking within the same year, so that annual grantmaking is directly tied to success in annual fundraising. Interestingly, the age of a fund is a significant predictor of its grantmaking capacity. On average, funds established in the 1970s grant out $790,000 per year, whereas funds established in the last decade average $480,000 in annual grantmaking.

---

**Grantee**

**CHANGEMAKERS** is a global online community supporting everyone’s ability to be a changemaker by inspiring, mentoring, and collaborating with others. Its online competitions identify and connect the best social innovators and implementers; participants compete to surface promising solutions then collaborate to refine, enrich, and implement them.

www.changemakers.com
NOTABLE STATISTICS

LARGEST NUMBER OF FUNDS
Women’s (96)

LARGEST TOTAL GRANTMAKING
Native American ($72 million)

LARGEST SINGLE GRANTS BUDGET
Latino ($27 million)

OLDEST FUNDS
Women’s and African American

FASTEST GROWING (BY NUMBER OF FUNDS)
Asian American

MOST AFFILIATED WITH COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS
LGBTQ

MOST CONSISTENT GROWTH OVER TIME
African American

LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF INDEPENDENT FUNDS
Women’s (61 percent)

LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF ENDOWED FUNDS
Women’s (60 percent)

GIVING PRIORITIES

Across the inventory as a whole, the top giving priority was education by a significant margin, followed by economic empowerment, health, and arts and culture. However, definitions and conceptions of these issues varied by community. For instance, among women’s funds, economic empowerment programs focused on financial literacy and job preparedness, whereas for African American funds, these programs concentrated more on community development. Health funding generally focused on culturally competent services, access to care, and support of community health centers. Arts and culture funding focused on cultural empowerment, arts and language preservation, and heritage programs.

The heavy focus on education resonates with existing research on donors of color, which has found that education is a philanthropic priority across ethnic and racial communities because it’s seen as an agent for change and a critical tool for individual and collective empowerment. The types of educational programs and services that identity-based funds support include programs to help educate parents about early childhood learning and college preparation, school-based academic intervention projects, technology instruction, tutoring services, and afterschool and summer programs designed to help close the achievement gap or meet the needs of disadvantaged children.

About a third of the funds in the inventory that supported education were dedicated scholarship funds, including some very large scholarship funds in the Latino and Native American communities. Although scholarship funding has not traditionally been seen as a social change strategy among mainstream philanthropy, in the context of identity-based funds it has significant symbolic value because it speaks to core values around fairness and access while addressing real and immediate disparities. In addition, many donors have personally experienced the transformative power of education as a key to their ability to achieve success and give back to their communities, resulting in a strong identification with the benefits of scholarship funding.

BREAKDOWNS BY COMMUNITY

While the 355 funds in the inventory share many basic features, when viewed by community, real differences stand out. Different communities have developed their own, unique philanthropic vehicles; they also prioritize different issues and approaches based on their needs, resources, and capacities, the full spectrum of which may not be visible to outside funders and observers. Below, the identity-based funds active in each of five communities of color are briefly examined. Similar profiles for women’s funds and LGBTQ funds are also included.
Grantee

Established in 1928, Connecticut’s COMMUNITY FOUNDATION FOR GREATER NEW HAVEN is among the country’s oldest and largest community foundations. It houses more than 825 charitable funds—including identity-based funds targeting the African American and Latino communities—and distributes roughly $19 million in grants each year to hundreds of nonprofits in its region.

www.cfgnh.org
AFRICAN AMERICAN FUNDS

83 funds collectively giving more than $25 million annually

RANGE OF ANNUAL GRANTMAKING: $1,250 to $17 million
MEDIAN ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET: $35,000

The African American community has some of the oldest and most deeply entrenched identity-based funds, with its first funds established in the 1920s. Prior to 1970, it had more funds than any other identity-based group. Over time, fund growth has remained steady. Almost a quarter of the African American funds included in the inventory were established in the last 10 years, a significant portion of them at community foundations.

Prominent among the 83 funds are two giving vehicles unique to the African American community: Black United Funds and foundations affiliated with fraternal organizations and civic associations. Civic and Greek-letter organizations in the African American community have wide networks and deep traditions of giving that over time have been formalized into 501c3 charitable organizations, donor advised funds, and independent foundations. These funds all conduct grantmaking in addition to fundraising for their chapters and national organizations. Over the last several years, giving circles have also become popular vehicles in this community.

The largest portion of African American funds in the RPA sample (42 percent) were affiliated with race-based organizations, such as Black United Funds and foundations associated with fraternal and civic associations. Only two funds were affiliated with mainstream nonprofits. Independent funds and funds affiliated with community foundations each represented about 28 percent of the inventory. Of all of the fund types, independent funds conducted the largest portion of the grantmaking.

Grantmaking. Although the total grantmaking of the African American funds for which data was available (57 percent) was roughly $25 million, most funds were small, with 40 funds giving less than $250,000 annually; one-third of funds granted out less than $10,000 per year. On the other end of the spectrum, the Associated Black Charities of Maryland alone granted out $17 million annually, while two other funds gave out more than $1 million per year. As with the overall inventory, the age and grantmaking capacity of these funds directly correlated. African American funds established in the 1970s had the highest average annual giving at $404,000, while funds established in the last eight years had the lowest at $24,000.

ASIAN AMERICAN AND ARAB AMERICAN FUNDS

24 funds collectively giving $2.5 million annually

RANGE OF ANNUAL GRANTMAKING: $5,000 to $829,000
MEDIAN ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET: $50,000
AVERAGE ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET: $150,000

Although two Asian American or Arab American funds were started in the 1970s, identity-based funds are relatively new to these communities, with
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the majority established in the last 10 years. The combined Asian American and Arab American communities had the smallest number of funds in the inventory and the lowest total grantmaking; most of the 24 funds gave less than $50,000 annually and none gave more than $1 million. This may be due in part to the fact that many donors in these communities give significantly outside of the United States, as remittances and through formal diaspora foundations.

Still, identity-based funds have been growing quickly in the Asian American and Arab American communities. Giving circles—the most prominent model for grantmaking in these communities, at 37 percent of the sample—were mostly young, with nearly half established in the last four years. Community funds were the second most common grantmaking model, with four of seven community funds established in the last eight years.

Half of the Asian American and Arab American funds included in the inventory were affiliated with identity-based organizations, such as the Asian American Federation in New York or the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS) in Michigan, suggesting that the development of funds is often a natural progression of the programs and services these organizations already provide. Almost half of the funds (46 percent) focused on just one ethnic population (Persian/Iranian, Hmong, Filipino, Native Hawaiian, etc.).

The Asian American and Arab American communities were the only groups in the inventory whose funds put a significant giving priority on creating links between civic life within immigrant enclaves and participation in the larger society. This resonates with earlier donor research linking philanthropic activity within Asian American communities to a cultural sense of civic responsibility.21 The Asian American community was also the only one to put a significant priority on funding programs that promote elder care.

**Grantmaking.** Affiliates of identity-based organizations had the second-highest grantmaking total at $578,000 per year (from an 83 percent complete sample). All funds that gave in excess of $250,000 (three in total) were independent funds. Overall, independent funds conducted the most grantmaking, at $1.9 million annually.

### LATINO FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41 funds collectively giving nearly $39 million annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANGE OF GRANTMAKING:</strong> $4,500 to $27 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET:</strong> $1.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET:</strong> $92,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the oldest Latino fund was established in 1967, growth in these funds has been fairly recent, with the largest number established in the 1990s. In general, older Latino funds focus their funding on scholarships and professional advancement, while the newer funds have more diverse
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giving priorities and missions. The Latino community was also the only community to place high significance on funding for legal services and programs related to civil and immigrant rights.

Seven of the funds in the sample were affiliated with identity-based organizations, such as the Hispanic Federation of New York, Hispanics in Philanthropy, the National Hispanic Council on Aging, or the National Association of Latino Arts and Culture, all of which run other national and community-based programs in addition to grantmaking. Approximately half of the funds were affiliated with community foundations, and most of these were established in the 1990s and 2000s. As with the Asian American and Arab American communities, formal and informal philanthropic vehicles for funding outside of the United States were significant for this community and not included in the inventory.

**Grantmaking.** The Hispanic Scholarship Fund, the largest fund in the sample, accounted for $27 million in annual grantmaking and included monies from the Gates Millennium Scholars Program. However, the majority of Latino identity-based funds (87 percent) gave out less than $500,000 annually; only four granted out more than $1 million annually. While independent funds represented just a quarter of all funds in the sample, the overwhelming majority of grantmaking dollars—94 percent—came from these funds.

### NATIVE AMERICAN FUNDS

**60 funds collectively giving more than $73 million annually**

**RANGE OF GRANTMAKING:** $8,500 to $26 million  
**AVERAGE ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET:** $1.5 million  
**MEDIAN ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET:** $308,705

Many Native American funds grew out of the Native rights movement in the 1970s and early ’80s, with the first Native American identity-based fund established in 1971. However, almost half of the 60 Native American funds in the inventory were founded after 1997, representing a diverse mix of tribal funds and independent funds. Interestingly, Native American funds conducted the most grantmaking of all the communities profiled in the inventory—87 percent more than Latino funds, which had the next highest grantmaking total.22 Also, this was the only community that placed a significant priority on the environment—specifically, environmental protection and resource preservation—in its grantmaking.

Native American communities have some distinct philanthropic vehicles and fund types, both because of diverse Native traditions of giving and because of the status of Native tribes as sovereign nations. Indeed, Native American funds exhibited the widest range in organizational structure. More than half of the funds were affiliated with tribes. (For the purposes of the inventory, they were categorized as being affiliated with identity-based organizations.) Some tribal funds are part of the tribal government itself; others have a separate organizational status under Section 7871 of
Since 2001, Raleigh, NC-based FAITH PARTNERSHIPS has been helping families in underserved and poverty-stricken communities in North Carolina and beyond by building collaborations among faith-based groups, grantmakers, and government and by providing outreach and trainings to faith-based organizations looking to build capacity and create new programs.

www.faithpartnerships.org
the Internal Revenue Code, which is similar to the nonprofit status of a
government program, where the tribal government is treated as a state
government for specified tax purposes, such as receiving tax-deductible
contributions.\textsuperscript{23} Alternatively, some tribal funds have chosen to incorporate
under Section 501c3 of the IRS.

There are also independent 501c3 funds that serve multiple tribes, such as
the Potlatch Fund and the Minnesota Tribal Government Foundation, as
well as independent Native funds—such as the Seventh Generation Fund
and First Nations Development Institute—that were not affiliated with
specific tribes but serve many different Native communities. Separately,
many tribes conduct philanthropy without using formalized philanthropic
entities, including funding for scholarships.

Philanthropic vehicles associated with gaming and energy contributed
substantially to the grantmaking capacity of the sample as a whole.
However, grantmaking from funds affiliated with gaming and energy was
often significantly restricted by state compacts that require support of the
surrounding geographic community and non-Native causes.

**Grantmaking.** The Native American community had the most significant
grantmaking capacity of all the communities profiled. Eleven funds gave
out more than $1 million annually—some significantly so. For example,
the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community Foundation gave out
more than $26 million, and the Cherokee Preservation Foundation gave
out nearly $9 million. However, the majority of Native American funds
granted out between $250,000 and $1 million annually. Interestingly, the
funds that gave more than $1 million were established in every decade that
Native American funds have existed, suggesting that in this community,
grantmaking capacity does not correlate with the age of the fund.

**WOMEN’S FUNDS**

\textit{96 funds collectively giving more than $31 million annually}

**RANGE OF GRANTMAKING:** $5,500 to $3.6 million

**AVERAGE ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET:** $360,000

**MEDIAN ANNUAL GRANTMAKING BUDGET:** $136,000

Women’s funds have the longest history; the earliest women’s funds were
founded before the turn of the twentieth century and focused primarily
on the educational and vocational needs of girls and women. However, it
was not until the women’s movement came into full force in the 1970s that
the growth of women’s funds accelerated. The largest number of women’s
funds (about 40 percent) were founded in the 1990s. Interestingly, women’s
funds outnumbered the funds for any other community included in the
inventory.\textsuperscript{24} This community also had the largest percentage of endowed
funds, at slightly over 60 percent.\textsuperscript{25}

Women’s funds also had the most formal structure of all of the communities
profiled, partially because of the support they have gained from the
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Women’s Funding Network, a membership association for such funds. In terms of funding vehicles, women’s funds had a lower percentage of giving circles than other identity groups. The majority of women’s funds—61 percent—were independent, and these funds were responsible for roughly 85 percent of the grantmaking. Fewer than one-third of women’s funds were housed at community foundations, accounted for slightly less than 7 percent of total grantmaking.

Grantmaking. Collectively, women’s identity-based funds gave out more than $31 million in annual grants. The majority of funds gave out between $100,000 and $500,000 each year. The Ms. Foundation, established in 1972, had the highest grantmaking budget at $3.6 million. As with the overall inventory, age and structure strongly determined the grantmaking capacity of these funds. Most funds granting out more than $1 million a year were established before 1990, and all but one were independent funds. Of the funds granting out less than $25,000 annually, most were founded in the 1990s and 2000s, and more than half were affiliated with community foundations.

LGBTQ FUNDS

34 funds collectively giving $9.6 million annually
MEDIAN GRANTMAKING BUDGET: $69,000
AVERAGE GRANTMAKING BUDGET: $60,494 for affiliates of community foundations, $722,838 for independent funds

LGBTQ identity-based funds experienced their biggest growth in the 1980s and ’90s. Although the AIDS epidemic was a galvanizing force for both community activism and the development of formal philanthropic entities during those decades, funds established during this period were also concerned with promoting civil rights, building community infrastructure, supporting youth, and violence prevention.

Twenty of the LGBTQ funds included in the inventory (59 percent) were affiliated with community foundations, the highest percentage for any community profiled. This is largely due to an initiative by the Joyce Mertz Gilmore Foundation in the 1990s to establish LGBTQ funds at community foundations, working in partnership with Funders for LGBTQ Issues, a membership association of grantmakers. However, the majority of the grantmaking by LGBTQ funds (about 83 percent) came from independent funds. Based on sample of 23 funds for which founding years were known, about half of the funds established in the 1990s—and a majority of funds started in the last 10 years—were affiliated with community foundations.

Grantmaking. The majority of LGBTQ identity-based funds (22) awarded less than $500,000 annually, and 60 percent of the funds gave less than $250,000. Three funds in the sample granted out more than $1 million annually. Age did not appear to correlate with grantmaking capacity in this community.
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THE JOURNEY CONTINUES: UNLEASHING RESOURCES

The Emerging Funds for Communities of Color initiative described at the opening of this chapter did more than just expand our understanding of philanthropy in communities of color: it kicked off a series of events and experiments that set us on a course of ever-deepening commitment and involvement in the field.

In 1999, we launched a second effort designed to further build out our growing knowledge of identity-based philanthropy: the Unleashing Resources Initiative (URI). The findings and recommendations from the EFCC initiative had spurred our team to reshape its core strategy and start developing new ways to expand philanthropy into six undertapped communities (youth, wealth creators, women, corporate social innovators, social entrepreneurs, and communities of color) via three integrated approaches: supporting emerging leaders and donors, creating and sharing knowledge, and building tools for nonprofit sustainability and innovative giving. URI was the leading effort launched under this strategy.

URI had two phases. The first phase—discovery—focused on creating additional learning about the changing context of philanthropy, identifying key partners in communities of color, and supporting promising program models. It was in the second phase—implementation—that we started to touch identity-based funds more directly, helping to boost the capabilities and capacity of several through technical assistance, operating support, and professional development. Like EFCC had done before it, URI illuminated some interesting patterns. What we observed through this work was that no matter which community they served or what social change issues they addressed, nearly all identity-based funds and their supporting organizations faced the same basic set of challenges—including those listed below.

- Across communities, many donors, leaders, funds, and foundations were on identical, parallel, or complementary tracks. Yet few were codifying their methods, or sharing either their missteps or their best practices. As a result, a terrific amount of “wheel reinvention” was happening across the field.
- Emerging networks within and across race and culture were weak or fragmented.
- A significant amount of donor generosity and activism remained untapped, in part because culturally relevant tools for engaging donors of color were mostly in their early, experimental stages.
- Capacity building was an almost universal challenge. Most funds and organizations were operating on limited resources. Some were highly successful but growing rapidly and lacked the knowledge or experience to manage a developing entity.
The Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS) is a human services organization committed to the economic and cultural development of the Arab American community. In 1971, ACCESS opened as a small storefront to help Arab immigrants translate documents and learn English. Today, it has a budget of more than $14 million and offers nearly 100 programs in seven locations. In 2004, ACCESS founded the National Network for Arab American Communities (NNAAC), the first network of Arab American community organizations, bringing together 14 leading grassroots service providers to jointly advocate for Arab American community needs. After a successful $20 million campaign to establish a community health center and the Arab American National Museum, ACCESS adopted the mission of promoting Arab American philanthropy on a national scale.

ENGAGING DIVERSE DONORS | Arab Americans are highly diverse, making fundraising and donor development a continuous challenge. “We come from a region marked by great wealth—there are more than 1,000 billionaires in the Middle East—but also great disparities,” says Maha Freij, deputy executive director and chief financial officer. Arab Americans come from 22 different countries and practice a variety of faiths, and older generations of Arab Americans view the world very differently than new immigrants. Yet finding ways to engage all of these populations—and understanding their very disparate concepts of giving—is critical to building a donor base. “The Arab American community

LOCATION: Dearborn, MI
YEAR FOUNDED: 1971
TYPE OF ORGANIZATION: Nongrantmaking nonprofit social services organization
WHO THEY SERVE: Arab Americans nationally and locally; Dearborn, MI, has one of the highest concentration of Arab Americans in the United States
is an untapped donor resource, but we’re becoming more sophisticated in our approaches to it,” says Freij.

**9/11** | “While September 11 affected the whole nation, Arab Americans were affected in very unique and difficult ways,” says Freij. Overnight, ACCESS’s mission became vastly more challenging. In response to a sharp rise in anti-Arab sentiment, the organization intensified its outreach, offering educational seminars and programs for teachers, law enforcement professionals, and legislators. Post-9/11, support sometimes came from surprising places. “When we launched the Arab American Heritage campaign in 2001, we first went to our staff. One woman—an administrative assistant making $12 an hour—made a $1,000 pledge. A few months after September 11, she stopped me in the hall to say that she’d like to increase her pledge to $10,000,” says Freij. “That moment taught me the value of reaching people with a message that resonates with their brains and hearts.”

**POOLING TALENT AND RESOURCES** | The National Network for Arab American Communities (NNAAC), founded by ACCESS in 2004, enables Arab American community-based organizations to share resources and jointly advocate for community needs. ACCESS provides technical assistance to NNAAC member organizations on board development, fundraising, grant writing, and program development. From its inception, NNAAC programs have been based on an understanding that effective community-based work must have strong community support—which is why engaging new, diverse donors continues to be a top priority. “We are harnessing the power of collective giving to show the community what it can do and be,” says Freij. “Arab Americans are thirsty for this.”

**CULTURES OF GIVING INVOLVEMENT**

ACCESS received three rounds of COG funding:

- an Expanding the Boundaries grant (2005) to help deepen the work and reach of the NNAAC, specifically by increasing the individual and collective capacity of NNAAC members to attract Arab American donors
- an Innovation & Impact tools and capacity grant (2007) to begin the development of a formal institutional fund promoting the development of Arab American philanthropy
- an Innovation & Impact matching grant (2008) to launch that formal structure: the Center for Arab American Philanthropy (CAAP)

The Expanding the Boundaries grant enabled ACCESS to add fundraising training to the forms of assistance it provides NNAAC member organizations. The hope was to develop a mechanism by which the Arab American community could become sustainable on its own without relying on grants from foundations. As part of its efforts, ACCESS conducted the first research ever done on giving in the Arab American community and created an “Inspiring Arab American Giving” brochure—the first publication encouraging Arab American donors to identify themselves as philanthropists who can give strategically. They also intensified their efforts to reach out to donors by conducted outreach workshops for Arab American professionals and organizations. And they made progress toward establishing a permanent philanthropic structure by organizing the Center for Arab American Philanthropy (CAAP), developing a vision and hiring staff. This work continued and intensified under the Innovation & Impact tools and capacity grant.

As a result of the matching grant, ACCESS further increased its donor engagement activities and officially launched CAAP, transforming an unconnected group of donors into a cohesive grantmaking collective. CAAP’s primary focus is individual Arab Americans who are already giving but do not have tools to give strategically or who work in formal philanthropy but are not connected to their community organizations, as well as young professionals who have little philanthropic experience but are actively engaged in community service. Shortly after its launch, CAAP issued its first Request for Proposals for Arab American community organizations. In 2009, CAAP awarded $73,900 to 16 organizations in its first round of grantmaking. Additionally, CAAP granted another $101,900 to Arab American organizations through 30 newly established donor advised funds.

**SOURCES**: Kellogg Foundation interview with Maha Freij; Cultures of Giving grant applications and final reports; ACCESS, NNAAC, and CAAP websites.
Of course, the flip side of challenge is opportunity, so in the early 2000s we brainstormed two strategies for helping the field address these challenges. First, we would shift our efforts from research and development to significant pilot grantmaking and more targeted nonmonetary support. “We wanted to test out what it would look like if we infused some additional capital into these organizations,” explains deputy director Alandra Washington. “What would happen if they had that capital? How might that lead them to new ways of doing their work?”

Second, throughout EFCC and URI we had worked with a handful of leaders from identity-based funds and their sponsoring organizations, creating learning coalitions and experimenting with ways to foster new forms of collaboration. Through those efforts, we noticed what these leaders noticed: that strengthening the connections between and among them had tremendous positive impact on their individual effectiveness. Thus the second thread of our work going forward would be to attempt to build a community of practice among the field’s leading practitioners.

But not before we had a collective experience that would inspire all that followed.

INNOVATION FOR THE FIELD

It was March 2004. Our work was about to kick into high gear, as we prepared to announce Cultures of Giving—our largest effort to promote, support, and expand identity-based philanthropy to date. Weeks earlier, we’d invited a long list of leaders of identity-based funds and organizations to Battle Creek, MI, for our first ever Leadership in Philanthropy Networking Conference. The three-day conference would be a rare opportunity for these leaders—with their different backgrounds, various levels of authority, and distinct areas of expertise—to find and forge common bonds in their philanthropic work. And it would offer them a rare forum for discussing the challenges and the promise of that work with one another, as well as with our entire team at the Kellogg Foundation.

The conference would also, we hoped, prototype a working model for the community of practice we intended to create and give us a feel for just how large a network we could catalyze.

**Grantee**

GRASSROOTS LEADERSHIP is a national Charlotte, NC-based multiracial team of organizers working to transform the justice system by advocating for a community-based justice system, the abolishment of for-profit private prisons and unnecessary immigrant and family detention, and alternatives to incarceration.

www.grassrootsleadership.org

“There is power in collaboration and power in creating a collective vision around where you want your community and your institutions to be.”

Lillian Rodríguez López
President
Hispanic Federation
We had hoped the conference would attract at least a few dozen leaders of color. So our first surprise came when, on that March day, 85 leaders converged on our offices. Like the group that later gathered at the 2011 conference in Wilmington, NC—indeed, many of them the very same people—their diversity was stunning. They represented 14 states plus Washington, DC, and their job titles ran the gamut. More than half were African American; 17 percent were Latino, 12 percent were Asian American, and 4 percent were Native American. Only 7 percent identified as white. More than 60 percent were women. Perhaps most remarkably, 11 of the 85 attendees were between 12 and 20 years old.

Here, in our offices, stood a large and highly diverse group of people doing the very types of philanthropy—often alone, with little funding, and outside the view of big foundations—that we had committed to helping grow and spread throughout the country. Says trustee Wenda Weekes Moore, who attended the conference: “We saw a room filled with partners on our journey. We were excited.”

A VISION FOR PHILANTHROPY’S FUTURE

During what became an extraordinary three days, we asked those 85 leaders to assess philanthropy’s current realities, imagine its ideal evolution, then explore the gaps in between. What was their vision for philanthropy’s future? And how must present-day philanthropy change in order to realize that vision?

The resulting conversation—perhaps the first of its scope and kind—proved remarkable for the candor with which attendees shared their challenges and their aspirations both for themselves and for the field; the mix of hope, frustration, and commitment that radiated from everyone’s comments; and the leaders’ clear desire to be included in what counts as philanthropy rather than feel as though they were flying below visibility and recognition. But perhaps most remarkable was the collective vision put forth by the group for what a more inclusive field of philanthropy could and should look like.

A future in which “philanthropy” is more broadly and inclusively defined. They said the common perception of philanthropy as the rich giving to the poor often stands in the way of efforts to grow philanthropy for—and particularly by—communities of color. They called for a wider definition of philanthropy that would include the diverse expressions of giving within their communities—and counter the perception that people of color are recipients of charity more often than they are its providers. “Diverse donor communities are already rich with energy, vision, and wisdom,” said one leader. “These strengths will push forward the momentum for redefinition with its own vitality, but it would be desirable for large funders to help accelerate the process.”
Adela Cepeda gets asked to serve on a lot of nonprofit boards. Why? For one, Cepeda runs one of the country’s top financial advisory firms, with a client list that includes the City of New York, O’Hare Airport, and the states of Connecticut and Illinois—so her gifts of time and know-how are understandably coveted. Just as important: Cepeda, who lives in Chicago, is a Latina. “I get a lot of calls saying, ‘Juan Gonzalez is leaving our board. It’s really important to have Hispanic representation. Will you join?’” says Cepeda, whose family emigrated from El Salvador when she was 6. “Regardless of how I identify, I get identified.”

Yet Cepeda feels grateful for the bombardment. “Having the privilege of a good education and being active in the business community forces me to be generous and to give in every way that I can—financially but also in terms of my time,” she says. Also, those invitations present an opportunity. “The Latino community is one of the hardest working and lowest paid in the United States,” says Cepeda. “We need people to articulate our community’s needs.”

In 2004, Cepeda discovered a new way to serve those needs when she co-founded Nuestro Futuro, an endowment enabling individuals across the Latino community to pool resources for greater impact in improving the quality of life of Latinos in metropolitan Chicago. “Our culture of giving is huge—it’s just doesn’t look like traditional philanthropy,” says Cepeda. “Nuestro Futuro takes people who are not normally in the philanthropic community and teaches them how to participate in a different way.”
Like most identity-based funds, Nuestro Futuro seems to specialize in giving grants to community agencies, startups, and activities that aren’t on the radar screen of mainstream funders or even most donors. For example, Nuestro Futuro recently gave a grant to a small Latino-run dental clinic cooperative that provides nearly free dental care to Latino immigrants and others who can’t afford full-priced care or need a Spanish-speaking dentist. “This is the kind of initiative we need to fund and to mimeograph,” says Cepeda. “We give to organizations that are, at the people level, really making an impact.”

Nonetheless, Cepeda and her co-chair, Maria Bechily, admit that raising money has been harder than they anticipated. “The notion of collective philanthropy sounds wonderful in theory, but it’s hard to put into practice,” says Bechily. “Often the donors we need are already giving in other ways and have committed their resources elsewhere.” But Bechily and Cepeda are tenacious. “Now I go to corporations in Chicago and say, ‘Twenty percent of your employees are Latino, so you really have to give to Nuestro Futuro,’” says Cepeda. The organization’s Cultures of Giving matching grant also inspired a burst of new giving: Nuestro Futuro received 94 gifts during its match campaign—70 of them from new donors.

“I think all of us are proud of our heritage and our culture, so we have to direct funds to the programs that are going to ensure its continuation,” says Cepeda. “One or two people in our community at our giving level can’t do a lot. But hundreds of us putting something into an issue can make a difference, even in a big city like Chicago.”

A future in which philanthropy’s communities of color share and swap best practices and approaches in structured ways. While informal learning communities exist, these leaders saw a clear need for more formal coaching and mentoring practices within and across communities, which would help to establish a more intentional culture of knowledge sharing among them. Communities of color abound with both accomplished veterans and high-potential newcomers. Yet the two are often disconnected, and that gap needs to close. Many of the younger conference attendees also expressed concern about systemic barriers in philanthropy to engaging young leaders. Establishing more regular mentoring, feedback, and learning pathways would go a long way toward addressing this problem and developing a pipeline of new leaders of color.

A future in which more open sharing between communities of color and mainstream philanthropy enhances and expands everyone’s effectiveness. The leaders saw a future in which their own philanthropic work was more visible—and others’ work more visible to them. More shared knowledge about giving practices and leadership approaches within communities of color, they said, would help everyone better understand which work best—and which don’t work at all. So
would gaining fuller access to the latest practices and developments in mainstream philanthropy—and, in turn, exposing mainstream philanthropy to their own innovative practices. This open exchange would feature not just quantitative analysis but also real-life stories—including stories of failures from which everyone might learn.

**A future in which the broader field of philanthropy recognizes and reflects the changing face of society.** Leaders lamented the lack of diversity among the leadership and staff of mainstream foundations and among foundations’ core donors. Too many institutions take the narrow view of diversity, they said, adding different faces to their boards but not using the opportunity to transform their institutional culture through the addition of new perspectives, insights, and experiences. To truly narrow the gap between philanthropy’s haves and have-nots, communities of color need to become part of the field’s power structure.

Inclusiveness, sharing, learning, knowledge, support—these were the cornerstones of the future these leaders hoped to create. For us, their collective vision was more than just interesting and inspiring: it was a call to action that would infuse all our work going forward. “We were blown away by their passion—but also by their sense of urgency, which only added to our own,” says Alandra Washington. “They had momentum, we had momentum. You could feel the rumblings of change coming.”

“At that time, we didn’t know what to expect. We weren’t sure where the foundation was headed, what agenda was being placed before us,” recalls Diana Wilson, president and CEO of Faith Partnerships, which would become a Cultures of Giving grantee. “We didn’t even understand the possibilities. But I think what happened next—the work we did and the way we came together in various forms in a spirit of collaboration—exceeded everyone’s expectations.”

---
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Cultures of Giving—the centerpiece of our efforts to support and grow philanthropy in communities of color—unfolded through a series of programmatic strategies stretching from 2004 to 2010. In total, we awarded $15.5 million through four Cultures of Giving strategies, each of which had a different but complementary objective:

- **Expanding the Boundaries** was a pilot grantmaking initiative designed to **ADVANCE** the practice of identity-based philanthropy by strengthening and building the capacity of community-led organizations and their leaders.

- **Building a Community of Practice** aimed to **CONNECT** the work and the knowledge of these organizations and leaders by catalyzing a field-wide network.

- **The National Leadership in Action Awards** would **PROMOTE** and celebrate the innovative philanthropic work being done by identity-based organizations by drawing wider attention to their greatest achievements.

- Finally, **Innovation & Impact** would **ENGAGE** new and existing donors in identity-based funds and build the capacity of funds to recruit and serve donors.

While many organizations, partners, and donors were connected with and through this work, our core group of Cultures of Giving grantees comprised roughly four dozen organizations across the United States. Because our intention from the outset was to provide field-wide support,

**Grantee**
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our funding extended not just to identity-based funds but to other related and closely integrated structures that play leading roles in the field as well, including the affiliate organizations hosting these funds or experimenting with creating them; affinity groups tied together by common membership and operating in particular communities of color; and intermediary organizations providing research, tools, and technical support to all of the above. All of these entities are building philanthropy by, for, and within their own communities but through different platforms, and all are contributing important work to the field.

Also, while we felt confident in our initial strategic approaches, we knew that our knowledge would evolve very quickly once Cultures of Giving got started—and we believed that our strategies would need to evolve with it. From the outset, then, our aim was to test out various approaches for how to best support the field, then shift our strategic focus in response to what we were seeing and learning from the organizations and people we funded. This open stance toward learning made us—and the program—much more nimble than it would have been otherwise.

Finally, throughout Cultures of Giving, we took the position that it was the funds and organizations already working inside communities of color that knew best what they needed to move ahead. We saw our role as supporting those judgments by providing financial backing and other types of resources for what they wanted to do in their communities. “From the
outset, we acknowledged our grantees for all they brought to bear in solving problems,” says Gail Christopher, vice president of program strategy for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. “We were very pragmatic about it,” adds former director of mission-driven investments Tom Reis. “Solutions would come from the communities themselves.”

**ADVANCE: EXPANDING THE BOUNDARIES**

Expanding the Boundaries began as a learning opportunity but quickly blossomed into the first stage of our Cultures of Giving strategy focus. The goal of this first major pilot grantmaking effort was broad in scope and big in ambition: it aimed to do no less than advance the work of emerging leaders and donors of color; amplify the size, impact, and effectiveness of philanthropy in these communities; increase the engagement and visibility of identity-based funds; and increase the presence and force of identity-based giving within mainstream philanthropy. Our financial commitment was matched to the task: we invested $9.3 million in Expanding the Boundaries—a tenfold increase over our earlier investment in EFCC. Says deputy director Alandra Washington: “We wanted to infuse income into these organizations and help them expand their impact exponentially.”

In total, we awarded 29 grants averaging just over $300,000, with the majority funding projects that focused on leadership development and capacity building. To ensure that Expanding the Boundaries had maximal impact on the field, we gave grants to a critical mass of organizations and programs that were at their tipping point and would realize profound and powerful results from our investment. Most grantees had extensive

**Grantee**

The **HISPANIC FEDERATION** is a network of nearly 100 nonprofits serving more than 2 million Latinos in the Northeastern United States. Since 1993, the Federation has advocated nationally for Latino rights and inclusion and awarded more than $9 million in grants, making it one of the most successful Latino grantmaking organizations in the country.

www.hispanicfederation.org
CULTURES OF GIVING
PROGRAM GOALS

• Build and strengthen the CAPACITY of identity-based organizations
• Help identity-based organizations gain greater ACCESS to knowledge, tools, and funding streams that could strengthen their work, including those coming from mainstream philanthropy
• Support and strengthen LEADERS and improve the leadership pipeline of people of color
• Catalyze new and stronger NETWORKS within and across communities
• Innovate new culturally relevant TOOLS, MODELS, AND PRACTICES for engaging and building the leadership capacity of community donors
• Raise the VISIBILITY of identity-based organizations within the wider philanthropic field
• Support the DEVELOPMENT of new philanthropic institutions in communities of color
• Encourage RESEARCH on giving across communities of color and CODIFY the best-practice tools, trainings, and lessons that are emerging

philanthropic experience: 17 of the grantees had more than 10 years of experience in the field, and 14 were founded before 1990. (For a full list of grantees, organized by initiative, see page 64.)

Emphasizing cross-race, cross-culture collaboration

Historically, most efforts to fund philanthropic projects in communities of color have targeted individual communities—not all communities of color at once. This has set up and fed competition between communities for the same limited funding; as a result, there has been little collective, cross-cultural energy around building the field and sharing tools and practices for doing so across communities. With Expanding the Boundaries, we hoped to build different ways of working across race and culture to advance innovative approaches to giving in all communities simultaneously. Therefore, in our request for proposals, we emphasized an interest in projects that built relationships across cultural and racial lines and leveraged the resources of different cultural and racial communities. As a result, 16 of the projects we funded had a cross-race or cross-culture component.

WHAT WE LEARNED

From the beginning, many grantees expressed concern about their ability to develop projects that were multiracial or multicultural in nature. They stressed that they couldn’t engage in cross-culture collaborations until they were first able to engage in relationships within their own communities. They also cited a lack of trust among communities of color emanating from a perceived “zero-sum” competition for available resources—which, as we just mentioned, is a legacy of the way these organizations have experienced funding competition in the past. We learned very quickly, then, that working together cannot be forced and rarely comes first.

“That’s been the hardest piece to crack: testing out how to catalyze collaborative cross-cultural projects,” says Alandra Washington. “At this early stage their priority was to shore up their own work first, which made sense.” However, while grantees’ formal collaboration was limited at this point, their informal sharing was tremendous (see “Building a Community of Practice”). In response to grantee feedback, we reduced the emphasis on cross-race and cross-culture projects in our next major grant phase, Innovation & Impact. We also made space at our national networking meetings for frank dialogue on the perceived competition for scarce resources among racial and cultural groups.

However, this tension paled in comparison to the incredible capacity building that the Expanding the Boundaries grants enabled—much of it groundbreaking. For example:

• The Michigan-based Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS) conducted the first research ever done on giving in the Arab American community and created an “Inspiring Arab American Giving” pamphlet—the first publication to inspire Arab American donors to identify themselves as philanthropists who can
give strategically. The organization also began laying the groundwork toward establishing the Arab American community’s first ever identity-based fund.

- North Carolina-based Faith Partnerships built a network of African American women leaders of faith, training them to become influential change agents in their community by establishing giving circles and developing church projects addressing community issues.

- Wisconsin’s Cardinal Stritch Leadership Center used its grant to develop and launch the Philanthropy Incubator Project—one of fewer than 30 such programs in the country designed to identify, inform, connect, and support diverse, emerging donors of color in strategic philanthropy.

- Minneapolis-based Native Americans in Philanthropy expanded the scope of Native philanthropy by broadening and deepening a network of Native funders, mainstream funders, and Native nonprofits committed to this work.

- Atlanta-based Southern Partners Fund developed a philanthropy and leadership network to enhance the individual and collective ability of leaders of color to activate community change.

- The San Francisco-based Women’s Funding Network provided leadership and donor engagement training to dozens of African American women and girls and helped numerous African American women’s organizations develop new strategic philanthropy competencies.

Meanwhile, Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP) used its grant to incubate the very first giving circles ever to be established in the Asian American community. “Looking back, I have even more clarity and appreciation for the investment that the Kellogg Foundation made in us with that grant,” says Peggy Saika, president of the San Francisco-based AAPIP. “We were able to develop a small business plan and really build our back-office capacity. It was phenomenal for us to have that experience. And it was from that work that the very first giving circles in our community emerged.” Since then, more than 600 Asian American/Pacific Islander donors have pooled their money and time through AAPIP giving circles, awarding $600,000 to 70 nonprofit organizations in the Asian American community so far. “Our Cultures of Giving grant was really seminal,” says Saika. “It was risk capital on their part and it was risk capital for us. But we did it. And look what happened.”

Grantee

Founded in 1983, San Francisco-based HISPANICS IN PHILANTHROPY (HIP) is a transnational network of grantmakers committed to strengthening Latino communities through organized philanthropy. To date, HIP has raised more than $39 million and made grants to more than 500 Latino-led nonprofits across the Americas.

www.hiponline.org
2 CONNECT: BUILDING A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

The 2004 Leadership in Philanthropy Networking Conference described in the last chapter (see page 39) had been a game-changer for many of its attendees. In their evaluation of that conference, 96 percent of the leaders of color who attended said they had created new connections to resources that would help them accomplish future goals. By the end, many said that their perspectives on philanthropy had been significantly expanded. If that much good could be achieved with one meeting, what might catalyzing a living, breathing network accomplish?

Based on the learnings from our Expanding the Boundaries investments, a critical goal of the Cultures of Giving strategy was to create a community of practice among our grantees, transforming an amorphous group of philanthropic and community leaders working independently in their respective communities into a network of change agents connected by a common and recognizable social agenda. We wanted to create new opportunities for these leaders to connect and reconnect with others doing similar or complementary work, swap ideas and best practices, and discuss emerging opportunities. We were also eager to see what kinds of creative cross-cultural collaborations might emerge, and whether the group would work together to build a collective vision for the field. Ultimately, we hoped that taking part in a network of like-minded leaders across race and culture would put everyone in a stronger position to effect systemic change.

Our efforts to catalyze a network took several forms, each described below.

**Annual national networking meetings.** Between 2006 and 2008, we sponsored three annual connecting meetings, bringing together community and philanthropic leaders from around the country who were either doing work in communities of color or had an interest in doing so. In order to ensure the relevance of these meetings and also model cross-culture collaboration, we engaged a subset of grantees to co-design the convenings with us. Each meeting also had an explicit theme. The 2007 conference in Seattle, WA, for example, tackled the question of how philanthropy in communities of color fits within the larger philanthropic community from many angles, while the theme of the 2008 conference, held in Tempe, AZ, was “Powerful Networks for Powerful Change.”

Each meeting featured a mix of plenary discussions, panels, breakout sessions, and site visits highlighting the good work being done locally in communities of color. One meeting featured a “network board” where attendees could post ideas or problems and others could sign up to discuss them and a “communications boot camp” on the how-to’s of developing relationships with the media. Case studies were presented, best practices lifted up—and a lot of time blocked out for networking. “The networking time has been the most important,” says Donna Chavis, executive director of NCGives and a meeting co-designer. “We built in a lot of time for dialogue, because that’s where a lot of the biggest learning happened.”
The meetings drew large crowds, with 100 to 150 grantees, donors, and grantee collaborators attending each event. Judging from the energy and spirited dialogue, attendees were highly engaged in the meetings’ content. And each year, that content deepened. As the network grew stronger and grantees became more familiar with one another’s work, the collective conversation evolved from “who we are” and “what are we doing?” to “how we do it.” Plenary sessions and breakout discussions became more tactical than exploratory. And networking took on a life of its own.

**Virtual community.** Because there were considerable time gaps between organized gatherings of the community of practice, we also tried to keep the network virtually connected. We created a Cultures of Giving website, updating its content monthly and offering a weekly RSS newsfeed. We published 17 e-newsletters filled with noteworthy ongoing activities, featured profiles of selected grantees, and information about useful tools and resources. We also created a master contact list of all grantees plus others who were doing relevant work in communities of color. Finally, we offered an online library of research reports and other materials that grantees could learn and draw from.

**A “venture funds” program to facilitate collaboration, sharing, and learning.** Grantees could request up to $2,000 to fund a collaboration with one or more organizations in our “tools cluster,” a grantee cohort that had grown out of our earlier efforts to build tools for nonprofit sustainability and innovative giving. In total, 11 venture projects involving 14 Cultures of Giving grantees and 19 tools grantees were funded.

**A “small grants” program to facilitate regional gatherings.** In order to maintain the energy and connectedness generated at the national conferences, we provided $70,000 of funding to support regional networking opportunities. Small convening grants were available to subgroups of grantees that wanted to work together in their region to address barriers, share knowledge, and build collective vision and action. All past and present grantees could request up to $20,000 to coordinate a regional meeting or networking activity.

**WHAT WE LEARNED**

The small grants and venture funds programs did not prove as powerful as we’d hoped. This had much to do with their timing. In hindsight, both

---

**Grantee**

The Arizona-based **HOPI FOUNDATION** serves 12,000 Hopi across 12 villages on the Hopi Reservation as well as other tribes and indigenous societies throughout the Southwest. One the first independent foundations in Indian country, it provides grants, technical assistance, and other services to villages and nonprofit organizations serving the Hopi people.

[www.hopifoundation.org](http://www.hopifoundation.org)
were offered too early in the formation of the community of practice, before many grantees had a clear vision, direction, and understanding of their assets and challenges. Quite possibly, these programs could have been more effective if offered in the latter stages of Cultures of Giving. However, by 2008, there was less funding available for such activities. In interviews conducted by the program evaluator, some grantees commented that “given what they know now” they would have taken better advantage of the opportunity.

The annual national networking meetings, however, were absolutely pivotal in creating cohesion among grantees and, ultimately, in building a strong community of practice. Tremendous synergy, innovation, dialogue, and collaboration took place each time grantees, their donors, and their partners had a space to come together and network. The gatherings helped forge and strengthen relationships within the group by identifying common threads in their work and facilitated knowledge sharing and resource leveraging among and between racial and cultural groups. Attendees placed a high value on these gatherings in their evaluations, remarking that the meetings made them feel they were part of a much larger effort and their work had value to others outside their own communities.

The program evaluator found that grantees that became more catalytic in their activities were usually those who had been more active in developing relationships with other practitioners through these meetings. These relationships were instrumental in helping grantees identify new techniques and strategies that could be used or modified to address issues in their respective communities. They were also instrumental in helping identify partners and collaborators who could provide information, workshops, or trainings they lacked the expertise or staff to provide.

For organizations in the early stages of their work, the opportunity to learn from more established funds and hear their stories was invaluable. But no matter what their stage of learning, coming together with like-minded leaders was helpful. “We have so much to learn from one another,” says Barbara Poley, executive director of the Hopi Foundation. “You never know if someone has information that you might need or if you have anything to offer back to them. You really get to know people, and you have to listen. We’re all in the same world of trying to lead our people.”

“Looking back over those years, how do you assess the volume of outcomes resulting from the power of the collaboration?” says Diana Wilson, president of Faith Partnerships. “I don’t think we’ve begun to touch on that power. It wasn’t about the money. It’s what came out of the opportunity to get to know one another.”

Many others say that the Cultures of Giving network has played a critical role in the growth of both their organizations and their own leadership. Through the network, valuable partnerships and friendships have emerged across racial, ethnic, tribal, age, and gender lines. Years later, these relationships continue to evolve, extending the impact of this work well beyond the bounds of the initial program. The network has become a
**MISSION**

The Hispanic Federation provides grants to a broad network of Latino nonprofit agencies serving the most vulnerable members of the Hispanic community and advocates nationally with respect to the vital issues of education, health, immigration, economic empowerment, civic engagement, and the environment. Since 1990, its member base has grown from 15 organizations to nearly 100 and includes community health service providers, immigrant workers' rights organizations, education nonprofits, and economic development groups. Members receive assistance from the Hispanic Federation in grantmaking, capacity building, technical support, and community outreach. Since 1993, the Federation has awarded more than $9 million in grants, making it one of the most successful Latino grantmaking organizations in the country.

**A NETWORK OF NETWORKS** | The Hispanic Federation has been actively working to attract Latino donors since 1996, both on its own and through multi-organization collaborations. In 1997, the Federation convened the National Latino Funds Alliance, a national collaborative focused on promoting Latino philanthropy for Latino causes and providing technical assistance to community foundations seeking to develop Latino donor advised funds. In 2001, the Federation became part of the Coalition for New Philanthropy, a collective of six organizations working together to increase more strategic philanthropy among ethnic constituencies previously not targeted as donors. The National Latino Funds Alliance has received funding from the Kellogg Foundation since 1997, the Coalition for New Philanthropy since 2001.

**BALANCING ACT** | Supporting a large, diverse number of organizations requires continually balancing the needs and resources of the collective with the needs and requests of each agency. “Sometimes our role is to lead, and sometimes we just need to be there to make..."
sure we’re using the resources and talents that already exist in our very large network,” says Lillian Rodríguez López, the Federation’s president. Another balancing act: helping institutions and individuals learn to articulate their own needs and issues while honoring and elevating their unique capabilities and independence. “We understand that the member organizations are the issues experts and the content specialists,” says Rodríguez López. “Our goal is to build their capacity, improve their efficiency, and help them realize their potential.”

‘WHATEVER IT TAKES’ COMMITMENT | 2009 was a difficult year for the nonprofit sector—yet it was one of the best ever fundraising years for the Hispanic Federation, which surpassed its annual budget goal of $4.8 million by more than $1.7 million. The Federation partially attributes this to its staff’s “whatever it takes” commitment to serving the needs of the Latino community as fully as they can, especially in times of great need. In 2009, that commitment took many forms—from providing more than 500 Latino families with home foreclosure prevention assistance to offering free financial literacy workshops to training more than 50 fiscal directors and personnel of Latino nonprofits on how to establish appropriate internal fiscal controls and improve their financial stability. “Institutions like ours exist because we engage our communities in ways that other groups could never do,” says Rodríguez López.

GIVING VOICE | The Hispanic Federation advocates not just for local Latino communities but for Latinos across the country. For example, the Federation played a leading role in supporting the successful confirmation of Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor, organizing Capitol Hill visits with key senators and participating in national press conferences. More generally, the Federation seeks to educate elected officials, policymakers, the media, and funders about the needs and contributions of Latinos, and serves as a public policy advocate for the Latino community on a wide range of issues. One of its most powerful tools in this regard is its annual Latino-focused public opinion survey—the largest of its kind—featuring real data on the opinions, concerns, and preferences of Latinos, by city or state.

CULTURES OF GIVING INVOLVEMENT

The Hispanic Federation received three rounds of Cultures of Giving funding:

• an Expanding the Boundaries grant (2005) to the Coalition for New Philanthropy (of which the Hispanic Federation is a part) to deepen its ongoing work to increase philanthropic giving among donors of color

• an Innovation & Impact matching grant (2007) to the six-member National Latino Fund Alliance (which the Federation convened) to encourage new and increased giving to Latino identity-based funds by Latino professionals

• a supplement to the original Innovation & Impact grant (2009) allowing four of the six Alliance members (including the Hispanic Federation) to expand their campaigns for cultivating new donors

• The Federation also received a 2005 National Leadership in Action award

With its Expanding the Boundaries grant, the Hispanic Federation and other Coalition members expanded and deepened their programs to educate donors about formal philanthropic vehicles like giving circles, donor advised funds, and field-of-interest funds. For its part, the Hispanic Federation focused on creating donor engagement strategies and fundraising tools that could be used by all Coalition members.

Funds from the matching grant were used primarily as an incentive to attract first-time donors and to increase the giving of current donors. Each of six Alliance members were given $50,000, which they used to organize culturally relevant donor prospect events during the challenge period. Collectively, the Alliance raised $321,287 in new and increased funds, with 83 percent of individual donations coming from people of color. For its part, the Hispanic Federation saw a 23 percent increase in individual donors and increased its grantmaking budget by 20 percent. Given the success of the original challenge grant, the Hispanic Federation was awarded a supplemental grant to continue this work through December 2009.

SOURCES: Kellogg Foundation interview with Lillian Rodríguez López; the Hispanic Federation website and annual reports; Cultures of Giving grant applications and final reports.
vibrant, living platform from which new projects continue to launch, new lessons continue to bloom, and new momentum continues to generate. Every time the Cultures of Giving network convenes, community and conversation light up again, and more vital work gets done.
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PROMOTE: NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN ACTION AWARDS

Drawing wider recognition and attention to the innovative work being done by our grantees, their partners and donors, and other leaders in the field was another critical piece of our strategy from the outset. Through our network-catalyzing efforts, we had learned that identity-based philanthropy’s practitioners and organizations were often not very visible to one another—let alone to mainstream funders. For many identity-based organizations, even raising awareness of their funds, programs, and services within their own communities could be challenging, because the people they served were widely disbursed, their outreach budgets were small, or both.

In 2005, we launched the National Leadership in Action Awards as a way to more formally and publically showcase the transformative work that was being done in communities by nonprofit and philanthropic leaders of color. In total, we gave out 15 awards, five each in 2005, 2007, and 2008. Award winners received $50,000, an original commissioned art piece, and additional support described below.

CHOOSING THE WINNERS

In order to attract a wide range of nominees, we reached out to nonprofit leaders across in the United States, asking them to nominate peer organizations that were inventing new approaches to connecting resources of time, money, and know-how to work in communities of color. We were particularly interested in innovations in five categories: board and staff training, capacity building, leadership development, tools development, and donor engagement. Additionally, all nominees needed to demonstrate commitment to one of the following:

- Developing and creating knowledge and/or tools that advance giving in communities of color.
- Advancing partnerships between donors of color and community-based
organizations to promote social change.

- Promoting philanthropic leadership and innovation across communities of color.
- Creating philanthropic funds that support strategic giving in communities of color.
- Implementing strategies that connect giving from across mainstream philanthropy to the work of communities of color.

Each year, we convened a diverse committee of nonprofit and philanthropic leaders to review the nominations and select five winners. Interestingly, the majority of recipients were recognized and honored for innovations in two categories: tools development and donor engagement. For a full list of award recipients, see page 64.

**WHAT WE LEARNED**

Logistically, the 2005 cycle of awards was a learning experience for us and prompted several adjustments. For example, our 2005 call for nominations had produced just nine candidates and we wanted to boost that number. Subsequent wider distribution of the nomination announcement increased the nominee pool to 19 in 2007 and 23 in 2008. This “cast a wide net” approach to nominations also had an unexpected perk, bringing to our attention innovative models and practices that were not on our radar.

In each of the three years we gave out awards, we held a national awards ceremony. In 2005, we held that ceremony in conjunction with the Council on Foundations’ annual conference. But because the awards did not yet have brand/donor recognition, and because of competing interests at such a large event, the ceremony did not have the visibility or the attendance we had hoped for. This prompted more adjustments. In 2007 and 2008, we instead ran the awards ceremony as a featured program at our national networking conferences. In 2008, we also funded a local award reception for each winner and produced video clips highlighting their work, showing them at the national networking conference and making them available to the public through the Cultures of Giving website.

To boost awareness of the winners and their work even further, we made one other adjustment: media coverage. Through press releases and media contacts, we made strategic efforts to draw the attention of print newspapers and magazines. These efforts were moderately successful in national markets—but far more effective in recipients’ local markets and within multicultural and philanthropic outlets. In 2007, 18 media placements with a print circulation of 1.2 million were confirmed. In 2008, 12 placements were confirmed, with a circulation of 1.1 million.

**THE WINNERS’ EXPERIENCE**

Award recipients reported feeling greatly honored by the recognition. For many, arguably the biggest benefit wasn’t the money but the validation. “The award solidified for our board and our staff that we were doing the
right thing: that focusing on Latino philanthropy was important not just for us but for the whole field of philanthropy,” says Elsa Holguín, senior program officer at the Rose Community Foundation, which won in 2008 for incubating and launching the Latino Community Foundation of Colorado (LCFC), its first ever Latino fund. “We saw great potential in LCFC,” says Holguín. “But now a national foundation was saying, ‘We see it, too.’”

The Rose Community Foundation’s president and one of its trustees even flew to Tempe, AZ, for the national awards ceremony. For its local celebration, the foundation hosted a breakfast, asking Ramón Murguía, W.K. Kellogg Foundation trustee and chair of the Greater Kansas City Hispanic Development Fund, to speak on the importance of Latino philanthropy. “We all felt such a sense of pride and accomplishment at receiving the award,” says Holguín. “The recognition elevated LCFC’s work and ensured more support as we moved forward.”

The award had a similar effect on the Asian American Federation, which won in 2007 for its work to advance the civic voice and well-being of Asian Americans through increased community philanthropy, research, and support to community service organizations—including its extensive work to rebuild New York City’s Chinatown after 9/11. “The award motivated us and also reassured us that we were on the right track and making real progress,” says Cao K. O, the Asian American Federation’s executive director. The award also expanded its visibility and profile among donors. “Getting recognized by a national foundation was a big deal,” he says. “It helped build credibility and trust. Other organizations in the community saw it as a stamp of approval, and it made donors think about investing in us.”

The Asian American Federation prominently mentioned the award in its annual report and on its website, even playing the video clip highlighting its work at its annual gala. But by far the greatest impact of the award was its effect on Asian American Federation’s trustees. At the time, the organization had no endowment. But after receiving the award, says O, one board member offered $100,000 toward an endowment then challenged the other trustees to collectively match it. They did—and an endowment was born. Meanwhile, the organization used its $50,000 award to develop outreach strategies for a range of Asian American donors in the New York metropolitan area, including corporate professionals and high-net-worth individuals.
The National Community Development Institute (NCDI), an Oakland-based intermediary that provides technical support and training to identity-based organizations, used its 2005 award money to “pay it forward.” “My first reaction was just a sense of humility for being recognized by our peers,” says founder Omowale Satterwhite. “Then I started thinking about how to leverage the honor to strengthen our impact.” NCDI used the award to support its social responsibility work. “We’ve always tried to provide in-kind or volunteer services to organizations with really small budgets,” says Satterwhite. “So we intentionally used the funds to supplement our costs when working with groups that weren’t able to pay for our services.”

Associated Black Charities of Maryland, a 2007 winner, used its award money to energize its outreach to African Americans in Baltimore, update its educational philanthropic tools, establish a partnership with an area magazine, and develop a network of informational workshops and forums about philanthropy. First Nations Development Institute, also a 2007 recipient, focused on strengthening its base of individual donors by kicking off a new direct mail program featuring its new logo and updated messaging from its new public education program. The Twenty-First Century Foundation, which won in 2008, used the funds to support the post-production costs of “Bring Your ‘A’ Game,” a one-hour documentary offering alternative perspectives and solutions for critical issues facing African American men and boys, co-produced by actor Mario Van Peebles.

Chandra Anderson, the Twenty-First Century Foundation’s interim president, sees the real value of the National Leadership in Action Awards not as the money or the acknowledgment per se—but as what the experience translated into on the ground. “Ultimately, raising awareness about our organizations and about this field more generally is a capacity building strategy,” says Anderson. More trust, confidence, investment, validation, and visibility all enabled recipients to do what they already did best, only in even bigger and better ways.

**ENGAGE: INNOVATION & IMPACT**

In late 2005, we noticed a new pattern among many grantees. As their internal operations grew more sophisticated and sure-footed, their momentum was shifting outward toward engaging new donors. Yet it was also clear that many grantees felt under-resourced when it came to fundraising and continued to seek strong strategies, tools, and skill sets they needed to attract donors in their respective communities. This observation exposed an imbalance that needed to be addressed: while the ability of identity-based funds to serve as an entry point in reaching and engaging new donors is one of the most exciting aspects of the field, *culturally specific* donor engagement strategies remained largely underdeveloped, and even successful ones were rarely shared or codified.

In 2006-7, we launched Innovation & Impact—the fourth strategy of Cultures of Giving—in order to tackle this challenge head on. Our goal was to spur the creation and circulation of innovative and appropriate donor
engagement strategies that would raise the visibility of identity-based funds in their communities and attract the deeper donor base that each wanted.

To take advantage of the growth and maturity of the organizations we had already worked with, we restricted grants to existing Cultures of Giving grantees and their networks of partners and collaborators. In all, we gave 30 grants to 23 organizations through two formal funding cycles and one supplemental round, for a total investment of $3.4 million. Grants were made through the Cultures of Giving Fund established at Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, which helped design and execute the Innovation & Impact strategy. Grants under this strategy took two forms: tools and capacity grants and challenge grants, each described below.

TOOLS AND CAPACITY GRANTS

We offered 18 tools and capacity grants, which together totaled more than $1.1 million. These grants supported the creation and dissemination of tools, trainings, and workshops specifically designed to help identity-based organizations conduct successful donor engagement and fundraising campaigns. In order to build out the knowledge of those already engaged in this work, we focused most of our grants on organizations that already had some experience in the following:

• Formalizing and codifying educational or training programs into standardized curricular materials and programs.
• Disseminating these programs to community-based organizations, especially those planning major campaigns to develop identity-based funds and/or develop major volunteer programs for community donors.
• Adapting mainstream fundraising techniques to the needs of community-based organizations.
• Developing culturally sensitive donor engagement techniques.

Grantees eagerly embraced the challenge, creating some incredible strategies and synergies in the process. The Center for Community Action, for example, used its grant to develop tools for engaging multicultural, rural donors in supporting women’s empowerment across North Carolina. San Francisco-based Hispanics in Philanthropy circulated its training and curricular materials to Latino donors and funds all over the country. The Grotto Foundation used its grant to expand its philanthropic leadership

Grantee

The mission of the NATIONAL BLACK UNITED FUND, headquartered in Newark, NJ, is to build a viable philanthropic institution for Black American opportunity, growth, and change. Its strategy is to use philanthropic resources to meet vital needs in black communities and to use those resources as venture capital to leverage social and economic change.

www.nbuf.org

“We don’t just care about people who can write really large checks. A large number of small contributions of any kind can lead to an enormous amount of impact and support.”

Ken Gordon
OUTGOING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
POTLATCH FUND
program to include culturally based trainings on donor engagement, fund development, and fundraising for Minnesota’s Native American community. Changemakers launched a two-year pilot project called “Essentials for Diversity in Giving,” culminating in the publication of a comprehensive curriculum dubbed “With Knowledge Comes Change: The EDG Toolkit.”

“The most important thing we can do for the future is put our body of practice in writing and disseminate it around the country,” says Omowale Satterwhite, founder of the National Community Development Institute (NCDI). As one of the most well-established intermediaries in the field, NCDI had spent years “perfecting our methodology and learning how to successfully interact with individuals and organizations in communities of color,” says Satterwhite. Through Cultures of Giving funding, NCDI adapted its considerable body of knowledge into a training model that can now be used to improve others’ capacity-building processes.

Eugene Miller, assistant director of the Center of Philanthropy and Civil Society at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, says that creating, codifying, and sharing these strategies and methodologies is critical, field-building work. The Center used its $30,000 tools and capacity grant to give other Cultures of Giving grantees—and more than 85 additional community-based organizations and foundations nationwide—free access to its extensive research on philanthropy in communities of color. “One of my objectives is to help the field understand the breadth and depth of work that has already been conducted,” says Miller, “so that we don’t have to keep reinventing the wheel.”

**CHALLENGE GRANTS**

While the tools and capacity grants laid critical groundwork, an even larger focus of Innovation & Impact was its challenge grant strategy. We offered 12 challenge grants totaling more than $2.2 million, with those grants ranging from $50,000 to $500,000 over one to three years. Organizations receiving these grants faced a straightforward yet daunting task: to raise from community donors a set amount of money that would then be matched on either a 1:1 or 2:1 basis. The goal of this strategy was to stimulate increased giving, collective giving, and/or major gifts from community donors via identity-based funds by:

- Cultivating new donors through outreach and education.
- Strengthening the engagement of existing donors by helping them organize and plan their giving.
- Bringing an existing identity-based fund to scale or establishing a new one.
- Challenging donors to raise funds on behalf of particular community causes.

This required many grantees to create brand-new strategic donor engagement models for connecting donors to relevant community issues and change efforts—or to seek assistance in doing so from tool and capacity...
grantees. Indeed, many of the organizations who received these grants had never run a challenge campaign before—and more than a few had never actively sought community donors.

“We had never made individual giving a priority or done any big outreach,” says Cao K. O, executive director of the Asian American Federation. Instead, donors found them through word of mouth or through their published research reports on Asian American community issues. So when the Federation entered its first matching challenge, everyone was nervous. “We all worried, can we make it?” recalls O. “Individual giving takes time to cultivate—plus, the grant came the same year as the recession. But to our surprise, the donors came forward.” The Asian American Federation received two back-to-back challenge grants, for $185,000 and $90,000 respectively. Its fundraising exceeded the match requirements both times, thanks largely to small donors.

**Why Donors Matter**

One of the most powerful ways for an identity-based fund to amplify its impact is to expand its primary resource for doing so: namely, its donor base.

Without a doubt, communities of color teem with generosity. Much of that generosity is informal and casual, expressed through acts of benevolence and support so prevalent that they simply seem part of the fabric of a community taking care of itself. But when that generosity gets harnessed and directed through formal philanthropic vehicles like identity-based funds, something interesting happens. The funds can do more for their communities because they have more resources. But donors can also do more. Their contributions of time, money, and know-how can take on even greater power, depth, and dimension.

The first step in expanding a donor base is creating greater awareness and knowledge within communities about collective, strategic giving. “There are lots of individuals in communities of color who have the potential to give and want to give but need the support to help them become more effective in giving,” says trustee Joseph Stewart. The next step is expanding their engagement once they’re onboard. “I don’t think people come into this being a social change donor. So what will you do to help donors move through those levels of development?” says Darryl Lester, principal and founder of HindSight Consulting.

“What’s challenging is figuring out how to best support these new donors in their philanthropic journey, quickly moving them beyond the early stages of checkbook giving and toward leveraging their time and dollars through a more strategic lens,” says Katherine Fulton, president of Monitor Institute.

Yet this is a critical conversion, because just as identity-based fund organizers have sophisticated “inside” knowledge about how best to help their communities—so too do their donors. “Who knows best about the area you’re making grants to? Who can spark new energy into this area and provide a value that is unmet?” says Ramón Murguía, trustee for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. This is why most funds view their donors as partners, eagerly welcoming their hands-on input and involvement. “The people who are ‘experts’ at social change and who have the potential to make the most difference,” says Scot Nakagawa, former interim executive director at the Social Justice Fund, “are those most impacted by that change.”

“That’s why identity-based funds need the capacity to mobilize, support, and share ideas among this new generation of donors,” adds Fulton. “How will the funds capture and leverage the dollars, the donors, and the leadership to tackle the difficult problems facing these communities and beyond?” This is the critical question—and donors sit right at its center.

**Grantee**

The NATIONAL CENTER FOR BLACK PHILANTHROPY, based in Washington, DC, was established in 1999 to promote giving and volunteerism among African Americans, foster their full participation in all aspects of philanthropy, educate the public about the contributions of African American philanthropy, and research the benefits of black philanthropy to all Americans.
Because its identity-based fund—the Latino Community Foundation of Colorado—was so new, the Rose Community Foundation didn’t have a lot of experience in engaging community donors either. They took a different approach to their match. “We wanted to find 20 Latinos to give $25,000 each,” says Elsa Holguín, who coordinated the challenge campaign. The unexpected strategy drew in donors, half of whom were first-generation immigrants. It also sparked media attention. “The press thought it couldn’t be possible, Latinos giving $25,000!” says Holguín. “So we got two great outcomes from the match: we engaged new donors and elevated the conversation about Latinos as givers.”

Across the board, the challenge grants proved a “best practice” strategy for attracting new donors, reengaging existing donors, and raising a fund’s visibility. Despite the faltering economy, every single one of the challenge campaigns met or exceeded its fundraising goal.

By its nature, the matching challenge also helped identity-based organizations surmount what can otherwise be a big obstacle to giving: donors want to see their contributions used immediately and specifically to address community needs, and the match enabled that. “We could channel people’s contributions straight out in new grants to Native organizations because other funders were paying our core costs,” says Ken Gordon, outgoing executive director of the Potlatch Fund. “If we did not have this other support, and if we had to take a cut out of each donor’s contribution to pay for our operations, then our case would not be so compelling.”

In at least one community, the challenge grant was its first foray into collective community giving. The notion of contributing into a donor pool through an identity-based fund was anathema to the Arab American community before the match, says Maha Freij, deputy executive director and chief financial officer of the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS). “Individually we are very successful, but collectively we are not because there are so many reasons to not work together,” she says. “As a result, the individual donor community had not been positively engaged.”

ACCESS used its challenge grant to launch its new identity-based fund, the Center for Arab American Philanthropy (CAAP)—the first fund in the United States to engage Arab Americans in strategic philanthropy. “The match attracted so many people that ours was exhausted immediately,” says Manal Saab, an ACCESS donor who sits on CAAP’s professional advisory board. “Donors weren’t giving to their full capacity, but the matching money allowed to us to have deep conversations about how philanthropy can lift a community as a whole,” adds Freij. “This was the first grant that enabled us to really take a look at this work. It allowed us to have the staff, do pilot research, and do one-on-ones with major donors to study and learn from them.”
Manal Saab’s path to philanthropy was bumpy at best. Born in Beirut, Lebanon, her family escaped war by immigrating to the United States—a country that Saab had idolized and romanticized as a small child, devouring episodes of “CHiPs” and dreaming of faucets with running hot water.

Saab’s family arrived in Ohio during the Iranian revolution, when American public perception of the Middle East was particularly negative and limited. “Even though I was Lebanese, my fellow high school students saw me as a Khomeini,” says Saab. “And I didn’t speak a word of English.” Teased mercilessly by her classmates, Saab eventually got into enough trouble to be expelled. “I sat home watching soap operas for six months and learned English,” she says. Actually, she learned it to perfection. Saab graduated summa cum laude from Cleveland State University and then earned a master’s in public administration.

Her early difficulty acculturating to American life, coupled with memories of war in Beirut, created within Saab a deep devotion to people in need and drove her to pursue a career in public health. One day, she found herself on the east side of Cleveland, a poor area rife with crime, where she was developing an ambulatory outpatient clinic. Six men jumped her car. “Before I knew it, they stole everything,” says Saab, who was seven months pregnant at the time. But then one of her muggers recognized her clinic badge and started yelling at the others to bring everything back. Within a week, that man—James—was on her payroll and going to school.
“That experience gave me a great satisfaction so everlasting that I wanted to do more and more,” Saab says. “As an immigrant, you want that American dream, you want to claim one or two stitches of the fabric that makes this society so great. But you have to make sure it’s passed on by doing your part. To hold your rightful place as an American citizen is to give back.”

For Saab and her husband, Ghassan, that also means giving back to the Arab American community. Through their family foundation, the Saabs contribute generously to a host of local and national organizations, many of them Arab focused. In recent years, Saab has become deeply involved with one such organization in particular—the Arab American Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS). As a Michigan resident, Saab had long been impressed with ACCESS. But it was not until the organization launched a nationwide fundraising campaign in the wake of September 11, 2001, that she became a donor.

ACCESS’s efforts to bring together Arab American donors for a shared purpose at a time when anti-Arab sentiment was running so high proved a powerful draw for Saab. “Our community generally gives a little here, a little there, to our schools, mosque, or church,” says Saab. “But we don’t really impact social change. This was an opportunity to do that—and to do it collectively.” Today, Saab actively serves on the professional advisory board of ACCESS’s Center for Arab American Philanthropy and the national advisory board of its Arab American National Museum.

“Civic commitment is very contagious,” says Saab. “You can’t find yourself involved in one thing and not get involved in everything.” Certainly, that is true for Saab. In 2010, she and her husband became the first immigrants ever to receive the Russell G. Mawby Award for Philanthropy, the most prestigious philanthropy award in Michigan.

### CULTURES OF GIVING GRANTEES

**EXPANDING THE BOUNDARIES**

**Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS),** Dearborn, MI, 2005, **$300,000.** Establish permanent structures for promoting strategic philanthropy in the Arab American community.

**Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy,** San Francisco, CA, 2005, **$220,000.** Facilitate and stimulate philanthropic giving in Asian Pacific American communities.

**Association of Black Foundation Executives,** New York, NY, 2005, **$200,000.** Strengthen professional development opportunities for leaders in the philanthropic and nonprofit sectors while serving as a vehicle to increase philanthropy for and in black and Latino communities.

**Boston Women’s Fund,** Boston, MA, 2005, **$300,000.** Inspire local social change philanthropy in communities of color by documenting successful models for doing so through the collaborative “Our Public Spirit” project.
Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI, 2005, $186,480. Identify, connect, and support emerging donors of color in Metro Milwaukee through the Cardinal Stritch Leadership Center’s Philanthropy Incubator Project.

Center for Community Action, Lumberton, NC, 2005, $200,000. Establish the Giving Exchange, a tool for increasing the philanthropic engagement in communities of color in Robeson County, NC.


Diversity Pipeline Alliance, McLean, VA, 2005, $500,000. Develop the next generation of philanthropists of color through a national network dedicated to helping minorities pursue business careers.

Faith Partnerships, Raleigh, NC, 2005, $200,000. Increase the engagement of African American women of faith in social change philanthropy.

Foundation for the Mid South, Jackson, MS, 2005, $200,000. Grow its base of African American donors by fundraising for a new identity-based fund aimed at improving economic and social conditions in the Mid South.

Grassroots Leadership, Charlotte, NC, 2005, $400,000. Increase the philanthropic fundraising skills of African American leaders in the southeastern United States through education, outreach, and training.

Grotto Foundation, Minneapolis, MN, 2005, $180,000. Advance Native American leadership and participation in Minnesota by training foundation board, staff, and future-leader mentees in fund management, program development, and donor outreach.

Hands On Network, Atlanta, GA, 2005, $390,000. Promote sustainable community development within economically marginalized communities of color by engaging resident leaders and assets.


The Hopi Foundation, Kykotsmovi, AZ, 2006, $200,012. Support the development of a leadership and professional mentoring program to teach Hopi leaders the tactical and strategic skills needed to govern and grow philanthropic organizations.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund, Washington, DC, 2006, $300,000. Build the capacity of the Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity project to advance the mission of achieving racial equity in the philanthropic and nonprofit sectors.

Grantee

The NATIONAL CENTER FOR FAMILY PHILANTHROPY, based in Washington, DC, promotes philanthropic values, vision, and excellence across generations of donors and donor families. It works to ensure that these donors and their advisors have access to the highest quality information and the encouragement they need to achieve their charitable missions.

www.ncfp.org

National Center for Family Philanthropy, Washington, DC, 2005, $200,000. Strengthen the content and flow of information through the network of organizations serving donors within communities of color.

National Community Development Institute, Oakland, CA, 2005, $400,000. Create a community of learning around philanthropy in communities of color by developing and implementing a training and technical assistance program.

Native Americans in Philanthropy, Minneapolis, MN, 2005, $140,000. Increase the scope and effectiveness of Native philanthropy by broadening and deepening a network of Native funders, mainstream funders, and Native nonprofits.

Potlatch Fund, Seattle, WA, 2005, $200,000. Improve Northwest Native American communities by expanding the leadership capacity of Native American philanthropists and nonprofit organizations.

Public Allies, Milwaukee, WI, 2005, $406,878. Stimulate dialogue and giving between and by philanthropic institutions, women, and people of color, with a special focus on developing the philanthropic knowledge and skills of young people aged 18 to 30.


Southern Partners Fund, Atlanta, GA, 2005, $200,000. Develop a philanthropy and leadership network to enhance the individual and collective ability of leaders of color to activate community change.

Sponsors for Educational Opportunity, New York, NY, 2005, $199,998. Provide philanthropic leadership development training to young professionals who can channel their knowledge and resources back into communities of color.

Support Center for Nonprofit Management on behalf of the Coalition for New Philanthropy, New York, NY, 2005, $900,000. Increase the participation of donors and volunteers of color in five community nonprofits in metro New York: Asian American Federation of New York, the Center for Philanthropy and Civil Society at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, the Hispanic Federation, the New York Regional Association of Grantmakers, and the Twenty-First Century Foundation.

Third Sector New England on behalf of Resource Generation, Boston, MA, 2005, $320,000. Engage young wealthy people of color as participants and leaders in philanthropic networks.

Tides Center on behalf of Social Venture Network, San Francisco, CA, 2005, $394,320. Build partnerships between business leaders and social entrepreneurs of color; increase the resources aimed at combating institutional and structural racism through capacity building, education, and convenings of grantmakers and grantseekers.

Women’s Funding Network, San Francisco, CA, 2005, $395,000. Enable African American women’s organizations to develop strategic philanthropy competencies and provide leadership and donor engagement training to African American women and girls.
The Hopi Foundation's mission is to promote self-sufficiency, self-reliance, and local self-determination among the Hopi people (so much so that one of its guiding principles is *itam naapyani*, or “doing the work ourselves”). One of the first independent foundations in Indian country, it provides grants, technical assistance, and other services to villages and nonprofit organizations serving the Hopi people. Its services and programs address a range of social and economic issues on the reservation—including unemployment, poverty, and violence—while also promoting the preservation and celebration of traditional values and customs.

‘YOU TELL US’ | The Foundation looks almost entirely to the communities it serves to guide its direction from year to year. “People bring their requests to us—we do not go out and create programs for them,” says executive director Barbara Poley. Those who propose ideas are then responsible for helping bring them to fruition. “From the beginning, we have always asked our people, ‘What are you bringing to this project? What can you contribute?’” says Poley. “That started the work of leading our community and ourselves back into a feeling of empowerment.” Ultimately, she says, “if our work improves the material and spiritual condition of the Hopi people and others, we are on the right track. That is the bar against which we measure all our efforts.”

**STRENGTH THROUGH GIVING** | Hopi have been practicing philanthropy for centuries through reciprocity, bartering, potlatches, and resource sharing. “Our job is to perpetuate, enhance, and expand these practices in the context of today’s world,” says Poley. “We have to help our people understand that ‘philanthropy’ does not mean anything more than what we have been doing within our community for generations.” And community is the operative word; working collectively to solve Hopi
problems is a Foundation core principle. So is honoring community strength and wisdom. “We see our people as strong—not as weak, deficient people who need to be fixed,” says Poley. “The work that we do is based upon what we know about our community, but it is not based upon looking at our community as being ‘in poverty.’”

BEYOND THE RESERVATION | The Foundation helped sponsor the Center for Prevention and Resolution of Violence in Tucson, AZ, providing medical treatment and other assistance to indigenous people from 35 countries who are political exiles or victims of torture. The tribe also established a recurring $10,000 award for clinicians working with victims of torture in any part of the world. “The historical experiences of Hopi and other Native peoples create a heightened concern for human rights issues around the world,” Poley says. “We think it’s important for the Hopi Foundation to have a position on intolerance in the world and to do what we can to bring healing to those people who need it most.”

A CONTINUED CHALLENGE | While the Foundation has been active for more than two decades, Poley and her team still work hard to spread awareness of the organization. “That might not sound like a big challenge, but for us it is, because Hopi are raised and taught not to brag about ourselves.” Young Hopi often approach Poley and others saying they want to know more about the Foundation’s work. “Our challenge is making sure they know the work that we have been doing and invite them to participate as givers or volunteers,” Poley says.

CULTURES OF GIVING INVOLVEMENT

The Hopi Foundation received two rounds of Cultures of Giving funding:

• An Expanding the Boundaries grant (2005) to develop a leadership and professional mentoring program for Hopi leaders in philanthropy
• An Innovation & Impact tools and capacity grant (2007) to research and assess the giving capacity of the local Hopi community, develop a culturally appropriate fundraising toolkit, and train local organizations in building fundraising capacity

The launch of the Hopi Leadership Program, a 15-month course designed to cultivate and mentor a new generation of Hopi leaders, has been transformational for the organization—and for those taking the course. Prior to its first Cultures of Giving grant, the Foundation (and the Hopi more generally) had no formal way to prepare new leaders to guide Hopi institutions and organizations into the future. The Hopi Foundation used its Expanding the Boundaries grant to develop an entirely new model of leadership in which training in Western management practices would be complemented and informed by traditional Hopi knowledge and values.

But while running its first pilot program, the Foundation learned something surprising: participants were far less knowledgeable about traditional Hopi ways than expected. The boarding school experience and forced assimilation over several generations has created a deficit in knowledge about traditional Hopi culture, language, history, and values. “Before they could fully focus on Western philanthropic strategies, we felt ever strongly the need to better understand and transmit the Hopi perspective and establish a strong framework by which participants could eventually consider and evaluate non-Hopi perspectives and tools,” the Foundation reported. Additional sessions, including more Hopi language instruction and village visits, were added accordingly.

For participants, the Hopi Leadership Program has fostered an emerging vision of how they could be of service to their communities without sacrificing traditional values and beliefs. “By creating a professional development program that is firmly and specifically rooted in the Hopi worldview, we feel that we may have charted new territory for native communities,” the Foundation reported. Two participants from the first program have since established a nonprofit theater group working to teach community members and youth about Hopi history and values; others are applying their knowledge to their work in tribal government, delivery of healthcare services, treatment of victims of substance abuse, and helping survivors of childhood trauma. Said one participant in her final evaluation: “The program gave me hope that I could stay Hopi.”

Sources: Kellogg Foundation interviews with Barbara Poley; Cultures of Giving grant applications and final reports; “Leadership Talks with Barbara A. Poley and Loris Ann Taylor of the Hopi Foundation,” Leadership for a Changing World, 16 December 2005; the Hopi Foundation website.
North Carolina People’s Coalition for Giving (NCGives). Initially funded under our Unleashing Resources Initiative, NCGives was later added to the Expanding the Boundaries cluster of organizations; however, its grants—totaling approximately $6 million—were not counted under Expanding the Boundaries.

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN ACTION AWARDS

Each recipients received $50,000 and an original commissioned art piece created by an up-and-coming artist.

2005

American India Foundation (New York, NY) for its creative work in enabling potential donors to help catalyze social and economic change in India through online donations and hands-on volunteerism.

Association of Black Foundation Executives (New York, NY) for its work with grantmakers to increase the number of grants addressing African American issues and concerns.

Hispanic Federation/Latino Funds Collaborative (New York, NY) for spearheading a joint effort by six Latino funds to strengthen Latino involvement in philanthropy.

National Community Development Institute (Oakland, CA) for its work to promote community development and social transformation in diverse, low-income areas.

Pointe Coupee Community Enrichment Fund (Point Coupee Parish, LA) for promoting philanthropy as a tool to bridge gaps of race and class in rural communities.

2007

Asian American Federation of New York (New York, NY) for advancing the civic voice and well-being of Asian Americans through increased community philanthropy, research, and support to community service organizations.

Asian Immigrant Women Advocates (Oakland, CA) for empowering low-income, limited English-speaking Asian and Latina immigrant women to bring about positive changes in their workplaces, community, and broader society.

Associated Black Charities of Maryland (Baltimore, MD) for representing, responding to, and fostering coordinated leadership on issues of special significance to Maryland’s African American communities.

First Nations Development Institute (Longmont, CO) for its work assisting Native peoples in controlling their own assets and building capacity to direct their economic futures in ways that fit their cultures.

Hispanics in Philanthropy (San Francisco, CA) for increasing philanthropic investment in Latino communities, supporting participation of Latinos in philanthropy, and fostering policy change to enhance equity and inclusiveness.

Grantee

Based in Oakland, CA, the NATIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE is recognized as one of the premier technical assistance providers for grassroots organizations in low-income communities of color. NCDI’s core strategies are technical support and training services, cross-cultural bridge building, and the development and advancement of the capacity-building field.

www.ncdinet.org
2008

**ACCESS** (Dearborn, MI) for providing economic and social services to Arab immigrants, Arab Americans, and non-Arabs alike while breaking down linguistic and cultural barriers.

**Native Americans in Philanthropy** (Minneapolis, MN) for its work to promote, facilitate, and celebrate philanthropic giving to Native communities while providing professional development opportunities and support for Native Americans working in the field of philanthropy.

**Potlatch Fund** (Seattle, WA) for nurturing the Native tradition of giving in Northwest Indian Country and promoting the economic development, civic participation, and overall well-being of Native people and their communities.

**Rose Community Foundation** (Denver, CO) for its leadership in advancing cross-cultural collaborations with Denver’s Latino community and supporting initiatives to strengthen philanthropy in communities of color.

**The Twenty-First Century Foundation** (New York, NY) for facilitating strategic giving for black community change and working with donors to invest in institutions and leaders that address challenges within black communities across the country.

**SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM**

**Faith Partnerships,** $20,000. Convene three meetings to create dialogue with the African American faith community about identity-based funds and social change philanthropy. Partners: Women’s Foundation for a Greater Memphis, National Black United Funds.

**Hispanic Federation,** $20,000. Convene and assist current Cultures of Giving challenge grantees and new Hispanic funds that want to join the alliance. Partners: Rose Community Foundation, National Latino Funds Alliance.

**Potlatch Fund,** $20,000. Convene on issues relevant to Native American philanthropy. Partner: First Nations Development Institute.


**INNOVATION & IMPACT: TOOLS AND CAPACITY GRANTS**

**ACCESS,** Dearborn, MI, 2007, $75,000. Help the Collaborative for Arab American Philanthropy (CAAP) develop training materials and philanthropic advisory services for Arab American donors.

**Center for Community Action,** Lumberton, NC, 2008, $75,000 (with challenge grant). Create fundraising tools for engaging multicultural, rural donors in supporting NC women’s economic empowerment, coupled with a challenge grant to develop a women’s fund to support low-income women pursuing education and career advancement.

**Center on Philanthropy & Civil Society and Research Foundation of the City University of New York,** New York, NY, 2007, $30,000. Provide free access to the Center’s research on philanthropy in communities of color to other grantees and more than 85 additional community-based organizations and foundations nationwide.

**Changemakers,** San Francisco, CA, 2007, $75,000. Develop and deliver the donor education curriculum “Essentials for Diversity in Giving” to the staff of philanthropic affinity groups, regional associations of grantmakers, and community-based funds and foundations.
As a Chinese American growing up in Houston, Rogene Calvert didn’t know much about her culture. It wasn’t until she started traveling around the country after college that interest in her Chinese heritage—and a determination to help her own local Asian American community thrive and prosper—began to blossom. “I was seeing these great resources in other cities like Boston and Denver and San Francisco and New York,” says Calvert. “I wondered why we didn’t have more resources in Houston for our Asian community, who had cultural and linguistic barriers to getting services.”

So Calvert began creating those resources herself. For 30 years and counting, she’s been a fixture in Houston’s nonprofit world, directing and advising organizations that serve Asian American children and families and spearheading programs designed to lift the whole community into greater physical and mental health. Among her proudest accomplishments: founding the Asian American Family Counseling Center and the Asian American Health Coalition/HOPE Clinic—both of which now boast operating budgets topping $1 million.

But something still bugged Calvert. “We didn’t have a lot of philanthropy in Houston in terms of Asian American giving and I often wondered why,” she says. “I realized that while Asian Americans do a lot to take care of one another, the ‘Western way’ of giving was not well understood in our community.”
So Calvert set out to change that—starting with herself. “As a nonprofit person, I was always the one going after people for money. I never really considered myself a donor.” Without much money to give, Calvert instead gifted her time and talent. She became an active volunteer and community advocate, serving on a bevy of local boards and making a habit of approaching mainstream funders with compelling, needs-based arguments for investing in Houston’s Asian American community. “You have to stay on those folks who have the ability and resources to help,” she says.

Calvert’s personal philanthropy deepened even further in 2007, when she co-founded the Asian American Giving Circle of Greater Houston, a designated fund of the Greater Houston Community Foundation. “We kept the membership modest at $300 a year because we want to attract immigrants as well as young people,” explains Calvert. Now in its fourth grant cycle, the circle distributes $10,000 annually to Asian American-focused organizations and projects in the Houston area. Last year, AAPIP matched some of the funds they raised, giving the group new impetus.

One of Calvert’s favorite aspects of the giving circle is seeing how much excitement the act of giving generates for its members. “I come from nonprofits so grantmaking isn’t new to me,” she says. “But seeing accountants and lawyers and others get really enthralled by the process of reviewing grants and selecting grantees has been amazing.” Even more striking, says Calvert, is the group’s deepening awareness of community issues and needs. “For many of our members, doing site visits is the first time they’ve really gone out into the community and seen its needs up close,” she says. “It makes us all want to do even more.”

Delta Research and Education Foundation, Washington, DC, 2007, $40,000; 2008, $40,000. Produce training materials and learning aids for engaging African American donors and provide workshops and seminars to the network of 950 chapters of the Delta Sigma Theta sorority. Use these materials to increase the fundraising capacity of African American women, particularly Delta Sigma Theta members.

Faith Partnerships, Raleigh, NC, 2007, $40,000; 2008, $40,000. Develop donor engagement training sessions for African American women involved with faith-based organizations and networks in the South. Codify the curriculum so that training sessions can be taught more widely.

First Nations Development Institute, Longmont, CO, 2008, $75,000. Provide training and technical assistance to Native American tribes considering whether and how to create tribally controlled grantmaking vehicles.

Foundation for the Mid South, Jackson, MS, 2007, $75,000. Provide tools and services to enhance the capacity of community-based organizations to engage community donors in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

The Hopi Foundation, Kykotsmovi, AZ, 2007, $75,000. Research and assess the current giving capacity of the local Hopi community, develop a culturally appropriate fundraising toolkit, and conduct targeted training to help local organizations build their fundraising capacity.

Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Los Angeles, CA, 2007, $75,000. Develop and provide training to implement culturally competent curricula on giving across communities of color, in partnership with the National Black United Fund, the National Society of Hispanic MBAs, and its own base of Asian American professionals.

Minneapolis Foundation on behalf of the Grotto Foundation, Minneapolis, MN, 2008, $75,000. Expand the Grotto Foundation’s philanthropic leadership program to include culturally based trainings on donor engagement, fund development, and fundraising for Minnesota’s Native American community.

Native Americans in Philanthropy, Minneapolis, MN, 2007, $75,000. Develop a fundraising curriculum for strengthening and increasing giving, receiving, and sharing in Native American communities, based on past collaborative work between NAIP and Indiana University’s Center on Philanthropy.

Rose Community Foundation on behalf of the Latino Community Foundation of Colorado, Denver, CO, 2008, $82,000 (with challenge grant). Support capacity-building donor engagement trainings for grantees of the Latino Community Foundation of Colorado, along with a challenge grant to stimulate giving to LCFC.

Women’s Funding Network, San Francisco, CA, 2007, $55,000; 2008, $50,000. Provide training in social change fundraising and grantmaking and develop a set of tools to promote sustainable fundraising efforts for community-based organizations focused on women of color. Disseminate these tools through a distance learning curriculum on social change fundraising for African American and Latina donors.

INNOVATION & IMPACT: CHALLENGE GRANTS

ACCESS, Dearborn, MI, 2008, $100,000. Launch the Center for Arab American Philanthropy (CAAP) as a social change fund for Arab American donors supporting Arab American communities.

Asian American Federation of New York, New York, NY, 2007, $185,000; 2008, $90,000. Expand Asian American giving in New York City, help AAF’s Community Fund leverage matching funds to stimulate giving for disadvantaged Asian American youth and elders, and endow the fund. Further encourage giving to AAF’s Community Fund, with a focus on increasing the number of new Asian American donors, including young professionals and high-net-worth individuals, and engaging them with community issues.


Grantee

Founded in 1990 and based in Minneapolis, MN, NATIVE AMERICANS IN PHILANTHROPY is strengthening indigenous communities by creating deeper ties with the philanthropic sector, advocating for increased resources and Native leadership, and supporting the development of Native philanthropy.

www.nativephilanthropy.org
**Hispanic Federation**, New York, NY, 2007, **$300,000**; 2008, **$325,000**. Encourage new and increased giving by Latino professionals to Latino-focused social change funds of the six-member National Latino Funds Alliance, including the Hispanic Federation. Expand the matching challenge for four of the six partners in the National Latino Funds Alliance and cultivate new donors of color through fundraising events and donor leadership activities.

**National Black United Fund**, Newark, NJ, 2007, **$200,000**. Stimulate new and increased giving by African American donors in four areas: New York/New Jersey; Atlanta, GA; Detroit, MI; and Chicago, IL.

**Potlatch Fund**, Seattle, WA, 2007 & 2008, **$225,000**. Explore new approaches to cultivating individual donors among the 54 federally recognized Native American tribes in the Pacific Northwest.

**Social Justice Fund Northwest**, Seattle, WA, 2007, **$200,000**. Inspire new and increased giving from donors of color and increase the fund’s overall grantmaking for racial justice in the Northwestern U.S.

**Twenty-First Century Foundation**, New York, NY, 2007, **$200,000**; 2008, **$90,000**. Stimulate giving from African American donors to the foundation’s Black Men and Boys Fund, which provides grants to programs for education, employment, criminal justice reform, and fatherhood support. Further support new donor engagement through donor-hosted house parties and one-on-one meetings and issue briefings, as well as partnerships with the UCLA Black Alumni Association, Alpha Phi Alpha, faith-based groups, and other community networks.

Grantee

POINTE COUPEE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION, based in Pointe Coupee Parish, LA, is promoting philanthropy as a tool to bridge gaps of race and class in rural Louisiana. The Foundation supports nonprofits and public organizations that build up its parish and its residents.

www.pccommunityfoundation.org
The four Cultures of Giving strategies described in the previous chapter, as well as the exploratory steps that preceded them, were all different but complementary efforts to feed and water the same growing tree. Each effort was designed to help identity-based funds and their supporting organizations build new roots while at the same time expanding their capacities and capabilities outward and upward. And early results suggest that this is exactly what happened.

Across the Cultures of Giving network, grantees’ knowledge and sophistication grew appreciably over the period of their funding. “Their work showed terrific progress and momentum,” says deputy director Alandra Washington. “Even through rocky times like the economic recession, it got better, more strategic, and more aligned as time went on.” This was particularly true for grantees funded under more than one initiative and/or those who participated in the national networking meetings over multiple years.

In general, most grantees were still in ramp-up mode in 2005-6, conducting research on community issues, identifying potential partners and leaders, establishing appropriate new directions, and positioning themselves for future activities. In 2007, their work became more focused as they realigned staff, strengthened their infrastructures to support planned projects, leveraged resources by forming advisory councils and working groups, and began disseminating information through workshops, issue briefings, and research reports. By 2008, grantee activities were much more refined and mostly focused on deepening donor engagement and bolstering their own organizational sustainability.

---

**Grantee**

Seattle-based POTLATCH FUND is a nonprofit community foundation serving 54 federally recognized tribes in the Northwestern United States. The Fund expands and inspires philanthropy for and by Native Americans by helping them create Native nonprofits that address community issues and supporting those nonprofits through small grants and continued trainings.

www.potlatchfund.org
Obviously, not all grantees followed the same trajectory or held themselves to the same metrics of progress and success. But it is no exaggeration to say that Cultures of Giving had a significant impact on grantee organizations and the communities they serve. While it is too soon to measure long-term results, the early outcomes are inspiring:

- Grantees established 205 working collaborations during the course of this work, and 91 percent of grantees engaged in knowledge-sharing.
- 94 percent created new leadership.
- 82 percent reported developing effective new models and practices.
- $5.9 million was raised by the 64 percent of grantees reporting figures for the period of their funding—all of which targeted programs and services in communities of color. Assuming the remaining 36 percent generated funds at a similar rate, the total amount raised could be as high as $8.8 million.
- Cultures of Giving challenge grant campaigns raised $4.4 million in contributions from more than 1,500 community donors.
- Despite coinciding with the economic recession, all challenge grant campaigns met or exceeded their match.
- Overall, donor engagement deepened: 150 outreach events were attended by 2,500+ donors of color.
- 1,400 staff of community-based organizations attended 75 trainings and workshops.
- 17 new formal 501c3 community organizations emerged as a result of grantee activities.
- More than $2.9 million was distributed through grants back into communities of color. (This figure does not include the costs of leadership development trainings, capacity building workshops, and other services and programs created by grantees to spread awareness and build engagement in their communities.)

While it will take a greater longitudinal study to fully measure the impact of Cultures of Giving on vulnerable children and families in communities of color, we do know that millions were positively touched by this work. We also have a conservative estimate of the number of communities likely to have been directly affected, as well as their broad-stroke characteristics, based on the zip codes in which grantees were located and the places where community mobilization occurred:

- 226 local communities were touched directly by grantee community funding and mobilization activities. 92 percent were in urban locations.
- 7.7 million people live in these communities, including 1.7 million families and 1.9 million children under the age of 18.
- On average, 15 percent of families in these communities are headed by women and have children under the age of 18, and at least 10 percent...
MISSION

Social Justice Fund Northwest works to address the root causes of social, economic, and environmental inequities through strategic grantmaking efforts to grassroots organizations that are tackling these issues throughout the Northwestern United States. The Fund is structured as a membership organization, where member donations are pooled to create a grant fund and members participate as decision-makers in determining the distribution of that money. Its members are a cross-race, cross-class group of more than 600 individuals, 35 percent of whom identify as people of color. Since its inception, the Fund has granted more than $11 million to launch and sustain community-based organizations that promote democracy, human rights, and racial and economic justice in the region.

INTERNAL TRANSFORMATION | The Social Justice Fund was founded in 1978 by a small group of wealthy white donors—and for most of its history it remained predominantly white. In 1997, the Fund made a structural commitment to diversifying the class and racial composition of its donor base, amending its bylaws to open membership to people with a much broader range of incomes: individuals could join for a minimum contribution of $1,000 or 1 percent of their annual income. However, this did not substantially change membership demographics, so in 2003 the amount was lowered to $240. “It opened us up to a whole new diversity of people,” says Bookda Gheisar, who served as the Fund’s executive director from 2000 to 2007. “It also allowed us to engage our communities in a cross-cultural dialogue we didn’t have access to before.”

DEEP PARTICIPATION | Because it is a member-based foundation, all granting decisions are either made or influenced by donors. “When someone gives us a gift, they are eligible to sit at the grant committee table and be a part of giving that money away,” according to the Fund.
Scot Nakagawa, who served as interim director in 2008, says member input helps steer funds to where they’re most needed. “Because our members are diverse, we get access to cross-class, multi-racial, and varied opinions from some of the people closest to the changes being made,” says Nakagawa. All members are encouraged to participate fully in the Fund—whether by helping out with fundraising, hosting a party, writing for the newsletter, or lending their time and talent to another task. “They have the option of being marginally or highly involved in the work that we do, which puts the power to enact change in their own hands,” says Nakagawa.

**CLOSING THE GAP** | The Fund’s primary goal is to be a financial resource to “groups that are difficult for traditional funders to support—usually those that are smaller than average or are tackling controversial or innovative ideas,” says Nakagawa. By funding such organizations—and involving its members so intimately in the grantmaking—the Fund believes it is “closing the gap between the giver and the receiver in social justice philanthropy,” says Gheisar. “Every time I take a grantmaker on a site visit for the first time, they get to see firsthand what’s going on among the grassroots organizations we seek to help,” adds Nakagawa. “I can actually see minds changing.”

**CULTURES OF GIVING INVOLVEMENT**

Social Justice Fund received two rounds of Cultures of Giving funding:

- an Expanding the Boundaries grant (2005) to increase its donor base and increase donor participation in leadership roles
- an Innovation & Impact matching grant (2007) to stimulate new and increased giving from donors of color and to increase the Fund’s overall racial justice grantmaking

Under Expanding the Boundaries, the Fund experimented with a variety of donor engagement strategies, including media campaigns, subsidized membership fees, and awareness and visibility forums. Most significantly, the Fund intensified its engagement with the People of Color in Philanthropy Network, a formal collaboration of six grantmaking organizations in the Northwest concerned about the access and visibility of people of color in philanthropy, first convened by the Fund in 2003. During the grant period, collaborators in the Network facilitated introductions and provided networking opportunities that helped the Fund identify new members.

Social Justice Fund also made significant strides toward increasing donor participation in leadership roles. By 2007, 40 percent of the board and 67 percent of staff were people of color. However, this intensified diversification—and the new organizational configuration it ushered in—created unforeseen challenges. First, many at the Fund began to question the amount of time they were spending on attracting small donors; while the diversity of their donor base was increasing, their overall fundraising numbers were not. Second, as the involvement of people of color increased, many current white donors (referred to by the Fund as “allies”) felt displaced from the organization and began to reduce their donation of both money and time. These challenges compelled the Fund to refine its strategy going forward, increasing the cost of membership and better defining the role of allies.

In 2007, the Fund launched its Innovation & Impact work with an intensive donor engagement campaign, which was led by current donors of color and used matching funds from the grant as incentive. Although the Fund did attract new members and donors as a result of these efforts, this time it was not as successful in increasing the diversity of its membership: members identifying as people color rose from 37 percent in 2007 to just 38 percent in 2008. This result was partially attributed to a major leadership transition experienced by the Fund during this time. Bookda Gheisar, the Fund’s longtime executive director and the leader of its effort to diversify and democratize, left in late 2007. An interim director stayed for nine months, with Scot Nakagawa stepping in for the remainder of 2008. Ultimately, the timing of this leadership transition dampened the effectiveness of its donor engagement campaign.

**SOURCES:** 2007 annual report; Kellogg Foundation interviews with Bookda Gheisar and Scot Nakagawa; Cultures of Giving grant applications and final reports; the Social Justice Fund Northwest website.
earn less than $10,000 a year. Both of these estimates are more than twice the national rate. Across communities, median family income is 27 percent lower than the national median.

• **1.4 million** community residents live below the federal poverty level—and **36** percent are children.

• Unemployment in these communities is **twice** the national rate.

Of course, embedded deep inside these statistics is the real “juice” of this work: the thousands of moments when a life changed because of it. These are the stories we’ll never know and can only imagine: the sharp burst of pride felt by a first-time donor; a recent immigrant learning his first words of English thanks to a program offered by a grantee; a teen who can’t afford college opening the letter announcing his scholarship; a company inspired to create a match after reading a brochure about giving circles; a donor becoming a staffer, or a staffer a donor, because she finds the work so invigorating; an executive director feeling reenergized because of a thank-you note from a person grateful that her interests—and her ethnicity—are being served and represented. These are the most powerful and lasting effects of this work—and they will continue to multiply and spread out, like seeds, over time.

**THE LEARNING LADDER**

The experiences of grantees provide strong hints to mainstream funders about how to support the field as it grows. They also offer critical tips to those working in the trenches of identity-based philanthropy about what challenges to expect and how some of them might be managed. As we found through our support of this work, nearly all of the leaders and organizations involved in raising and running identity-based funds face a similar set of issues. Those that learned to anticipate and navigate these issues well were the most likely to experience continued growth and sustainability.

Before sharing the lessons emerging from this work, we first want to call attention to a meta-lesson: an important pattern we observed among grantees, their partners and donors, and even ourselves during the course of Cultures of Giving. It has to do with what Hopi Foundation executive director Barbara Poley calls **firsts**: the sometimes startling number of new experiences that an identity-based fund must steer its way through as its operations and/or programmatic experiments expand.

**Grantee**

**PUBLIC ALLIES’** mission is to advance new leadership to strengthen communities, nonprofits, and civic participation. Since 1992, the Milwaukee, WI-based organization has been developing a new generation of diverse leaders and promoting innovative leadership practices that meet the demands of changing times.

www.publicallies.org
“There are a lot of firsts for us as an organization,” says Poley. “Once you have experience in something like a matching challenge, you know how it works. But before that you have no idea.” In the absence of a definitive guide to raising and growing an identity-based fund, most practitioners “learn by doing”—again and again. The pattern goes something like this: at any point in time, a fund possesses a certain level of knowledge, experience, and readiness. Then a new opportunity comes along—in the form of a sudden infusion of capital, a new grant, a prospective partnership, or maybe a new program idea. Whatever its form, this new opportunity forces the fund out of familiar territory and into a new context of decision-making and learning. This can happen very frequently, particularly to young funds.

According to our grantees, it doesn’t take much to tip them into a whole new world they’re not yet familiar with—or, put another way, to challenge them to climb the next rung in their own ladder of learning. For example, many of our Innovation & Impact challenge grants went to organizations that did not have extensive experience in staging a challenge campaign, and some had never gone after small donors. The external impetus to focus on cultivating a wide base of community members, many reported, forced them to grow in areas they otherwise would have neglected. But there was considerable learning involved. “On some level, we are all inventing the process of how to do this,” says the Rose Community Foundation’s Elsa Holguín.

Success also forces funds to climb another rung. “When we started with our funding from the Kellogg Foundation, we were not in any way anticipating how fast we would succeed,” says Diana Wilson, president of Faith Partnerships. With her Expanding the Boundaries grant, Wilson wanted to educate influential women of faith about the value of collective philanthropy and giving circles in particular. Before she knew it, giving circles started to formalize all around her. This was wonderful. But it left Faith Partnerships with the question: now what? So, up the ladder they climbed.

At other times, organizations get blindsided by an unexpected opportunity. For example, a donor recently offered the Asian American Federation a $2 million match, with all matched funds going toward its endowment. “It’s an incredible opportunity but also a big challenge for us,” says executive director Cao K. O. In order to reach that number, the organization would need to pursue wealthy donors—something it has never done before. Most of its donors are in the $1,000 to $5,000 range. “The offer has created a healthy tension for us,” says O. “It has raised a lot of questions and even opened a debate about our mission. I think of moments like this as growing pains for the organization.”

Chandra Anderson, longtime consultant to identity-based funds and now interim president of the Twenty-First Century Foundation, says the key to navigating these new burst of learning and opportunity is self-awareness. “Organizations don’t know what they don’t know,” says Anderson.
MISSION

Founded in 1985 through a $100,000 United Way grant, Associated Black Charities (ABC) has successfully managed more than $110 million in grants and provided technical assistance to more than 1,000 community-based organizations. “We serve as a broker to close the health and wealth gap for Maryland’s families and children, especially African Americans,” says Diane Bell-McKoy, ABC’s president and CEO. “We raise funds to help other groups do their work in the community, and we pay attention to the issues that impact the African American community’s ability to be as healthy, wealthy, and robust as it can be.” Through its funding and grantmaking, ABC addresses issues of education, healthcare, leadership development, community empowerment, economic empowerment, and wealth building. ABC also serves as a funding catalyst and fiscal agent for nonprofit and community-based organizations across the state of Maryland.

BROAD FOCUS | With a mission to spark change and increase opportunity in communities of color statewide, ABC supports a variety of approaches in multiple counties and across all age groups. For example, the organization staffs a state coalition to address health disparities, manages the data collection and outreach for a public policy agenda on obesity, and administers grants to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS and tobacco use in a number of communities throughout the state. ABC also facilitates scholarships from area donors and businesses, holds leadership training for seasoned professionals, and provides funds for an innovative after-school program to
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keep high school students connected to school and work opportunities.

**FOSTERING LOCAL INVOLVEMENT** | While many of the counties in which ABC works have high poverty rates, it is also true that Maryland has one of the largest concentrations of African American wealth in the country, says Bell-McKoy. Fostering local leadership and involvement across all facets of the African American community is an effort Associated Black Charities takes seriously. “The African American community doesn’t always see themselves as philanthropists, although they are and have been, historically, through the black church and so many other ways,” says Bell-McKoy. “We’re helping people understand that ‘philanthropy’ means them, it means their neighbors—and that giving of their time, talent, and dollars can make a difference.”

**MORE IN THE MIDDLE** | To close the wealth gap in Maryland and to strengthen the competitiveness of the region and state, ABC launched “More in the Middle,” a wealth building initiative designed to retain, grow, and attract a greater African American middle class in Maryland through five strategic interventions: homeownership and foreclosure prevention; workforce development and career advancement; higher education readiness, access, and completion; business and economic development; and asset building and financial literacy. “The More in the Middle agenda offers an ‘on-ramp’ for everyone in the state of Maryland,” says Bell-McKoy. “Areas with long-lasting economic weaknesses are bad for growing and sustaining families, businesses, and prosperity. But strengthening economically distressed ‘linchpin’ groups positively affects the families, communities, and social and economic structures around them.”

**HEALTHIER AND WEALTHIER** | Supported by the investment of individual donors, corporations, foundations, and other public and private funds, ABC continues its mission to facilitate the creation of measurably healthier and wealthier communities throughout Maryland through responsible leadership and philanthropic investment. To date, ABC has created several giving circles to pool and strengthen the impact of money from local donors, and Bell-McKoy says plans are underway to create more in the future. As part of its effort to increase knowledge of charitable giving vehicles in the African American community, ABC also hosts community workshops on estate planning and planned giving.

**BUILDING CAPACITY** | Among ABC’s top priorities for the future is increasing unrestricted funding to support a stronger capacity building unit with an emphasis on measuring impact and outcomes, and assisting the groups it serves to do the same. “Within communities of color and low-wealth communities, you have strengths and assets,” says Bell-McKoy. “Good outcomes come as a result of strong, targeted, and well-staffed organizations. We’re just a part of the critical pathway in bringing about change in communities and on behalf of families and children.”

---

**CULTURES OF GIVING INVOLVEMENT**

Associated Black Charities of Maryland was one of five organizations to receive a National Leadership in Action Award in 2007. ABC used its $50,000 award to energize its outreach to African Americans in Baltimore, update its educational philanthropic tools, establish a partnership with an area magazine, and develop a network of informational workshops and forums about philanthropy.

**SOURCES:** Kellogg Foundation interview with Diane Bell-McKoy; the Associated Black Charities of Maryland website; the Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers blog.
For example, grantees who received challenge grants suddenly found themselves having to learn how to manage and store the money they raised. “When you start getting money from 1,000 donors versus three, there are a whole different set of processes that you have to put in place—but many organizations don’t understand that they don’t know how to do that,” says Anderson. “When they can recognize that there’s something new they have to learn, then the door begins to open. But they first have to have that recognition, and they need someone they trust to give them the lesson.”

Similarly, donors have their own learning ladder to climb. As donors get more engaged in philanthropy and in working with funds, they face opportunities to do things they’ve never done before. “I remember the first time new donors had to read grant proposals,” recalls the Rose Community Foundation’s Holguín. “They had no idea what to do, but they were mostly businesspeople. So I told them it was like a business plan: think of it as a proposition for you to invest.” That group of donors has since moved beyond that growth challenge and into another: they’re in conversation about developing their own program.

With every step up the ladder, relationships among organizations, funders, donors, and communities can shift. The key is having the insight to know when this might happen and how to prepare for it. At each level, identity-based funds and their donors build relationships that are new and different from the ones they’ve had before. Both have to open themselves to learning and renegotiating those relationships.

LESSONS FOR THE FIELD

Below is a mix of lessons, challenges, and best practices that emerged from Cultures of Giving. This list is not exhaustive, but simply aims to highlight the most important learnings from this work as judged by our grantees, our evaluator, and our program team.

**Staffing and staff capacity.** Understanding the minimal number of staff needed to launch and maintain a fund is extremely important. Nearly half of all grantees reported staffing challenges, which took several forms. Most funds had limited staff to begin with; once they received their grants, the additional work required to manage a new program or strategy threw many funds into immediate staffing distress. Adding even one staff member could make a critical difference. Identifying people with the appropriate levels of expertise and experience is crucial for success.

**Grantee**

Boston-based RESOURCE GENERATION organizes young people with financial wealth to leverage their resources, their privilege, and their collective power to make lasting social and structural change, bringing all they have and all they are to the movements and issues they care about.

www.resourcegeneration.org
of experience and expertise was also vitally important; so was learning how to groom and grow a staff of skilled professionals who stick around for the long haul. The staffing issue was most critical when it came to donor engagement. Having dedicated staff—particularly fundraising staff—greatly increased the capacity to attract, engage, and retain donors and to explore diverse funding streams. Keeping donors engaged takes communication, infrastructure, and most of all, time.

**Leadership.** Not surprisingly, identity-based funds established and led by donor-leaders from the community they serve tend to have the greatest growth potential and staying power; this is also true for the organizations supporting or growing these funds. Additionally, funds led by long-term leaders who had championed them since their inception experienced considerably more stability. By far the most significant leadership challenge faced by grantees was turnover: many experienced the “revolving door” problem, particularly when it came to the leaders of their fundraising staff. High turnover greatly inhibited their ability to maintain continuity in donor cultivation, board development, and grantmaking. Other leadership issues included difficulty in shifting from a top-down model of leadership to one that was more democratic and dealing with tension between “old guard” leaders and young staff.

**Culturally relevant donor engagement.** Developing and deploying targeted donor engagement strategies that strengthened donors’ connection with community issues greatly enhanced a fund’s relevance and reach. Grantees that researched the various practices of giving in their communities, identified concrete community assets that could be used to address community needs, and took into account the diversity within their communities when designing outreach and programs were the most successful. For example, Native Americans in Philanthropy quickly realized that to run a leadership program in the Native community, it had to be attuned to the different cultural identities of more than 500 tribal nations.

**Demonstrating and communicating value and impact.** Measuring social change is a fuzzy prospect at best. Demonstrating “return on investment” can be particularly challenging for organizations focused on harnessing time and talent versus raising and distributing dollars. Yet funders and donors alike want to know that their resources are being used strategically to create real change. “There is a lot of anecdotal evidence, but often the grants aren’t big enough to justify evaluations that would make the case to mainstream foundations about the effectiveness of these funds,” says Kellogg Foundation trustee Ramón Murguía. As the field grows over time, the pressure to demonstrate measurable impacts will increase.

**Trust and transparency.** “When funders come to a community, there are immediate and detrimental power disruptions,” says trustee Fred Keller. These disruptions can become particularly charged when the issues being supported through funding are related to race, ethnicity, personal identity, and community self-determination. Any perception or mere hint of paternalism could derail a well-intended program and serve to deepen
any existing rifts between communities and outside funders. Funders must find ways to energize and assist communities without being prescriptive or dropping in money and running. “Ultimately, we have the power as funders to create a positive reinforcement or perpetuate a destructive system,” says Keller. “If we don’t get it right, we can be in the latter category. We must get it right.”

Clarity and transparency are fundamental to building trust between funders and funds and between funds and their donors. There were several moments during Cultures of Giving when we relearned this lesson. For example, when we announced that the primary funding strategy for Innovation & Impact would be challenge grants, grantees suggested that we were suddenly assigning greater importance to the giving of financial resources than to the giving of time and talent and were no longer committed to a more inclusive definition of giving in communities of color. As a result, we deepened our conversation with grantees about the initiative’s key goals, which clarified our intentions. Similarly, grantees that engaged in dialogue and solicited input from their communities were more likely to develop meaningful, trust-filled relationships with donors and other community organizations.

Target-rich networking. Individual identity-based funds, as well as the field as a whole, grow primarily through relationships. Encounters with potential funders, donors, and partners all become highly more likely if those leading a fund are actively pursuing these connections by spending time in “target rich” environments like workshops, conferences, and community events. The most nimble and successful grantees were those constantly trolling for new knowledge and connections. “I’m out all the time at as many events in the Latino community as possible, meeting people, cultivating relationships, and building our reputation,” says Marcelina Rivera, former executive director of the Latino Community Foundation of Colorado. “It’s community organizing the old-fashioned way. There may be newer or more ‘sophisticated’ models of doing this work, but in our community, personal relationships and face-to-face time matter.” Nearly all grantees reported that establishing relationships with other community institutions—whether civic, religious, or professional—helped leverage their leadership potential in their community. Personal outreach was also far more effective than institutional approaches in identifying and developing community leaders and donors.

**Grantee**
Based in Seattle, WA, **SOCIAL JUSTICE FUND NORTHWEST** is a nonprofit membership organization working to address the root causes of social, economic, and environmental inequities through strategic grantmaking efforts to grassroots organizations that are tackling these issues throughout the Northwestern United States.

www.socialjusticefund.org
**Building endowments.** Most grantees reported feeling constantly pulled between raising money to give out in grants for immediate community needs versus building endowments in order to ensure their sustainability over time. “Many of these funds have very small endowments and have to raise money year to year,” says trustee Ramón Murguía. “But it’s critical to their long-term success to raise more endowments.” Yet finding the funds to direct toward an organization’s sustainability can be extremely difficult. “Donors tend to want to give to immediate needs and see their money go right out into the community,” says the Rose Community Foundation’s Holguín. “So how do we challenge donors to put money into an endowment?” The Asian American Federation’s O says that unless donors have known you for a long time, it’s difficult to ask them to help address your long-term goals. According to RPA’s inventory of identity-based funds, roughly 40 percent have endowments, with those endowments tending to be relative to organizational size. Yet with few exceptions, grantees view endowment building as key to the future success of their funds and others like them. “I want to build something that will last,” says Maria Bechily, co-chair of the Chicago-based Latino fund Nuestro Futuro. “This is a powerful and important concept for all communities.”

**Funding for operations, training, and technical assistance.** Grantees reported that funders are often reluctant to finance unglamorous administrative and capacity building needs like overhead for managing giving circles, coordination costs for facilitating relationship building (phones, rental space, etc.), supply costs (paper, copying, printing, etc.), and other back-end costs of grantmaking. Most donors don’t want to give toward a fund’s photocopying budget either, preferring to see their fundraised dollars put directly toward community issues. Many funds also find themselves scrambling for money to hire professional staff, particularly development professionals, and for ongoing training and technical assistance. Yet securing grants to cover these costs is vital. “These funds can’t do everything on their own—they need encouragement and support from other organizations, including seed money,” says Kellogg Foundation trustee Wenda Weekes Moore.

**Succession planning.** Leadership transitions also need to be anticipated and planned for. If they aren’t, funds can grind to a halt, losing their momentum and the continuity of their programming while new leadership is secured. Transitions are particularly important if a particular leader serves as the “face” of the fund; this applies not just to executive directors but to project coordinators or other staff who have overall responsibility for the implementation of program activities. Ideally, a fund that knows a leadership switch is coming can obtain training and funding support to make that jump—but this absolutely has to be planned for. “The hardest dollars to get are transition dollars,” says Barbara Poley, executive director of the Hopi Foundation.
In addition to these lessons, at least two standout best practices have emerged from this work so far:

**BEST PRACTICE: The challenge grant strategy.** Across the board, the challenge grants given through the Innovation & Impact initiative proved a highly effective means for attracting new community donors, reengaging existing donors, and raising a fund’s visibility. Grantees reported that the challenge campaigns also had another enormous perk: they helped funds address two different goals simultaneously. On the one hand, funds could direct donors’ contributions directly into the community, which is what donors wanted. On the other hand, they could direct the granted match money toward building their endowment, enabling them to scale their philanthropic assets in shorter timeframes.

**BEST PRACTICE: The asset-based approach.** More stance than strategy, the asset-based approach was a worldview promoted by us that was in turn taken up by our grantees, their partners, and donors. In essence, it was an explicit choice to help support and grow philanthropy in communities of color by focusing first and foremost on their assets, helping to strengthen, supplement, or activate for the first time a community’s existing resources and capabilities. The approach helped grantees maximize local resources to solve the problems that the community identified as most pressing—rather than starting from the latter. It also emphasized establishing partnerships—among organizations and their donors, mainstream funders and communities of color, and organizations across communities—rather than creating paternalistic or competitive relationships that many might perceive to be characteristic of the traditional “charity” model.

Together, these challenges, lessons, and best practices create a strong argument for continuing to align this work in the future around a community of practice. Being part of a network has helped grantees cycle through these lessons far faster than they would have otherwise—by creating greater alignment among strategies on the ground, fostering significant knowledge sharing and experience swapping, and building relationships across previously disconnected leaders and organizations who have much to teach and learn from one another.

---

**Grantee**
San Francisco-based SOCIAL VENTURE NETWORK connects, supports, and inspires business leaders and social entrepreneurs in expanding practices that build a just and sustainable economy. SVN works to achieve this mission by building peer-to-peer relationships among high-impact, innovative business leaders and incubating organizations advancing sustainable business.

www.svn.org
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In this moment, we know far more about identity-based philanthropy, as a field and as a practice, than ever before. Yet while Cultures of Giving has shed bright new light on how philanthropy works in communities of color and what it needs in order to grow, some big questions remain. How sustainable are identity-based funds over time, and what are their long-term impacts? How long might it take to bring the field to scale, and what kinds of investments will that require? It will likely be years, possibly decades, before we have our answers. Yet it’s also true that the efforts and investments we make now will help shape and determine these outcomes. And not just these outcomes—but quite possibly the future of the field of philanthropy itself.

As the work described in this report hopefully illustrates, identity-based funds are transforming the way that generosity flows through and to communities of color—and creating new philanthropic resources, new forms of community empowerment, new leading actors, and new methods to tackle complex problems in the process. As a result, they are also influencing and invigorating the way that philanthropy across all communities gets practiced at a time when many of our old forms are crumbling. “Our current models of philanthropy are eroding,” says Tom Reis, our program director for mission-driven investments. “They will not last forever, so we’d better get our act together on this.”

It is not enough, then, to say that the field—and the face—of philanthropy is changing. Philanthropy has already changed. The only question is how fast and how well our traditional structures will catch up with it.

We believe that the entire sector must learn from, be inspired by, and grow with the rich mosaic of donors and funds that are working in the heart of...
this country’s communities of color—and that working with and within racial, ethnic, and tribal communities to envision and effect social change on behalf of vulnerable children and families will become increasingly critical to everyone’s future success.

This means providing seed support and other forms of assistance to funds throughout their growth cycle. It means embracing identity-based funds as critical partners in the sector and forging stronger connections with philanthropic leaders and other change agents within communities of color. It means diversifying the leadership of mainstream philanthropy to reflect our nation’s changing demographics. It means shifting our practices to reflect what communities of color are teaching us about the future of giving.

Ultimately, it means “figuring out how to create a true ‘culture of giving’ where everyone plays in the same space and isn’t separated,” says Sandy Kajiyama, director of program systems at Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP). In other words, a world in which there is no distinction between mainstream philanthropy and identity-based philanthropy, no walls or “zero-sum” thinking between communities of color, and no special labels or asterisks attached to this work. It would all be simply philanthropy.

**WHAT’S NEXT FOR US**

We are enormously proud of the work we have done so far to energize and expand philanthropy in communities of color. We are equally grateful for the ways in which this work has energized and expanded us as well. This body of work has helped to shape our larger approach to addressing issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. And it has become a cornerstone of our wider institutional commitment to racial equity and civic engagement—a commitment that continues to take on new strength and dimension.

Over the past few years, we have created the first organization-wide strategic framework in our foundation’s history. This framework reaffirms our commitment to improving the lives of vulnerable children and families by focusing on healthy kids, educated kids, and secure families, all within the context of improving conditions within communities. As a result, all of our work is now viewed through two lenses:

• A racial equity lens that ensures that communities acknowledge and address structural racism and historic burdens and disparities that hold too many children back.

• A community and civic engagement lens that will ensure people within communities have a voice in prioritizing and making the changes they want to see in their community, as well as catalyze innovation at the community level.
Timothy McIntosh of Durham, NC, is the kind of barber who listens deeply and thoughtfully to the passions and problems of his clients. Darryl Lester, president of HindSight Consulting and founder of the Community Investment Network, is an ardent champion of African American givers and giving circles. So when Lester sat down in McIntosh’s chair and the two started talking, forget the haircut. Philanthropic sparks flew.

“Darryl was on a mission to demystify philanthropy and make it accessible to everyday folks,” says McIntosh, who earned his state barber license while studying business management at North Carolina Central University. Still in his 20s when he met Lester, McIntosh was already well-versed in generosity; he grew up in a bighearted household and had always gone out of his way to help people. But the language of philanthropy was new to him. “I may not have known about organized philanthropy but I understood community,” he says. “I understood giving back.”

Lester invited McIntosh to join an informal group of African Americans interested in learning more about strategic community philanthropy. Those conversations led to the formation, in 2004, of the Next Generation of African American Philanthropists (NGAAP), a giving circle whose member pool their time, know-how, and money ($350 a year per member) to better the lives of African Americans in North Carolina.
NGAAP has already made considerable impact on the local community, supporting, for example, a nonprofit that advocates for poor rural areas lacking basic amenities and another that provides services and transitional housing to homeless African American women with HIV/AIDS. “We are very tactical about our giving,” explains McIntosh, who is one of 11 NGAAP members. “We’re always trying to take it a step further and get to the root causes of community issues, moving from charity to social justice and a lot of the harder issues.”

McIntosh’s involvement with NGAAP has radically shifted his perspective on giving. “It made me see myself as an asset and a change agent—as part of the solution,” he says. And it spurred him to seek out new ways to elevate his community and his craft simultaneously—or, as McIntosh puts it, “to marry my philanthropy and my entrepreneurism.”

In 2007, McIntosh opened a new barbershop and joined the state barber board; he also met with the North Carolina Department of Corrections, convincing them to open a prison barber school. Around that same time, he founded the Durham-based Park West Barber School (whose stated mission is to “cultivate and educate students entirely—preparing them for service and leadership in the barbering industry”) and launched the Barber Foundation, which serves as the school’s philanthropic arm, building partnerships and developing student community service projects.

Obviously, McIntosh wants Park West students—about 80 percent of whom are ex-offenders—to learn far more than the logistics of haircutting while under his watch. “They are the future barbershop owners in the community, so I help them explore the responsibility that brings,” says McIntosh, now 37 and a recent winner of the Association of Black Foundation Executives’ Emerging Leader in Philanthropy Award. “They have to see the connection between themselves and the strengthening of the community.”

Back at the barber shop, McIntosh continues to enjoy listening to customers’ passions and problems as he cuts their hair. Only now he sees them all as potential philanthropists. “When I go back into the shop and talk about the nonprofit site visit I just went on, the next question is always, ‘How can I be a part of that?’” says McIntosh. “Those of us doing this work have got to share our stories.”

Cultures of Giving played a key role in steering the Kellogg Foundation in this new direction. “Cultures of Giving was lifted up as a model initiative for the foundation and definitely informed our new framework,” says deputy director Alandra Washington. “With Cultures of Giving, we were ahead of the curve.”

**WHAT’S NEXT FOR THE CULTURES OF GIVING NETWORK**

And what was the outcome of the May 2011 Cultures of Giving meeting in Wilmington, NC, that opened this report? The one with the flute player, the colorful hallway, the air of reunion, the 147 leaders, and the buzz of fellowship?

The buzz never settled.
For a day and a half, through formal sessions and informal chat, those 147 leaders swapped stories of their approaches to addressing poverty and racism and community self-esteem through their work. They traded best practices for finding new donors and deepening donor leadership over time. They filled every minute of unscheduled networking time listening and learning across race, culture, ethnicity, tribe, and gender. A panel of donors mesmerized them with stories of why they give. Eugene Cho, founder of One Day’s Wages, gave a talk about his experiences as a community change agent that was part-standup, part-sermon and had everyone laughing, crying, or both. As a plenary and in small groups, the 147 leaders pulled out lessons from their collective work, then shifted forward to thinking about what comes next for themselves and for this vibrant community of practice they’ve built together over the years—a community that, by the way, was growing by the minute.

“We knew there were organizations not on our radar that had fresh perspectives and ideas we could learn from, so we invited them to come think with us,” was how Alandra Washington explained the many newcomers milling among the Cultures of Giving old-timers. Among them was Andy Carey, executive director of U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership, which is mobilizing grassroots philanthropy to create vibrant communities on both sides of that line. “This is a huge opportunity to find new partners, and the pure learning is enormous,” said Carey, his eyes busily scanning the crowd. Also new were Shirrell Burton and Karris Jackson of POISE Foundation, the first public foundation in Pennsylvania organized and managed by African Americans, who’d flown in from Pittsburgh to join the conversation. They arrived knowing almost no one and left with pockets stuffed with business cards.

New sparks flew in Wilmington, and a new vibe was growing. Kelley Gulley, president of the National Community Development Institute, sensed a difference. “This doesn’t feel like a conference,” she said. “It feels much more like a gathering of people who have been on a journey that’s the same but different. Different in the what, where, why, and how, but with the same goal of making sure that communities of color understand that their indigenous leadership and knowledge is what matters most. It’s not a big grant from a big foundation or a visit from a big politician. It’s the mom, the dad, the grandparent, the child who sees a need and gets busy meeting that
need and then becomes a philanthropist.” Gulley smiled. “Can’t even spell it. Don’t even know what it means. Don’t even care. They’re just meeting the need.”

Gulley was right—it was much more than a meeting. It was a celebration and appreciation of the work this group has done and its momentum going forward. And it was a demonstration of the tremendous energy still coursing through the Cultures of Giving network. In the meeting’s closing plenary session, that energy was palpable. Hands flew up for the microphone. Each person’s parting words built on the words of those who spoke right before them, rendering almost visible the collective action weaving itself together inside that ballroom.

Mac Legerton, Center for Community Action: “The question is not just ‘What is the Kellogg Foundation going to do?’ but also ‘How are we going to sustain ourselves?’ What responsibility are we going to take for this field as well?”

Monica Simpson, Resource Generation: “We have to take ownership of this as a movement.”

Kelly Gulley, NCDI: “Cultures of Giving was not a project. It is a movement.”

Diana Wilson, Faith Partnerships: “A movement happened. But now a family has evolved.”

Elsa Holguín, Rose Community Foundation: “We’ve learned. We’re ready. Now how do we get to the next level?”

At the end of the conference, Alandra Washington once again leaned toward the microphone. She told everyone that their commitment and perseverance, their willingness to learn and adapt as this field grows, and above all their determination to enrich the lives and the leadership of their communities are the fuel that will continue to drive this work forward—within the network and beyond. “I would just like to say thank you to this community,” she said. “Thank you for the work that you do and for allowing the Kellogg Foundation to be a part of it. We are at the end of this journey—but we all know this is just the beginning.”

One-hundred forty-seven people started clapping. Soon, the room vibrated with whistles, hoots, hugs, and a few “amens.”
Grantee

WOMEN’S FUND OF GREATER MILWAUKEE is a social change grantmaker dedicated exclusively to funding and advocacy for the needs of women and girls. The Fund supports and invests in women-led solutions that result in sustainable and long-lasting change for women and girls through grants and capacity building programs.

www.womensfundmke.org

Grantee

WOMEN’S FUNDING NETWORK connects and strengthens more than 160 organizations that fund women’s solutions across the globe, making it one of the largest collaborative philanthropic networks in the world. Collectively its member foundations invest $65 million annually in women and girls worldwide and have over $535 million in working assets.

www.womensfundingnetwork.org

Grantee

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY FOUNDATION works to advance the welfare of the black community through strategic and collective grantmaking, special initiatives and research, and donor education and services. Its mission is to lead, innovate, and influence giving for black community change.

www.21cf.org
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12. States now face budgets gaps topping $125 billion, making it unlikely that any social program that relies on public funding will escape seeing its budget slashed and its menu of services reduced. Since 2008, 31 states have cut healthcare services, 29 and the District of Columbia have cut services to the elderly and disabled, 34 states and DC have made cuts to K-12 education, and 43 states have decreased their spending on higher education, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. See Kevin Sack, “For Governors, Medicaid Looks Ripe for Slashing,” The New York Times, 28 January 2011, and Nicholas Johnson, Phil Oliff, and Erica Williams, “An Update on State Budget Cuts: At Least 46 States Have Imposed Cuts That Hurt Vulnerable Residents and the Economy,” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 5 November 2010.

13. Our primary focus was the subset of identity-based funds operating in communities of color—specifically, funds created in and for the African American, Native American, Latino, Asian American, and Arab American communities. Several of our Cultures of Giving grants also supported women’s and LGBTQ funds, primarily when their efforts, or the efforts of their collaborators, overlapped with work they were doing in communities of color.

14. The inventory was completed in 2009, during the later stages of our work. However, we share it here, out of sequence, in order to give readers a sense of the depth, scope, and variability of these funds before reading about our strategies for best supporting them.

15. Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors’ inventory of identity-based funds was led by Jessica Chao, with help from Meghna Shah, Ezra Vazquez-D’Amico, and Julia Parshall. Their effort built on prior, unpublished work by John Vogelsang and Henry Ramos to survey and map the field. For case studies from that research, see John Vogelsang, Anne Gardon, Barbara Taveras, and Rosalind Wilson, Social Catalysts: A Case Study of Fifteen Successful Diversity-Focused Funds (New York: The Diversity in Philanthropy Project, 2009).

16. Because 77 percent of the funds that cited “women and girls” as a funding area were women’s funds, their funding areas were broken down separately. As the chart indicates, if these responses were included, women and girls would have been the second most common program area.

17. Data on Black United Funds was shared by the National Black United Fund. Data on African American Greek letter organizations was shared by Delta Research and Education Foundation.

18. This is true even after removing the outlier independent fund, Associated Black Charities of Maryland, which grants out $17 million annually.

19. Data was available for 57 percent of the total African American inventory.

20. RPA combined these two communities into one sample because of their relatively small number of funds and because at least one fund serves both communities. Three funds in the sample focused on Arab American communities, two of them exclusively.


22. Data and information on Native philanthropic vehicles were provided by First Nations Development Institute and Native Americans in Philanthropy.

24. Thanks to collaborations with the Women’s Funding Network, the inventory of women’s funds is 99 percent complete. Nearly 80 percent of these funds are WFN members.

25. Funds that focused exclusively on women of color, such as the African American Women’s Project of the Women’s Fund of Greater Milwaukee, were counted in the relevant ethnic community and not counted in the sample of women’s funds. As with the other communities, international funds were not included.

26. Data on LGBTQ funds were shared with Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors by Funders for LGBT Issues.

27. Several grantees targeted communities served by identity-based philanthropy but not communities of color. Three grantees targeted women, two targeted young leaders under age 30, and one targeted the LGBTQ community.

28. Grantees funded under Innovation & Impact were expected to engage in fairly high levels of activity in the areas of donor engagement and resource generation, so shifting their focus in this direction was also a result of the shift in our funding strategy. However, our program evaluator, Houston-based Decision Information Resources (DIR), determined that grantees were already leaning in this direction, accelerating their experiments with new forms of donor engagement, before Innovation & Impact was announced.

29. The Cultures of Giving cluster comprised 39 grantees. However, the program evaluator was unable to obtain data beyond 2007 for five grantees. Two were no longer in operation and the remaining three did not respond to interview requests. All five non-responders were funded under Expanding the Boundaries only. Thus all statistics in this section are based on data compiled from 34 grantees. Of those 34 grantees, 56 percent were grantmaking organizations and 44 percent were nongrantmaking.
The Kellogg Foundation has laid a substantial portion of the groundwork for others to come and add their support. It helped build a sector that can—and must—be sustained by a broad base, both at the grassroots level and the institutional level.”

Melissa Berman
PRESIDENT AND CEO OF ROCKEFELLER PHILANTHROPY ADVISORS

The Kellogg Foundation has given people of color the opportunity to come to the table and really make a change in how we develop our philanthropy.”

Nareman Taha
COFOUNDER OF ARAB AMERICAN FAMILY SERVICES

This path has been groundbreaking. Momentum is building thanks to the Kellogg Foundation’s efforts.”

Adela Cepeda
PRESIDENT OF A.C. ADVISORY AND COFOUNDER OF NUESTRO FUTURO