



11 TRENDS IN PHILANTHROPY FOR 2022



Dorothy A. Johnson Center
FOR PHILANTHROPY

Contributing Authors



Trish Abalo

Research Associate
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Karen Hoekstra

Marketing and Communications Manager
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Kallie Bauer, M.B.A.

Senior Project Manager
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Michael Layton, Ph.D.

W.K. Kellogg Community Philanthropy Chair
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Teresa (Teri) Behrens, Ph.D.

Executive Director
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Tory Martin, M.A.

Director of Communications and Engagement
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Emily Brenner

Program Associate
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Michael Moody, Ph.D.

Frey Foundation Chair for Family Philanthropy
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Julie Couturier, CPA

Operations Director
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Kevin Peterson

Senior Program Associate
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Jamie DeLeeuw, Ph.D.

Director of Evaluation and Impact
Austin Pets Alive! (former Research
Manager, Johnson Center for Philanthropy)



Mandy Sharp Eizinger, M.S.

Program Manager
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Adam Engwis

Graduate Student Intern
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Tamela Spicer, M.A.

Senior Program Manager
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Tiana Hawver, M.S.

Office Coordinator
Johnson Center for Philanthropy



Aaron Yore-VanOosterhout, Ph.D.

Research Manager
Johnson Center for Philanthropy

What's Inside

Cryptocurrency

and Philanthropy:
New Donors
and New
Questions
for Nonprofits

1

PAGE 6

2

Reopening Federal
**Pell Grants for
Incarcerated People**
Means Higher Ed &
Funders Can Do More

PAGE 8

3

One Health
and **Animal
Protection
Philanthropy:**
A Growing
Sub-Sector

PAGE 10

Philanthropy
is Increasingly
Embroidered
in the
Culture Wars

PAGE 12

Innovations
in **Talent
Investment**
for
Individuals, Orgs,
and Communities

5

PAGE 14

Increasing
Attention to
the **Decline
in Household
Giving** to
Nonprofits

6

PAGE 16

Expanding the
**Definitions of
Philanthropy &
Philanthropist**

PAGE 20

Philanthropy is
Entering a New Era
of **Engagement with
Native Communities**

9

PAGE 22

**Donors of
Color are
Mobilizing**
for Their
Communities
— Often at
the Forefront
of Emerging
Trends

PAGE 18

10

Nonprofits are
Finding **New
Ways to Get the
Data** They Need

PAGE 24

Nonprofits are
Questioning
Their **Use of
Facebook**

11

PAGE 26

A Note From Our Executive Director



Whatever words you want to use to describe 2021, we can no longer use “unprecedented” in 2022 as we move into the third year of the pandemic. Workplaces of all types have adapted to the reality that COVID-19 is with us for the long haul. Remote work, online conferences, and pets and kids on video calls are now just part of our workdays — and likely here to stay.

Beyond these widespread changes, however, the philanthropic sector’s core work of harnessing private action to promote public good has been uniquely impacted. The urgency of addressing racial injustice and threats to democracy has influenced everything from how we define philanthropy and public good to how we use technology. The trends we explore in this report are ones whose roots predate the pandemic, yet their trajectory has been altered — perhaps permanently — by the events of the past two years.

What you will not find here is any commentary on the many new, day-to-day practices (e.g., streamlined funding applications, greater general operating support) our sector has adopted to adapt to this urgency. We don’t yet know if they will have the staying power to become new trends. Further, while important, these types of changes in practice are less critical than the fundamental shifts in paradigms that we’re seeing in the sector and have reflected on in many of the trends we’ve highlighted here.

We always value the time we take to reflect on the big picture for our sector as we write our annual trends report. We hope you also take the time to reflect and engage in conversation and debate — with us and with your peers and colleagues across the sector — about the observations and ideas herein.

Teresa (Teri) Behrens, Ph.D.



11 Trends in Philanthropy for 2022



Previous years' *11 Trends in Philanthropy* reports have examined the question “What is the role of philanthropy in a democracy?”

This year's trends reflect the sector's grappling with a similarly profound question: “What role does philanthropy play in our national project — that of *E Pluribus Unum*?”

Philanthropy is defined and redefined by the choices that are made every day, not only by professionals in the field but by countless neighbors and local leaders. People go into the work of philanthropy in order to build the communities they want to live in.

In 2022 and beyond, the communities we envision may continue to look different, but they remain grounded in the ideas of belonging and reciprocity. Each individual, and every choice they make about how to show up in their communities, matters.

The following 11 trends are presented in no particular order. We consider them all to be significant.

Cryptocurrency and Philanthropy: New Donors and New Questions for Nonprofits

Julie Couturier

In late 2017, an anonymous post on Reddit read, “I’m ... donating the majority of my bitcoins to charitable causes” (para. 2). The donor was known only as Pineapple Fund — their true identity has never been revealed. The Pineapple Fund ultimately donated 5,104 bitcoins worth over \$55 million to 60 charities (2017).

For many nonprofits, this was their first experience with cryptocurrency, but the need to understand how to move digital money in philanthropy has since intensified.

More Crypto Donors Means More Urgency for Nonprofits

Five years on, nonprofits are still struggling with the idea of cryptocurrency. The concept still feels alien and difficult to grasp. The asset itself can be volatile, the technology behind it confusing, and new cryptocurrencies are created all the time.

Meanwhile, a new segment of donors who got rich quickly in the crypto market is now emerging in the sector in a big way. Cryptocurrency contributions to donor-advised funds (DAFs) at Fidelity Charitable Trust (2021) more than doubled from \$13 million in 2019 to \$28 million in 2020. According to The Giving Block (2021), the value of total cryptocurrency donations is now over \$300 million annually — and is only expected to grow.

What is Cryptocurrency — and Why Should Philanthropy Pay Attention?

Cryptocurrency is the unit of account for a digital payment network called a blockchain. No central bank or government is regulating the crypto market, and as with most currencies, cryptocurrency has no inherent value beyond what people collectively agree to.

Crypto is a borderless currency, making it cheaper and easier to execute international transactions, as no exchange rates or international financial regulations are involved (Matharu, 2019). There are more than 7,000 different cryptocurrencies, including Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Dogecoin, whose popularity and price soared in early 2021 (Conway).

The emergence of this digital, online market provides new opportunities and challenges for the philanthropic sector. Cryptocurrency gifts offer two particular benefits:

- 1) In U.S. tax terms, cryptocurrencies are like any appreciated asset, including securities and real estate. Donors owe no capital gains taxes when they donate these assets to charity, usually resulting in larger gifts for nonprofits (Sullivan, 2021).
- 2) Blockchain technology can offer greater efficiency and transparency. International transactions can be completed within minutes for just a few dollars (Sullivan, 2021). Donors and others can refer to the blockchain to track donations from anywhere in the world and ensure contributions are being used for their intended purposes. Nonprofits have the potential to raise more funds based on increased transparency and trust.

Cryptocurrency Expands the Who and What of Philanthropy

On the donor side, individuals have discovered new giving opportunities using cryptocurrency DAFs. Crypto DAFs can keep donors’ identities anonymous, even while the transactions of the DAF are recorded in the blockchain and viewable to anyone. This interesting combination is appealing to some donors, and also helps address the lack-of-transparency criticism that exists for traditional DAFs.

Donors are also using cryptocurrency where traditional giving is not available or federal policy is still catching up. The University of New Mexico Medical Cannabis Research Fund, for instance, relies heavily on donations to support its clinical research into the effects of cannabis use. Cannabis research is largely excluded from federal research funding, and federal law currently prohibits banks from facilitating cannabis-related transactions. Companies like 420coin are using bitcoin's market independence to get around these restrictions to fund the University of New Mexico's research (UNM, 2021).

Cryptocurrency is also supporting the rise of a new demographic of donors. Young (millennial and Gen Z), male investors are more likely than others to own cryptocurrency, and many are just starting to get involved in philanthropy. Even considering those venturing into philanthropy for the first time, according to a survey from Fidelity Charitable Trust, people who invest in cryptocurrencies were more likely than traditional investors to donate at least \$1,000 to charity in 2020 (Theis, 2021).

What to Do With a Cryptocurrency Donation?

Nonprofits entering this space must determine whether, when crypto gifts arrive, they will sell immediately, hold indefinitely, or diversify part of the donation.

Each strategy has value. In October 2019, UNICEF launched the CryptoFund, which allows it to learn more about digital assets as it receives, holds, and disburses cryptocurrency. In its first year, CryptoFund made twelve investments in eight different countries (Lomozzo, 2020). UNICEF discovered that by keeping crypto in its native form, UNICEF, donors, recipients, and the public can track where the money is going and how it is being spent. Appreciation in the value of the digital asset is just a bonus.

For those nonprofits that want to convert crypto gifts into cash immediately to cover operational expenses, third-party intermediaries are stepping in to help. One example is Endaoment, a cryptocurrency public charity, which sponsors DAFs and accepts over 150 different cryptocurrencies. Robbie Heeger founded Endaoment to make it easy for people to give cryptocurrency without the hassle of selling it first and for U.S. nonprofits to accept it as cash (Stiffman, 2021).

Crypto Philanthropy Is Not Without Risks

Even as philanthropy learns how to use cryptocurrency for the public good, challenges remain. Crypto donations recorded in the blockchain can be transparent, but anonymous, making it difficult for organizations to cultivate relationships with supporters. Donor anonymity can also expose the beneficiaries of crypto-gifts to great risk if the source turns out to be questionable — there is a high risk for reputational damage if donations are seen as tainted, or even legal jeopardy if nonprofits are found to have participated in money laundering (Moody & Pratt, 2020).

Nonprofits entering this space must determine whether, when crypto gifts arrive, they will sell immediately, hold indefinitely, or diversify part of the donation.

Additional challenges stem from the asset's unregulated and volatile nature. A crash in the crypto market could have a major impact on nonprofit holders. Tax laws and federal regulations surrounding the crypto market currently lag other assets and are still catching up. Even more challenging, fraudulent initial offerings of cryptocurrency have entered the market (Cohn, 2021).

Despite its challenges, estimates are that over 300 million individuals are users or investors in cryptocurrency (Triple A, 2021). With stories like Pineapple Fund still in recent memory, and new stories making headlines — like Ethereum's co-founder Vitalik Buterin making a \$1 billion crypto donation to the India Covid Fund (Bambysheva, 2021) — philanthropy needs to continue to navigate the opportunities and risks of cryptocurrency to move toward new ways of doing good.

Reopening Federal Pell Grants for Incarcerated People Means Higher Ed and Funders Can Do More

Tiana Hawver and Aaron Yore-VanOosterhout

Although nearly 300,000 people were released from jails, prisons, and detention facilities as a preventive measure during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic, the United States currently incarcerates roughly 1.8 million people, despite dubious public safety benefits and proven, significant harm to entire communities (Kang-Brown et al., 2021; Rabuy & Kopf, 2015; Bloom, 2010).

Recent high-profile murders of Black men by police officers, however, coupled with popular critiques of the carceral system* — such as Michelle Alexander’s 2010 book *The New Jim Crow* and Ava DuVernay’s 2016 documentary *13th* — are spurring broad-based public movements for systemic reform. Foundations and donors, too, are expanding and diversifying their giving in this field.

Bail funds. Since George Floyd’s murder in May 2020, community bail funds — many of which are housed within the National Bail Fund Network — have raised nearly \$100 million to combat wealth-based incarceration (Kulish, 2020).

Mental health decriminalization. The Sozosei Foundation announced in 2021 it was providing \$1 million to 10 organizations that will help implement the nationwide 9-8-8 system, which seeks to

supplant 9-1-1 as a mental health emergency phone number (Karon, 2021). Many other foundations, too, have stepped in to pay for pilot projects at the community level, such as the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion program launched in Seattle, Washington, in 2011 (Green).

Funding collaboratives. The Hudson-Webber Foundation, the Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan, and other funders formed the Michigan Justice Fund in 2020. The fund in 2021 contributed nearly \$2.3 million to organizations as varied as Women’s Resource Center — a reentry resource provider for women incarcerated in western Michigan — to the Aspen Institute (Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan, 2021).


Funding Higher Education for Incarcerated People

Perhaps no other avenue shows more promise for widespread support than postsecondary education in prison. Thanks to recent changes in federal legislation for Pell grants, donors’ money and higher education’s efforts will now go much further.

In the mid-1990s, more than 90% of carceral systems across the country offered some postsecondary educational programming, enrolling

*We deliberately use the phrase “carceral system” instead of “criminal justice system,”

following the lead of some scholars in the field. As the Underground Scholars Initiative at the University of California Berkeley explains in their language guide, “‘Carceral System’ is far more accurate than the ubiquitous term ‘Criminal Justice System.’ Not all who violate the law (commit a crime) are exposed to this system and justice is a relative term that most people in this country do not positively associate with our current model. In this context, Carceral System is best understood as a comprehensive network of systems that rely, at least in part, on the exercise of state-sanctioned physical, emotional, spatial, economic and political violence to preserve the interests of the state”; Cerda-Jara, M., Czifra, S., Galindo, A., Mason, J., Ricks, C., & Zohrabi, A. (2019). *Language guide for communicating about those involved in the carceral system*. Underground Scholars Initiative. <http://tiny.cc/USILanguageGuide>



more than 38,000 students. When Congress rescinded Pell eligibility for incarcerated students in 1994, the number of enrolled individuals nearly halved by the next academic year — to 21,000. In subsequent years, the proportion of incarcerated students to people incarcerated overall continued to fall (Tewksbury et al., 2000).

This policy reversal effectively cut off hundreds of thousands of people from higher education, due both to high rates of poverty among incarcerated people and their families and, for those who could afford to pay privately, the disappearance of programs that relied on federal funding (Tewksbury et al., 2000).

Higher education in prison couples carceral system reform with one of philanthropy’s biggest priorities in the past century: education.

Then, in 2013, the RAND Corporation released an influential study. RAND found that incarcerated people who had participated in educational programming during their sentence had a 43% lower chance of recidivating (and thus being reincarcerated), with corresponding savings to the taxpayer (Davis et al., 2013).

Soon after, in 2015, the Obama administration announced the Second Chance Pell experiment, which extended Pell eligibility to incarcerated students at select colleges and universities nationwide. From that year onward, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has given more than \$36 million to college-in-prison programs, joined by smaller gifts from other funders such as the MacArthur and Ford Foundations (Wolfe, 2021).

In the 2020 FAFSA Simplification Act, Congress restored Pell grant eligibility to incarcerated people no later than July 2023. Meanwhile, more funders are stepping in to prepare colleges, universities, and corrections departments for the reopening of prisons to higher education.

- In 2019, the Lumina Foundation granted \$100,000 to the Michigan Department of Corrections to produce the *Re-Entering Learners Pathway Plan*, a best-practices guide for colleges and universities in the state to develop in-prison programming.
- In 2020, the Laughing Gull Foundation pledged \$1.3 million for organizations that offered or supported postsecondary education for “justice-involved individuals” across the U.S. South.
- In 2021, the Michelson 20MM Foundation funded the development of a guide for corrections officials as they partner with postsecondary education institutions, published by the RAND Corporation (Davis & Linton).

According to the most recent landscape study available, in the 2019–2020 academic year, there were 372 postsecondary education institutions offering credit-bearing courses in prison in 49 states. Nearly 34,000 students participated in these programs (Royer et al., 2021). As the Vera Institute of Justice estimates that up to 463,000 incarcerated people will be eligible for Pell grants when they become available in 2023, the number of programs is poised to jump in the years to come (Martinez-Hill & Delaney, 2021).

A Moment for Hope

Higher education in prison couples carceral system reform with one of philanthropy’s biggest priorities in the past century: education. This may make for an attractive combination for funders. But perhaps Jose Bou, who earned a bachelor’s degree from Boston University while incarcerated, offered the most compelling reason to support such programming when he explained to an NPR reporter that attending university in prison was “like being released every day” (Jung, 2019, para. 5).

One Health and Animal Protection Philanthropy: A Growing Sub-Sector

Jamie DeLeeuw



Humans and non-human animals intersect daily. As pets, tourist attractions, sources of food and labor, objects of human actions, and as their own affectors of ecological change, animals share our planet and our fate.

While still overwhelmingly human-centric, philanthropy has demonstrated increasing awareness of these intersections and consideration for the interests of animals and the environment over the past decade.

The numbers are still comparatively small, but convincing. In 2010, Giving USA noted that support for environmental and animal causes comprised only 2% (\$6.15 billion) of total giving (\$290.89 billion) to U.S. charities (2011). By 2020, that number had steadily increased to 3% (\$16.14 billion out of \$471.44 billion) (Giving USA, 2021).

This may appear to be a minuscule change, but presented differently (and adjusting for inflation) it is a 49.4% increase in this mission area's share of the whole. The growth in giving to environmental and animal organizations tripled that of human-centric recipient organizations from 2010 to 2020 (Giving USA, 2011, 2021).

While it would be difficult and time-consuming to disaggregate the data for environmental versus animal-related causes at this stage, the overall growth in this sub-sector is further illustrated by an increase in attention, infrastructure, and tools.

Astronomical Growth in Grant Dollars Focused on Animals Used for Food

There are millions of companion animals, billions of farmed land animals, and at least a trillion fish farmed annually worldwide (Clare, 2020). Despite their smaller numbers and generally far superior living conditions relative to factory-farmed animals (Anthis & Anthis, 2019), animal welfare funding

has predominantly supported companion rather than farmed animals' interests. However, research suggests that practice is shifting.

Animal Funding Atlas (2021) data show that in 2010, 186 grants were awarded for animal protection, totaling \$11.39 million. The vast majority of these grants — 91%, for a total of \$11.2 million — went to organizations and efforts focused on companion animals. Only a single identified grant for \$5,000 was directed towards animals used for food. The remainder of the grants were designated for wildlife protection.

A decade later, the proportions have changed dramatically. In 2020, funders awarded 455 grants totaling \$34.1 million for animal protection. While 68% of those grants went towards companion animals, they comprised only 19% of overall funding dollars. The 106 grants geared towards protecting animals used for food comprised 77% of funding (Animal Funding Atlas, 2021).

The size of the grants in this latter category (supporting animals used for food) is also astronomical in comparison to that single \$5,000 grant a decade ago. The largest grants in 2020 include \$4.1 million for the Humane League, \$2.8 million for Mercy for Animals, and \$2 million to Compassion in World Farming (Animal Funding Atlas, 2021).

The funder commitments overall are exponentially larger, too: \$25.3 million from Open Philanthropy Project, \$6.34 million from Maddie's Fund, and \$1.27 million from the Centre for Effective Altruism (Animal Funding Atlas, 2021).

By a different accounting, Andrew Rowan of Humane Society International (Kavate, 2020) “estimated funding for all farmed animal issues had grown from roughly \$5 million to \$50 million over the past 15 years” — a 900% increase.

Building Up Infrastructure and Tools for Animal Protection Funding

Many philanthropic actors in this space are also making moves in the last few years to promote collaboration and collective impact.

In 2020, animal protection nonprofits and foundations — including the ASPCA, Maddie's Fund, Summerlee Foundation, and Tigers in America — recognized a lack of tools for tracking animal protection grants, and banded together to address the gap. Together they created the Animal Funding Atlas, a tool to monitor opportunities for and the impact of animal protection philanthropy. Presently, over 50 grantmakers participate in the dashboard.

Other moves in the field include:

- Animal Grantmakers' membership has more than doubled. The affinity group was established in 1999 with 16 founding organizations. Today, they count nearly 40 foundations among their membership (2021).
- Seeing a need for grantmaking in farm animal welfare, Open Philanthropy Project made it a priority grantmaking area and now funds high-impact, or effective altruism opportunities.
- The nonprofit Encompass was formed in 2017 to increase effectiveness in the animal protection movement by cultivating greater racial diversity, equity, and inclusion while empowering Black, Indigenous, and all advocates of the global majority.

Taking a “One Health” Approach to Human-Animal Issues

Animal protection philanthropy may also be growing due to increased recognition of the shared interests and health of humans.

Zoonotic diseases (illnesses that can spread between humans and animals) account for 60% of all infectious diseases in humans (Centers for Disease Control, 2019). In response to this and other shared health threats, including climate change, the CDC established the One Health Commission in 2009, a “collaborative, multisectoral, and transdisciplinary approach — working at the local, regional, national, and global levels — with the goal of achieving optimal health outcomes recognizing the interconnections between people, animals, plants, and their shared environment” (n.d., para. 1).

In the decade since the commission's inception, One Health has gained attention as a funding, evaluation, and educational approach. In 2018, Maddie's Fund designated \$500,000 to the University of Denver to evaluate the One Health impact of the Humane Society of the United States' Pets for Life program in four communities, and \$2.89 million to University of Tennessee's One Health's AlignCare program (Maddie's Fund, 2021).

In 2020, American Pets Alive! — with support from Maddie's Fund, Rachael Ray Foundation, PetSmart Charities, Pedigree Foundation, and others — began piloting a community-centered Human Animal Support Services model in 33 shelters to help keep pets in their homes. The model adopts a One Health approach by expanding access to services such as veterinary care, lost pet reunification, rent assistance, and short-term foster pet housing.

Additionally, in 2020, for the first time, an animal welfare group, Mercy for Animals India, and public health research institute, George Institute of Global Health, created the Centre for One Health Research to promote human and animal health in India.

The Impact of COVID-19 on One Health and Philanthropy

The COVID-19 pandemic has understandably brought about increased attention to the principles of One Health. This is particularly true within our food systems, which account for about “50% of all zoonotic diseases that have emerged in humans”, contribute to climate change, and disproportionately negatively affect communities of color (Lurie, 2020, p. 19).

At convenings like the 2021 United Nation's Global Food Systems Summit, and through publications such as *Giving Smarter In The Age Of Covid-19: A Turning Point for Planetary Health* from the Milken Institute Center for Strategic Philanthropy (Lurie, 2020), and *Thriving Together: Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and Increasing Well-Being for Animals and People* from the International Fund for Animal Welfare (2018), this trend only appears to be gaining momentum.

Philanthropy is Increasingly Embroiled in the Culture Wars

Teri Behrens

The daily news is replete with stories about the increasing polarization in our society. Many issues we once thought of as common ground, such as public health, have become battlegrounds instead. Perhaps we should be unsurprised then, to see that philanthropy is becoming increasingly enmeshed in these larger culture wars.

The “culture wars” concept was popularized by sociologist James Davison Hunter in his 1991 book, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. In it, he argues that the ideological battle he saw happening then between secular progressives and religious conservatives represented a schism in values and the broader sense of a shared U.S. identity wider than anything since the Civil War.

Since Hunter’s initial publication, some public figures have embraced the language of war, as these broad ideological differences play out across a variety of issues, and promote a win/lose mentality that undermines any belief in or serious efforts to reach compromise.

Today, those contested core values — privacy, property rights, human rights, religious freedom — continue to come into conflict with each other in ways that are not easy to resolve. Voices from across philanthropy are now picking up the language of “culture wars” to describe how those same conflicts show up in our work and conversations.

The Heritage Foundation offers nearly two dozen articles in their digital “Culture Wars” collection (2020). In August 2021, *Inside Philanthropy* asked “Where is Philanthropy?” in the nationwide debate on critical race theory (Matthiessen). Internationally, in the United Kingdom, commentators in the media debated whether the Ministry of Digital, Culture, Media and Skills, which oversees policy related to charities, is being turned into the “Ministry of Culture Wars” (Kennedy, 2021).

Nonprofit advocacy groups on both sides, with support from individual donors and foundations,

have been escalating the rhetoric and working to influence policy at all levels to align with their beliefs and values. In the U.S., three issues in particular have drawn philanthropy deeper into this polarization: racial justice, voting rights and civic engagement, and abortion rights.

Centering Racial Justice

On the racial justice front, foundations like the Ford Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation have clearly staked out their positions. The Ford Foundation (2021) notes that they focus on “Disrupting systems to advance social justice” (para. 4), while the W.K. Kellogg Foundation identifies a commitment to advancing racial equity and racial healing as part of their DNA.

At local levels, community foundations are also committing to racial justice work. The Brooklyn Community Foundation, for example, states that racial justice is core to their mission of building a more fair and just Brooklyn, and they define racial justice as “the systemic redistribution of power, opportunities, and access for people of all races” (para. 3). Some foundations, as we noted in last year’s trends, have begun to focus on reparations, particularly for Native American and Black communities (Olivarez & Starstoneck, 2020).

On the other hand, under the leadership of Elise Westhoff, the Philanthropy Roundtable is strongly arguing against philanthropy’s focus on racial justice (Rendon, 2021) and launched a new campaign, True Diversity, that seeks to move the conversation away from race.

Education — long the recipient of philanthropic dollars — has come under fire for accusations of brainwashing students by teaching critical race theory (Anderson, 2021). A recent guest blog post on the Philanthropy Roundtable website encouraged philanthropists to support challenges to schools’ diversity, equity, and inclusion campaigns (Hermann, 2021).

Philanthropy and the Vote

While philanthropy has a long history of supporting civic engagement and voting rights (see, for example, the MacArthur Foundation's work), the aftermath of the 2020 elections elevated the voting rights vs. integrity of voting conflict in the sector. Despite the lack of evidence of widespread election fraud (Waldman, 2021), eighteen states have enacted legislation to restrict voting (Schouten, 2021) by making identification requirements more stringent (see the Georgie Secretary of State's website for example, and the National Conference of State Legislatures for a state-by-state list of identification laws) and to limit the options for mail-in and extended voting options (Texas, for example — see Brander, 2021).

Nonprofit organizations, foundations, and individual donors are stepping up on this issue in various ways. The Election Integrity Foundation received 501(c)(3) status in February 2020; their mission:

... to create voting villages and other platforms with the purpose of teaching election security and cyber security, providing resources when needed to validate the process surrounding elections, and working to ensure better election platforms are developed for the future to provide the best integrity of the voting process. (para. 3)

This might be viewed as a concerted effort to restrict access to voting in the name of security. The Carnegie Corporation, on the other hand, has continued to ramp up its support of civic engagement, including urging other funders to support advocacy, organizing, and litigation to protect voting rights (Daniels, 2019).

Access to Abortion

As this is being written, the U.S. Supreme Court has just heard oral arguments on a case that may alter the right to abortion afforded under *Roe v. Wade*. In the years since that decision, funders and nonprofits have lined up on both sides. Many of the organizations that offer reproductive health services are themselves part of the vast nonprofit health sector.

Yet, as the makeup of the Supreme Court has changed and more states have begun challenging the decision through new legislation that imposes restrictions, attention is ramping up.

The National Network of Abortion Funds has increased its fundraising and communications efforts in light of Texas' S.B. 8, which effectively outlaws abortions after six weeks and created an expansive "citizen enforcement" program (2021). In the meantime, anti-abortion activism has continued to grow; *Inside Philanthropy* recently documented the funders and nonprofits with an anti-abortion agenda. As they note, this work is often part of a larger conservative ideology (Travers, 2020).

In the U.S., three issues in particular have drawn philanthropy deeper into this polarization: racial justice, voting rights and civic engagement, and abortion rights.

We can see this widening schism across a variety of other issues, ranging from gun control to LGBTQ+ rights, and climate change. When we think of philanthropy as private action for the public good (Payton & Moody, 2008), it is not all surprising that definitions of what is public good differ across the sector. It is the flexibility to focus resources on issues that are important to society that gives philanthropy its power.

There is a danger that, as political power shifts across parties, the party in power will seek to restrict giving in ways that will support their ideological stance and damage the credibility of the philanthropic sector as a whole. For example, over the years there have been accusations that the tax-exempt applications of nonprofits that lean one way or the other have been given extra scrutiny by the IRS (Sekulow, 2017). Others have argued that there's no evidence of this happening (Hackney, 2018).

While philanthropy is part of our culture — and therefore perhaps inevitably part of the culture wars — those who care about it need to be vigilant that it not become a war victim by coming to be seen as a weapon, rather than a tool for the common good.

Innovations in Talent Investment for Individuals, Organizations, and Communities

Mandy Sharp Eizinger, Kevin Peterson, and Tory Martin



The nonprofit sector employs 12.5 million people in the United States (Salamon & Newhouse, 2020) and its people power is its most finite and important resource.

Since its founding in 2014, Fund the People has made the argument that “nonprofit people are nonprofit programs,” and that support for the nonprofit workforce is an “effective strategy for increasing performance, impact, and sustainability” (2017, para. 1).

Yet, the social sector has traditionally underinvested in that talent. Though direct figures for how much each nonprofit spends on professional development are not readily available, foundations invest approximately \$29 per person via grants for leadership development compared to their for-profit counterparts’ rate of \$120 per person (Callanan, 2014).

However, change appears to be on the horizon. Due to the combined pressures of several internal and external drivers, and accelerated by the pandemic, the sector is reflecting on its current models of talent management and deepening its focus on talent support. New efforts to experiment with and invest in talent are cropping up nationwide. While they remain generally small in scale, these efforts are gaining attention and proponents.

Investing in the Talent Pipeline Through Fellowships

In their 2020 report, *Awake to Woke to Work*, Equity in the Center found that while just 10% of nonprofit CEOs/executive directors are from the Black, Indigenous, and people of color community, there is more diversity at the beginning of the talent pipeline.

ProFellow’s 2020 *Fellowship Industry Report* found both that 1) more fellowship programs are focusing on early- and mid-career professionals, and 2) that the growth of professionally-focused fellowship programs in the last 20 years is rooted in the sector’s efforts to support a more inclusive workforce (Yadav & Johnson, 2020). Ninety-three percent of their survey respondents noted actively working toward recruiting diverse fellows as a key priority.

While the impact of these programs remains challenging to quantify, the report shares many case studies from fellowship programs that are already changing the game.

COVID & New Tech are Fueling a Low-Level Migration Across the U.S. So is Philanthropy.

With new, more sophisticated tools available for collaboration, and remote work a fact of daily life, employees are demanding more flexibility and organizations are providing it. Millions of American workers have pulled up stakes and moved wholesale to new cities and states (Molinski, 2021).

Interestingly, philanthropy was playing an innovative role in facilitating both remote work and this internal migration even before the pandemic. In the last several years, many foundations with place-based interests have begun offering incentives for workers from any sector to move to town — either to take new jobs or to continue in their existing positions from a new part of the country.

Remote work is making this migration possible; philanthropy’s incentives are making it attractive. Examples include:

- The Walton Family Foundation’s support of a \$10,000 incentive program to bring new talent to Northwest Arkansas (Perkins, 2021).

- The George Kaiser Family Foundation's investment of \$4 million in the Tulsa Remote program since 2018. Nearly 1,200 individuals have made the move (with many staying longer than the one-year commitment), taking advantage of a program that offers \$10,000 in cash, co-working space, attractive prices on city-center housing, and a community-building program for those willing to make the leap (Tulsa Remote, n.d.; The Journal Record, 2021).

According to an article in the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, “The effort in Northwest Arkansas is part of an increasing number of philanthropy-financed projects trying to spark economic development, promote civic and cultural life, attract skilled workers, and offset declining or sparse populations” (Perkins, 2021, para. 5).

While these programs are not aimed at supporting individual development, or even talent for the philanthropic sector alone, they are investments in the overall talent ecosystem and communities' abilities to provide vibrant environments.

Nonprofits are Adopting Distributed Leadership Models

Under the burdens of overwork and isolation, and often as a response to calls in the sector for more leadership opportunities for women and people of color, many nonprofits and foundations are now adopting co-leadership or distributed leadership models. These organizations are embracing a reorganization of decision-making stresses and a redistribution of work. And they're embedding talent development strategies within their new models:

- The Building Movement Project launched its co-leadership model in 2013 when Sean Thomas-Breitfeld joined Frances Kunreuther as co-director.
- Pia Infante joined John Esterle as co-CEO of The Whitman Institute in 2014.
- Many nonprofit news and media organizations, including Resolve Philly, Allied Media Projects (AMP), and Open News, launched with or adopted co-leaders.
- The Jacobs Foundation in Switzerland adopted its new structure in 2020, even creating co-directorship roles further down the org chart so

that every executive position would be shared (Dimovska et al., 2021).

Jenny Lee, the executive director of AMP, led the organization's transition to a co-leadership model. Lee stated: “My desire for a Co-Executive Director is in part about adding capacity. Directing AMP is a huge role that could easily amount to two full time jobs. But it is also about alleviating the loneliness of being an ED” (2020, para. 5).

In our conversations with various organizations on this subject, the reasons for adopting co-leadership models were near-universal: supporting more diverse talent and making leadership roles more sustainable.

Nascent Interest in Funding Sabbaticals for Nonprofit Leadership

As *Inside Philanthropy's* Dawn Wolfe (2021b) reports, there are still very few foundations offering paid sabbaticals for nonprofit leaders. The Durfee Foundation, Barr Foundation, Colorado Health Foundation, and a scant few others are the only ones on the list.

However, also in large part driven by pandemic-related burnout, many of the funders on this short list are adding sabbatical spots to their programs in the coming year and beyond. The Durfee Foundation and Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust also reported a slight uptick in interest in their sabbatical programs from foundation peers (Wolfe, 2021a).

It appears that more organizations are beginning to heed the call (Durfee Foundation, 2017; Center for Nonprofit Excellence, 2018) for restorative and strategic breaks for leaders in high-stress roles. Coverage from journalists and bloggers like Dawn Wolfe, *NPQ's* Steve Dubb (2018), and Vu Le (2020) will help drive this trend.

Competing for Talent

Research suggests that investments in workplace culture that create a supportive learning environment and positive employee experience are key to attracting and retaining talent. As the competition for employees increases, top-notch salaries, flexible work environments, and restorative leadership programs centered on equity are critically needed to ensure the health of nonprofit organizations.

Increasing Attention to the Decline in Household Giving to Nonprofits

Michael Moody

In July 2021, data from the Philanthropy Panel Study, a long-running survey project of Indiana University's Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, revealed that in 2018 the number of American households that said they give to charity dropped below 50% for the first time (Osili et al.). That number was 66% as recently as 2000. This decline — found in other evidence as well — is raising major alarm bells in the field.

This steady decline in giving to nonprofits is found across all racial and ethnic groups, and households headed by younger donors are even less likely to give (Osili et al., 2021). For those households that do give, the average amount given is going down for all but the wealthiest families (Generosity Commission, n.d.).

We've known for a while that the "wealth gap is becoming a giving gap" (Moody, 2019). The overall giving pie continues to increase — topping \$324 billion for individuals in 2020 (Giving USA, 2021) — but more of that pie is contributed by fewer households (Duquette, 2020; Rooney, 2019).

That said, research from the Fundraising Effectiveness Project (2021), the Blackbaud Institute (2021), and others suggests that during the pandemic there was at least a short-term reversal of this trend — perhaps attributable to extra funds from stimulus checks as much as newly motivated donors (Albrecht, 2021). However, it isn't clear yet if this pandemic-related giving increase was more than just a blip in this overall downward trend.

The longer-term decline in household giving is certainly troubling to nonprofits and anyone who believes that more giving by more people is a good thing. It raises the distressing possibility that the giving of "treasure" to nonprofits might eventually be something only rich people do.

Why are Fewer Households Giving to Charity?

The truth is we don't really know for sure what is causing this decline. Initial indications are that the answer will be a complex one.

Wealth concentration has exploded. Disposable income has gone down for the middle and working class. Student debt has skyrocketed (Martin, 2019).


Also, several traditional facilitators of household giving have been declining, especially among young people. These include religiosity, social capital, and trust in institutions — as scholars like Robert Putnam and Shaylyn Romney Garrett (2020) have shown. Trust specifically in nonprofits has also been declining (Independent Sector, 2021; Martin, 2021).

Finally, the decline might be because giving money to nonprofits is not the only way — or even the primary way — many households believe they can make the world a better place. As Lucy Bernholz (2021) explains in *How We Give Now*, giving to tax-exempt organizations is just one of many options in our modern "givingscape." Person-to-person helping, crowdfunding, political donations or activism, ethical consumption, and impact investing are becoming more popular alternatives — again, especially among young people (Cause and Social Influence, 2021).

Combatting the Decline in Household Giving

Some might ask: If the total amount of giving to nonprofits is still going up, why should we worry if that money is coming from fewer families while others slow or stop their giving?

For starters, we know that many charities, especially smaller ones, rely heavily on a broad base of modest gifts. The Urban Institute (2021)



found that nonprofits with annual budgets under \$500,000 said they relied on individuals for 30% of their revenue, versus 18% for larger organizations (Faulk et al.). Smaller organizations might not have the bandwidth to adapt their fundraising practices to attract bigger donations.

If the funding mix of any nonprofit becomes increasingly dominated by major gifts from a few supporters, what might the practical and ethical consequences be?

There are also power dynamics to consider. If the funding mix of any nonprofit becomes increasingly dominated by major gifts from a few supporters, what might the practical and ethical consequences be? Could this trend further perpetuate the too-common misconception that philanthropy is only the domain of the wealthy? Could it create a sort of two-tiered philanthropic landscape, where those with most of the wealth are privileged enough to give in the ways we measure and celebrate, while others only give in less formal ways that go mostly unrecognized?

With these and other reasons in mind, some are now devising plans to reverse the trend.

Economic Reform. Likely the best antidote is to stop or reverse growing inequality, and/or to help alleviate the financial strains felt by those households who are giving less to nonprofits. Some funders — such as the members of Economic Opportunity Funders — and many advocacy organizations are ramping up economic reform efforts, but such a massive social transformation is a task that requires a major shift in public policy.

Tax Incentives. Some advocate using the tax code to incentivize charitable giving by a larger range of households. Groups like Independent Sector and Council on Foundations continue to call for a universal charitable deduction or tax credit at the federal level (Montañez, 2020). At the state level, there is a push to create new or expanded tax-based incentives.

Research. The most notable effort by the philanthropic sector to combat this decline is the Generosity Commission. Following an initial round of research, the Generosity Commission was formally launched in late 2021. Over the next two years, it will fund additional research to inform recommendations for reversing the decline and embracing new ways of giving, and lead a “National Conversation” about its work. While this ambitious effort is just getting started, it is already not without its critics (Daniels, 2021; Rojc, 2021).

An Expanded View of Giving

In the end, even if we can slow or reverse this trend, it seems best if we expand our understanding of what “counts” as giving and doing good (Fidelity Charitable, 2021). There are tremendous benefits to thinking broadly about philanthropy, in a way that can include a range of informal, non-monetary, smaller, and more personal gifts and actions that might not be captured in a survey question about household giving to organizations (Payton & Moody, 2008). And in a world with increasingly blurry boundaries between sectors, it would make sense to pay more attention to the diversity of ways people are choosing to do good.

Expanding our conception of giving does not mean we have to discount traditional giving to formal organizations, or to allow that to become a choice only for the privileged few. Philanthropy can be “both/and.”

Donors of Color are Mobilizing for Their Communities — Often at the Forefront of Emerging Trends

Tamela Spicer

Research from the Mays Institute on Diverse Philanthropy (2021) “indicates that about two-thirds of Black and Hispanic households and nearly one-half of Asian households gave to charity in a given year” (p. 12).

Giving by donors of color is a growing area of interest and attention for the philanthropic sector, as non-Hispanic Whites “are no longer projected to make up the majority of the U.S. population” beginning in 2045 (Vespa et al., 2020, p. 5).

What’s more, donors of color are themselves leading — or are playing an increasingly visible role in leading — many of the shifts we’re seeing in the field.

Communities of Color Hold Centuries of Giving Traditions

Giving among communities of color is nothing new (Akanjo, 2021). According to philanthropy historian Tyrone McKinley Freeman (2019), philanthropy in Black American communities came early, with leaders such as James Forten, Thomy LaFon, and Clara Brown helping enslaved and formerly enslaved people to flee the south in the late 1700s and 1800s by financing abolitionist newspapers and the Underground Railroad and providing support in the aftermath of the Civil War.

Mutual aid societies developed in the late 1700s, working to abolish slavery. The end of the U.S.-Mexican War in 1848 gave rise to many more in an effort to help Mexican immigrants settle across the southwest (Duran, 2001). Many of these mutual aid societies existed well into the 1960s.

In the 21st century, we’ve seen notable gifts from donors of color, like Cuban-born Alberto Vilar’s \$50 million gift to the Kennedy Center in 2001, and Robert F. Smith’s gift to graduates of Morehouse

College. Smith announced during a commencement speech “that he would pay off the student loan debt of the entire 2019 graduating class of about 400 young men from the historically black school” (Freeman, 2019, para. 1).

Data Can Both Obscure and Illuminate Giving


Everyday examples of giving by donors of color are often crowded out by reports of the continued wealth gap in this country. That gap can foster a public misconception that communities of color are primarily on the receiving end of philanthropy rather than the side of generosity.

However, the data also point to a very different story. While the “black-white income gap has held steady since 1970” (Schaeffer, para. 7), “black families have contributed the largest proportion of their wealth ... to charity since 2010” (Ashley & James, 2018, para. 2) as compared to whites and other ethnic groups.

Furthermore, because giving by donors of color often looks different than among white communities and varies tremendously across the board, this generosity has often been missed by traditional forms of collecting information, such as surveys and tax filings (Vaid & Maxton, 2017). Black and Asian donors are more likely to donate goods, volunteer their time, and even donate blood. Black donors are the most likely to give to people they know, both with direct monetary gifts and in non-financial ways (Mays Institute, 2021).

Donors of Color are at the Forefront of Trends

Take a look at the sector: as we examine many of the major shifts that are redefining avenues of



giving and engaging, we see donors of color taking the lead and embracing innovation.

Household Giving. Despite an overall decline in household giving over the last 20 years, donors of color may be turning that tide. The pandemic and racial reckoning of 2020 saw an increase in giving by donors of color that outpaced white donors. According to the Blackbaud Institute's 2021 *Tipping Point* report, "Nearly half (46%) of Black donors say they gave more, with Hispanic (44%) and Asian (38%) donors close behind" (para. 17). Blackbaud's data also revealed that donors of color were more likely to give to new organizations in 2020, with Hispanic donors the most likely to do so.

Black and Asian donors are more likely to donate goods, volunteer their time, and even donate blood. Black donors are the most likely to give to people they know, both with direct monetary gifts and in non-financial ways.

Building Infrastructure for Givers of Color.

Fueled by continued disparities, "racialized groups have bonded with each other over their shared experiences, which has led to many racialized groups sharing a sense of economic reciprocity with each other" (Mays Institute, 2021, p. 11).

This sense of shared experiences and bonding is giving rise to a number of philanthropic giving networks and initiatives, like the Donors of Color Network, Borealis Philanthropy, the Community Investment Network, and Give 8/28 which raised over \$177,000 in just one day in 2021.

New avenues for giving and convening are also springing up among donors of color, as represented by the May 2021 launch of the Asian American Foundation. Founded in response to the increasing number of hate crimes against Asian Americans, the founding "record-breaking donation of \$125 million ... is the largest commitment ever made by Asian Americans to their own community" (Elkind, 2021, paras. 1, 2).

Giving Circles. As the movement for giving circles continues to gain momentum, donors of color are often leading the way, marshaling a form of giving that more closely aligns with traditions of collective philanthropy (Philanthropy Together, n.d.). A report from the Collective Giving Research Group (2017) indicates that newer members of giving circles tend to be more diverse, with Latino/a participation especially on the rise.

High Net Worth Donors. The growing number of high net worth individuals is often hidden in plain sight due to systemic racism and the historic lack of research focused on donors of color. A 2017 report projected, "1.3 million African American, Asian, and Hispanic individuals across the U.S. with a net worth of over \$1 million" (Vaid & Maxton, p. 3).

Cryptocurrency. At the 2021 Black Blockchain Summit, some 1,500 mostly Black people, gathered at Howard University "to talk about crypto ... as a way to make money while disrupting centuries-long patterns of oppression" (Ross, para. 2). A 2021 report from NORC at the University of Chicago demonstrated that "Two-fifths of crypto traders are not white" (para. 2). That 44% of crypto traders might just be the next generation of mega-donors.

As communities of color continue to navigate economic disparity, continued racism, and unprecedented health crises resulting from the pandemic, they are mobilizing in innovative ways for a collective philanthropic impact.

Expanding the Definitions of Philanthropy and Philanthropist

Michael Layton



One of the most consequential emerging trends in philanthropy is a growing consensus that we must expand our collective definitions of “philanthropy” and “philanthropist.”

Media reports and academic research often narrowly define philanthropy as cash donations to charitable organizations. The roots of this understanding can be dated back to the early 20th century and the rise of large grantmaking institutions and mega-wealthy, industrialist donors (Zunz, 2012). Andrew Carnegie’s (1889) *Gospel of Wealth* has long defined the archetypal philanthropist.

Today, however, the overlapping challenges of a global pandemic and inchoate racial reckoning have provided an opportunity to recast our conception of philanthropy (Kasper et al., 2021). The kaleidoscopic variety of ways in which Americans in all communities engage in voluntary action for the public good (Payton & Moody, 2008) is beginning to get its rightful due, both currently and historically.

Grantmaking, Research, and Advocacy on Diverse Forms of Philanthropy

Much of this progress can be attributed to the growing body of grantmaking, research, and advocacy focused upon acknowledging and building up philanthropy in communities of color. Large-scale research projects such as *Everyday Donors of Color* (Mays Family Institute on Diverse Philanthropy, 2021), *The Apparitional Donor* (Vaid & Maxton, 2017), and others are describing long-standing traditions and shedding light on their prevalence (See: Carson, 1993; Freeman, 2020; Mottino & Miller, 2005; New England Blacks in Philanthropy, 2021; Smith et al., 1999; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, n.d., 2012).

While these forms of community philanthropy go back generations and span the globe, what is new is institutional philanthropy’s growing appreciation

and support for and study of these practices. These works acknowledge actions that go beyond monetary contributions to registered charities and include “a medley of beneficent acts and gifts that address someone’s needs or larger social purposes that arise from a collective consciousness and shared experience of humanity” (Freeman, 2020, pp. 3–4).

We have now arrived at an emerging consensus that these practices are not a marginal aspect of philanthropy but constitute some of its core components (Bernholz, 2021).

Redefining our Understanding of American Philanthropy — Past and Present

Two recent publications nicely encapsulate how the definitions of philanthropy and philanthropist are being transformed, expanded, and enriched in ways that are having a lasting impact on the field. They also reinforce the sense that we have come to an inflection point in our understanding of philanthropy, where cumulative progress is supplanted by an enduring paradigm shift in how we understand this crucial aspect of society (Kuhn, 1970).

The first publication is a historical biography, Tyrone McKinley Freeman’s (2020) *Madam C. J. Walker’s Gospel of Giving*. Freeman writes that Walker embodied a tradition of generosity in the Black community that identifies “any resource that has the potential to alleviate suffering or bring about meaningful change ... as being useful philanthropic currency — be it time, money, employment, education, beauty, influence, inspiration, or tangible goods” (p. 208).

Walker’s gospel of giving stands in sharp contrast to Carnegie’s gospel of wealth. Walker’s philanthropy was an ongoing aspect of her life, which grew in ambition and magnitude as her fortune grew — it

was not something she came to after she achieved material success (Freeman, 2020).

The second publication is a work of social science. Lucy Bernholz's (2021) *How We Give Now: A Philanthropic Guide for the Rest of Us*, was sponsored by the Generosity Commission. In it, Bernholz moves beyond the analysis of survey results and IRS Form 990s to use case studies and focus groups to ask people, "How do you give?" This open-ended inquiry encouraged respondents to use their own words to describe how they seek to improve their communities, including: "I host events for local families," "I give shoes, backpacks and jackets every year," and "Employ poverty-level people, support them with daycare" (Bernholz & Pawliw-Fry, 2020, p. 11).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, monetary donations are only a small part of the efforts they describe.

Collective Action for the Public Good

Taken together, and placed within the broader movements for collective giving we have seen in previous *11 Trends in Philanthropy* reports (e.g., giving circles, global giving traditions, the leadership of donors of color), these two works are helping our sector to question and redefine itself in three critical and mutually reinforcing ways:

- **How we engage in philanthropy, emphasizing the importance of collective action and community connection.** In a historic nadir of "community connectedness and social solidarity in America" (Putnam & Romney Garrett, 2021, p. 105; Layton & Martin, 2021), the movement towards giving circles and other forms of collective giving grounded in conversation and collaboration is more important than ever. Through the Latino Giving Circle Network, the Latino Community Foundation, for instance, has been explicit about how giving circle participation aims "to change the meaning of philanthropist to be both more inclusive and a step toward building power" (Bernholz, 2021, p. 177; Layton, 2021).
- **Reimagining how we identify philanthropists, seeing generosity not only in those who make large monetary donations.** Since 1996, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation has supported organizations working to expand who is considered a

philanthropist. Most recently, as part of the Catalyzing Community Giving initiative, their work is to underline the centrality of community in identifying and solving community-based challenges (n.d.).

Organizations such as Learning to Give and the Giving Square are working to redefine the age of the "typical" philanthropist, as they encourage children and youth to understand the philanthropic relevance of their actions as caregivers and to see their calls for fairness as essentially philanthropic (Neugebauer, 2021; Mangrulkar & Behrens, 2013).

Part of expanding who counts as a philanthropist is appreciating the myriad ways in which we seek to improve our communities.

- **Where we express our solidarity, beyond the formal, institutional settings of organizations and foundations.** Part of expanding who counts as a philanthropist is appreciating the myriad ways in which we seek to improve our communities. When we help a neighbor, participate in a public meeting, or make purchases taking into account our environmental and community impact, we are acting to advance the public good.

Today, while some entrepreneurs have monetized the sharing economy, others have used the concept to provide mutual aid and advance connection. For example, the Buy Nothing Project was "founded in 2013 with the mission to build community by connecting people through hyperlocal gifting, and reducing our impact on the environment" (para. 3).

Overall, these expansions of the definitions of philanthropy and philanthropists acknowledge the myriad ways in which we collectively engage and mobilize our generosity to improve our communities. But perhaps the largest benefit will come when this recognition results in regulatory frameworks, incentive structures, and organizational practices that encourage greater numbers of Americans of all backgrounds to become engaged in giving (Bernholz, 2021).

Philanthropy is Entering a New Era of Engagement with Native Communities

Trish Abalo, Adam Engwis, and Tory Martin

While Native American communities have been working for generations to support their lands, peoples, and cultures, institutional philanthropy has largely ignored — or actively hindered — that work for over a century.

In the last several years, however — marked by major events such as the stand-offs at Standing Rock in 2016 (Kavate, 2020), the publication of Edgar Villanueva's *Decolonizing Wealth* in 2018, and the racial reckonings of 2020 — philanthropy has been experiencing a surge in awareness of the unique experiences, strengths, and challenges faced by Native American communities. Today, we see philanthropy entering a new era of engagement with Native communities.

Native Communities Are Active Philanthropists

Grounded in centuries-old traditions of giving as mutual responsibility, community care, and reciprocity, Indigenous people have historically pushed to resource their own communities (Konzen, 2019; Scott-Enns, 2020).

Within formal Native American philanthropic institutions, examples include Native-led foundations, tribal enterprise giving, community development financial institutions, and pooled funding collaboratives, as well as nonprofit funds. The American Indian Science and Engineering Society, the American Indian College Fund, and the Association on American Indian Affairs, for instance, offer scholarships and academic support, among other resources.

Due to current data reporting barriers, it is difficult to estimate how much funding Native-led sources give, but specific cases demonstrate Native philanthropic entities' commitment to serving their communities. For example, Delgado (2006) found that from 2001–2003, Native-led foundations, nonprofits, and tribal funds disbursed over \$122.5 million.

Institutional Funding for Native American Causes Overall Is Dismal

Research from the First Nations Development Institute (First Nations), reported by Frontline Solutions (2018), found that only 0.23% of philanthropic funds went to Native-led nonprofit organizations. A 2019 study from Native Americans in Philanthropy (NAP) and Candid, *Investing in Native Communities*, found that, on average, just 0.4% of total annual funding by large U.S. foundations was given to Native American communities and causes from 2002 to 2016.

Even in the midst of a historic reckoning on racial and social justice, the reality is dismal. Sixty-seven percent of nonprofit survey respondents who self-identified as serving Native American communities reported to the Center for Effective Philanthropy that their organization had received no new funding from their foundation supporters in 2020 (Martin et al., 2021, p. 20). In contrast, 52% of overall nonprofit survey respondents said their support from foundations increased in 2020 over 2019 levels (p. 13).

Yet, several large investments in global Indigenous communities in late 2021 may be cause for optimism.

- NAP was included in the summer 2021 round of funding from Mackenzie Scott and received a \$2 million gift (Kunze).
- In September 2021, nine grantmakers signed on to the Protecting Our Planet Challenge. Made alongside their collective \$5 billion commitment to conservation efforts was a pledge to work closely and differently with Indigenous communities going forward (Rendon).
- At COP26, 17 funders and five nations pledged a collective \$1.7 billion specifically “to support the advancement of Indigenous Peoples’ and local communities’ forest tenure rights” (Ford Foundation, 2021, para. 2).

This is About Awareness for Native American Leaders and History

First Nations and Candid's report (2019) revealed that "Invisibility is one of the biggest barriers Native peoples face in advocating for tribal sovereignty, equity, and social justice" (p. 20).

Barron et al. (2020) drew connections between awareness, disinvestment, and the exclusion of Native Americans from the majority of foundation boards and staff. Research from CHANGE Philanthropy (Kan, 2021) and the Council on Foundations (2021) shows that Indigenous-identifying people make up a mere 0.7–0.8% of philanthropy professionals.

The shift we are seeing today, then, is a palpable increase in the presence of Indigenous voices, stories, organizations, and partnerships at philanthropy's many tables. Native American leaders, movements, and histories are appearing frequently on conference programs and plenaries across the field:

- At the 2021 CHANGE Philanthropy Unity Summit, speakers included staff from the National Urban Indian Family Coalition, National Native American Boarding School Healing Coalition, Indigenous Peoples Task Force, and many others.
- Researchers from the First Nations Development Institute and the University of Arizona presented together on *Leadership and Gender Dynamics in the Native American Nonprofit Sector* at the 2021 ARNOVA 50th Annual Conference (Ellenwood & Foxworth).
- The Alliance for Nonprofit Management issued an apology for beginning their 2021 virtual conference on Indigenous Peoples' Day, offering a slate of learning and reflection resources for colleagues (Timko & Penn).

Land Acknowledgments and Land Back Movements

Land seems to be at the forefront of what philanthropy is paying attention to, catalyzed by Native advocates. Practitioners who have attended a recent conference or webinar will be familiar with the concept of a "Land Acknowledgment," defined as "a formal statement that recognizes and respects

Indigenous Peoples as traditional stewards of this land and the enduring relationship that exists between Indigenous Peoples and their traditional territories" (Northwestern University, 2021, para. 1).

While it is impractical to quantify how frequently land acknowledgments now appear during philanthropy networking and learning events, anecdotally they appear to be on the rise. Aided by the creation of the Native-Land.ca map in 2015, and its subsequent popularization by project administrator Native Land Digital, program attendees seem increasingly able to promptly share their own Land Acknowledgments in the "chat" feature — implying that awareness of recognizing Indigenous ancestral ties to land is growing rapidly.

[W]e are seeing today ... a palpable increase in the presence of Indigenous voices, stories, organizations, and partnerships at philanthropy's many tables.

Additionally, Land Back efforts — in the Black Hills of the Great Sioux Nation (Estes, 2021); the Delmarva Peninsula of the Nanticokes and Lenapes (Hedgpeth, 2021); the East Bay of the Lisjan Ohlone people and the Sogorea Te' Land Trust; and elsewhere — are also making headlines and garnering philanthropic attention. This movement is about reclamation of Indigenous sovereignty, jurisdiction, and governance, as well as ancestral knowledge, language, and culture — entangled in centuries of broken treaties and unceded territory, tied to contemporary U.S. state and federal law, and today's economic and social realities.

This Could Be the Beginning

It remains to be seen whether the funding and resources necessary to begin moving the proverbial needle for Native communities will materialize. As major philanthropic institutions begin to voice support, actionable follow-through will be key. Native communities are forging pathways forward, and philanthropy is situated to help do the work in unprecedented ways — if it will reckon with the power dynamics and continued legacies of colonial systems in the field (Chitnis, 2018).

Nonprofits are Finding New Ways to Get the Data They Need

Kallie Bauer

The nonprofit sector has long differed from the for-profit sector in its relationship to data. Benetech's founder and CEO, Jim Fruchterman, highlighted these differences in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review*: whereas for-profit entities can harness transactional data to demonstrate financial viability, nonprofits have the unique challenge of collecting data from a variety of sources — communities, staff, donors, policymakers — to demonstrate impact (2016).

Simultaneously, limited budgets and data know-how have held nonprofits back for years (Paz, 2020). To overcome these challenges, many organizations have traditionally relied on existing programmatic data or publicly-available datasets for information about the communities they serve.

However, with the availability of new technology and new partnerships, nonprofits are taking advantage of the rise of data philanthropy, predictive analytics, and machine learning to demonstrate impact.

Making Publicly Available Data Useful to the Public

For decades, nonprofits have especially relied on data and reports made available by government entities. The U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) is a prime example. The ACS provides detailed population and housing information (e.g., educational attainment, housing burden, unemployment estimates, etc.) at a variety of geographic levels on an annual basis.

Today, the number of publicly-available datasets — from government and non-government sources — is growing. Part of this is due to an increase in “open data” efforts, such as OpenCorporates (launched in 2010), which shares data on corporations worldwide, and Open990, which takes advantage of the 2019 Taxpayer First Act requiring nonprofits to file their IRS Forms 990 electronically, making

hundreds of millions of data points on the nonprofit sector available to the public.

The number of data dashboards is also on the rise (Bauer & Borashko, 2020). Organizations like Data Driven Detroit, Western Pennsylvania Regional Data Center, and the Johnson Center are developing public dashboard platforms. These increasingly powerful tools to extract and display information about specific populations are making it simpler for everyday users to find and display the information they need without having to collect it themselves.

Data Philanthropy: Private Data for the Public Good

The for-profit sector sits on massive quantities of data about consumer habits, personal mobility, social network behaviors, etc. Some companies are now seeing the potential to use those databanks for more than commercial pursuits.

Data philanthropy allows nonprofits to use private data, otherwise unavailable to them, to better serve their communities. The Mastercard Center for Inclusive Growth is a large promoter of data philanthropy. In one partnership with the Urban Institute, the Mastercard Center for Inclusive Growth provided anonymized and aggregated credit card transaction data, delimited by time and geography (2018). Researchers at the Urban Institute used that data to investigate charitable giving and equitable development in U.S. cities (McKeever et al., 2019).

Data philanthropy is also playing a large role in the global pandemic response. Many mobile devices track users' geographic location. As a result, it is possible for private companies like Google to collect mobility data. In 2020, Google started producing COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. They show how visits to places, such as parks or grocery stores, are changing in frequency, volume, and time of day for different geographic regions.



UNICEF is using these reports — in conjunction with other private datasets from Telefonica, IBM, Amadeus, and Red Hat — to invest in a collaborative platform called MagicBox. MagicBox allows UNICEF to study the socio-economic impacts of physical distancing policies in real time (Garcia-Herranz et al., 2020).

Using Predictive Analytics in Fundraising

Kirstie Tiernan and Gurjeet Singh (2019) define “predictive analytics” as, “a set of techniques and technologies that extract information from data to identify patterns and predict future outcomes” (para. 2).

[N]onprofits are taking advantage of the rise of data philanthropy, predictive analytics, and machine learning to demonstrate impact.

One area where predictive analytics is gaining traction is fundraising and development. Typically, nonprofits must decide who of their prior and potential donors to contact for fundraising. This can be a time-consuming process. Nonprofits must look at donor records and decide which factors appear the most relevant. They may spend time conducting their own statistical analysis on large volumes of data to find this information or contract out the service to a third party.

Predictive analytics can streamline this process. Each donor can be assigned a donation probability (using a predictive model), based on historical giving patterns and other donor characteristics. If a donor has a high donation probability, they can be targeted in fundraising campaigns. Using predictive analytics cuts down on the overhead nonprofits spend contacting donors who are unlikely to contribute investments. It also increases the efficiency of fundraising campaigns (Tiernan & Singh, 2019).

In fact, a 2021 *Salesforce Nonprofit Trends Report* indicated nonprofits who had higher digital maturity, defined as “[the] ability to leverage data to inform decision-making, reach new audiences, personalize communications, and forecast fundraising income” (p. 1), were more likely to meet their fundraising revenue goals.

Applying Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning to Your Mission

Some nonprofits are taking predictive analytics a step further with artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning. Authors France Hoang and Dave Levy (2020) write,

AI makes predictive analytics for nonprofits faster, better, and more affordable. AI can sort through more massive volumes of data than any human could and, through machine learning, develop predictive models faster and with far more complexity and power than what a person could do on their own. (para. 8)

PATH, a Los Angeles-based nonprofit addressing homelessness, provides an example (Levy, 2021). PATH used machine learning to develop LeaseUp, a platform that identifies available housing units in a given area so that case managers can recommend the best housing option in real-time to their clients. Using this technology, PATH has been able to reduce the time it takes to find housing for their clients from 90 days to 45 days.

Caveats

Although AI and machine learning can be powerful tools, nonprofits should also consider the risks involved with this technology. Anyone working with data must be cognizant of the possible impacts of implicit (and explicit) biases in the information they extract or programs they build (Lee et al., 2019).

It’s also possible for machine-learning programs to make mistakes if human oversight is taken out of the equation (Szalavitz, 2021). Great care should be taken when pursuing AI and machine learning. The rewards can be powerful for an organization, but they do not come without risks.

Nonprofits are Questioning Their Use of Facebook

Emily Brenner and Karen Hoekstra

As the world's largest social media platform, Facebook has changed not only the way people connect and interact with one another but the way nonprofit organizations engage their donors and stakeholders as well.

However, the recent testimony before Congress from Facebook whistleblower Frances Haugen confirmed what many suspected for some time — that Facebook is well aware of the harm its products cause, yet continues to pursue questionable data collection practices and optimize an algorithm that amplifies the spread of misinformation (Allyn, 2021). As we learn more about how Facebook and other social media platforms are causing harm to civil society, philanthropic organizations are starting to ask themselves a difficult question: should we stop using Facebook (Levey, 2020)?

Donors and Data Privacy

With over 2.9 billion monthly active users worldwide (Statista, 2021), Facebook provides enormous value to nonprofits as an avenue for awareness-building, community engagement, and, of course, fundraising. Facebook says it has helped raise more than \$5 billion for nonprofit and private causes since 2015, the year it began facilitating online donations (The NonProfit Times, 2021).

But despite its fundraising capabilities, Facebook is, at its core, an advertising platform; as much as 99% of its revenue comes from advertising (Edelman, 2020). The more its users engage, the more data it can mine and monetize. There's legitimate concern across our sector that Facebook promotes its work with nonprofits purely as a way to mine donor data — another opportunity to collect and sell more information (Fontelera, 2021).

Mightycause CEO Tom Matthews (2019) highlighted how the company's fee-free fundraising options appeal to nonprofits looking to save on donation

processing costs, but that convenience comes at the high cost of donors' privacy and data.

When someone likes a post, clicks on a link, or contributes to a fundraiser on a nonprofit page, Facebook stores that data — anything and everything from the individual's demographics, social networks and relationships, political leanings, life events, food preferences, hobbies, and entertainment interests, to the digital devices they use (Hitlin & Rainie, 2019) — and uses it to sell to advertisers and target solicitations on Facebook and its other applications, including Instagram and WhatsApp.

Nonprofits have expressed other concerns about Facebook, as well. Richard Levey (2020) described how Facebook has frustrated some nonprofit leaders by falsely censoring their messages for being “political statements” (based on its own, unclear screening criteria) and, thus, thwarted their organizing efforts. Other organizations find that they aren't able to promote, or “boost,” their messages because of Facebook's algorithm, meaning a nonprofit might miss out on organizing or fundraising opportunities when attempting to address time-sensitive issues.

Increasing Calls for Change

Haugen's testimony has accelerated a phenomenon that was already happening on a smaller level. As far back as 2010, there were public calls for users to leave Facebook (Warren). The group behind the now-defunct website QuitFacebook.com explained, “If you agree that Facebook doesn't respect you, your personal data or the future of the Web, you may want to join us” (Smith, 2011, para. 6).

The ongoing Facebook Logout campaign, organized by the tech accountability group Kairos, calls on Mark Zuckerberg to step down as CEO of Facebook, demanding that the company prioritize data privacy, tackle disinformation and misinformation,



and provide transparency on content moderation decisions (2021).

In October 2021, a coalition of nearly 50 nonprofits in the U.S. launched a movement to draw attention to the dangers of apps like Facebook, whose algorithm “use[s] our own personal data to manipulate us” (HowToStopFacebook.org, para. 1; Jackson, 2021). They argue that these platforms are harmful to children, undermine democracy, and exacerbate discrimination. The group’s website, HowToStopFacebook.org, prompts visitors to sign a petition asking lawmakers to investigate Facebook and pass more stringent data-privacy legislation.

[Facebook’s] fee-free fundraising options appeal to nonprofits looking to save on donation processing costs, but that convenience comes at the high cost of donors’ privacy and data.

Some nonprofits have already stopped using Facebook entirely. Portland, Oregon-based tech nonprofit NTEN announced its departure from Facebook in June 2020 (Sample Ward). And late last year, Momentum Nonprofit Partners posted a message on Facebook saying, in part, “After careful review of our mission and values, we have determined that Facebook does not align with our values as an organization and our commitment to creating positive change in our community” (2021).

Nonprofits Aren’t the Only Ones Taking a Stand

A growing number of for-profit businesses have suspended their paid advertising on Facebook as part of the #StopHateForProfit campaign, organized by a coalition of civil rights organizations including the Anti-Defamation League (ADL)

and the NAACP. Patagonia, The North Face, REI, Upwork, and others joined the boycott amid concerns that Facebook continues to be “complicit in spreading disinformation and fomenting fear and hatred,” (Fung & Kim, 2020, para. 5). “We hope this campaign finally shows Facebook how much their users and their advertisers want them to make serious changes for the better,” said ADL CEO Jonathan Greenblatt (Fung & Kim, 2020, para. 12).

Hello, Meta. Goodbye, Facebook?

While it’s clear there is increasing interest in moving away from Facebook, what isn’t clear is what might take its place. A platform with the same functionalities and reach does not currently exist, which will make leaving the platform a difficult choice for many nonprofits (Levey, 2020).

Those that use Facebook to interact with donors and are heavily reliant on its fundraising capabilities will have the hardest time shifting away from Facebook. “Smaller organizations are ... more severely impacted by the inability to reach back out to the donors who are giving via Facebook, because they really need them,” said Elyse Wallnutt, director of strategy at Media Cause (Levey, 2020, para. 16).

With the announcement of Meta, the new parent brand of Facebook, the company stated that Meta’s focus will be to “bring the metaverse to life and help people connect, find communities and grow businesses” (2021, para. 1). Nonprofits, broadly, exist to serve the same purpose — to help communities thrive for the greater good. Yet in that same announcement about the future of the company, Facebook/Meta clarified that their corporate structure would not be changing, nor would the ways they collect and share data.

There’s no question that Facebook will have the resources to support the development of Meta’s vision — but an increasing number of nonprofits are questioning whether they want to take part in that future.

Cryptocurrency and Philanthropy: New Donors and New Questions for Nonprofits

Bambysheva, N. (2021, May 12). Ethereum's co-founder Vitalik Buterin donates over \$1 Billion to India Covid relief fund and other charities. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ninabambysheva/2021/05/12/ethereum-co-founder-vitalik-buterin-donates-over-1-billion-to-india-covid-relief-fund-and-other-charities/>

Cohn, M. (2021, July). As cryptocurrency donations rise, nonprofits grapple with processing. *The NonProfit Times*. NPT Publishing. <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/As+Cryptocurrency+Donations+Rise%2c+Nonprofits+Grapple+With+Processing.-a0667878062>

Conway, L. (2021, September 16). The 10 most important cryptocurrencies other than Bitcoin. *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/tech/most-important-cryptocurrencies-other-than-bitcoin/>

Fidelity Charitable. (2021, October 28). *Growing popularity of cryptocurrency could fuel charitable giving*. <https://www.fidelitycharitable.org/about-us/news/growing-popularity-of-cryptocurrency-could-fuel-charitable-giving.html>

The Giving Block. (2021). *Cryptocurrency fundraising: Nonprofit guide to accepting crypto donations*. <https://thegivingblock.com/resources/cryptocurrency-fundraising-nonprofit-guide-to-accepting-crypto-donations/>

Lomozzo, C. (2021, December 20). *The UNICEF crypto fund: What is it all about?* Unicef. <https://www.unicef.org/innovation/stories/unicef-cryptofund>

Matharu, A. (2019). *Understanding cryptocurrencies: The money of the future*. Business Expert Press. <https://www.businessexpertpress.com/books/understanding-cryptocurrencies-the-money-of-the-future/>

Moody, M., & Pratt, M. (2020, December 22). Tainted money and tainted donors: A growing crisis? *11 Trends in Philanthropy for 2020*. Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/tainted-money-and-tainted-donors-a-growing-crisis/>

Pineapple Fund. (2017). *About*. <http://www.pineapplefund.org>

Pineapple Fund. (2017, December 13). *I'm donating 5057 BTC to charitable causes! Introducing The Pineapple Fund* [Online forum post]. Reddit. https://www.reddit.com/r/Bitcoin/comments/7jj0oa/im_donating_5057_btc_to_charitable_causes/

Stiffman, E. (2021, June 9). Crypto, meet donor advised funds. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. <https://www.philanthropy.com/newsletter/fundraising-update/2021-06-09>

Sullivan, P. (2021, July 30). Nonprofits get a new type of donation: Cryptocurrency. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/30/your-money/cryptocurrency-donation-nonprofit.html>

Theis, M. (2021, October). Crypto donors are generous but report difficulties giving. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. www.philanthropy.com/article/crypto-donors-are-generous-but-report-difficulties-giving-to-charity

Triple A. (2021). *Cryptocurrency across the world*. <https://triple-a.io/crypto-ownership/>

UNM Newsroom. (2021, June 15) *The future of crowd-sourced research philanthropy*. <http://news.unm.edu/news/the-future-of-crowd-sourced-research-philanthropy>

Reopening Federal Pell Grants for Incarcerated People Means Higher Ed and Funders Can Do More

Bloom, J. D. (Winter 2010). The incarceration revolution: The abandonment of the seriously mentally ill to our jails and prisons. *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics*, 38(4), 727–734. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/medeth38&i=729>

Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan. (2021, June 3). *Justice system reform projects receive over \$2 million in support*. <https://cfsem.org/2-million-michigan-justice-fund/>

Davis, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Saunders, J., & Miles, J. N. V. (2013). *Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education: A meta-analysis of programs that provide education to incarcerated adults*. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR266.html

Davis, L., & Linton, J. (2021). *What corrections officials need to know to partner with colleges to implement college programs in prison*. RAND Corporation. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/tools/TLA1253-1.html>

Green, S. J. (2011, Oct. 13). Seattle program aims to break the habit of incarceration. *Seattle Times*. <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/seattle-program-aims-to-break-the-habit-of-incarceration/>

Jung, C. (2019, April 23). For one man, getting a degree in prison was 'like being released every day' [Audio podcast transcript]. In *All Things Considered*. NPR. <https://www.npr.org/2019/04/23/716479029/for-one-man-getting-a-degree-in-prison-was-like-being-released-every-day>

Kang-Brown, J., Montagnet, C., & Heiss, J. (2021, January). *People in jail and prison in 2020*. Vera Institute of Justice. <https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/people-in-jail-and-prison-in-2020.pdf>

Karon, P. (2021, July 1). How a new foundation seeks to decriminalize mental illness. *Inside Philanthropy*. <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2021/7/1/how-a-new-funder-is-investing-to-decriminalize-mental-health-with-a-focus-on-the-coming-988-national-suicide-hotline>

Kulish, N. (2020, June 25). Bail funds, flush with cash, learn to 'grind through this horrible process.' *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/25/business/bail-funds.html>

Laughing Gull Foundation. (2020, November). Laughing Gull Foundation announces over \$1.3 million in grantmaking toward organizations focused on higher education for justice-involved individuals. <https://www.laughinggull.org/hep-grant-announcement-2020>

Lumina Foundation. (n.d.). Grants: Michigan Department of Corrections. <https://www.luminafoundation.org/grant/1907-1110552/>

Martinez-Hill, J., & Delaney, R. (2021, March 4). *Incarcerated students will have access to Pell grants again. What happens now?* Vera Institute of Justice. <https://www.vera.org/blog/incarcerated-students-will-have-access-to-pell-grants-again-what-happens-now>

Rabuy, B., & Kopf, D. (2015, July 9). *Prisons of poverty: Uncovering the pre-incarceration incomes of the imprisoned*. Prison Policy Initiative. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/income.html>

Royer, C. E., Castro, E. L., Gould, M. R., & Lerman, A. E. (2021). *The landscape of higher education in prison 2019–2020*. Alliance for Higher Education in Prison. https://assets-global.website-files.com/5e3dd3cf0b4b54470c8b1be1/619db1bc9daf730844a239e6_TheLandscapeofHigherEducationinPrison-2019-2020_v3.pdf

Tewksbury, R., Erickson, D. J., & Taylor, J. M. (2000). Opportunities lost: The consequences of eliminating Pell grant eligibility for correctional education students. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 31(1/2), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v31n01_02

Wolfe, D. (2021, June 17). Pursuing social justice, Mellon's making higher learning available to incarcerated Americans. *Inside Philanthropy*. <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2021/6/17/heres-how-mellon-strives-to-make-higher-learning-available-to-incarcerated-americans>

One Health and Animal Protection Philanthropy: A Growing Sub-Sector

American Pets Alive! (n.d.). Human animal support services. <https://www.humananimalsupportservices.org>

Animal Funding Atlas. (2021). (select focus areas for grant years). <https://animalfundingatlas.org/#/>

Animal Grantmakers. (2021). *Our history*. <https://animalgrantmakers.org/our-history>

Anthis, K., & Anthis, J. (2019, February 21). Global farmed and factory farmed animals estimated. <https://www.sentienceinstitute.org/global-animal-farming-estimates>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (n.d.) *CDC's One Health Office: Who we are*. <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/who-we-are/index.html>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (n.d.) *One Health basics*. <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/index.html>

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.** (2019, May 6). *8 zoonotic diseases shared between animals and people of most concern in the U.S.* <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2019/s0506-zoonotic-diseases-shared.html>
- Clare, S.** (2020, November 2). *Animal welfare cause report.* Founders Pledge. <https://founderspledge.com/stories/animal-welfare-cause-report>
- Encompass.** (n.d.). *Let's create an equitable animal protection movement.* <https://encompassmovement.org>
- Giving USA.** (2011). *The annual report on philanthropy for the year 2010*, a publication of Giving USA Foundation, researched and written by the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy <https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/file/lakeinstituteonfaithgiving-insightsaugust2010.pdf>
- Giving USA.** (2021) *The annual report on philanthropy for the year 2020*, a publication of Giving USA Foundation, researched and written by the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy <https://store.givingusa.org/collections/home-page-2021/products/2021-infographic?variant=39324695068751>
- International Fund for Animal Welfare.** (2018, November 18). *Thriving together: Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and increasing well-being for animals and people.* <https://sdgfunders.org/search/lang/en/?s=animal>
- Kavate, M.** (2020, September 9) Could philanthropy prevent the next pandemic by stopping zoonotic diseases? *Inside Philanthropy.* <https://www.animalgrantmakers.org/resources/2020%20Conference/Inside-Philanthropy-Could-Philanthropy-Prevent-the-Next-Pandemic-by-Stopping-Zoonotic-Diseases.pdf>
- Lurie, M.** (2020, September 1) *A turning point for planetary health.* Milken Institute. <https://milkeninstitute.org/report/turning-point-planetary-health>
- Maddie's Fund.** (2021). *Annual report 2020-2021.* <https://www.maddiesfund.org/assets/communications/maddies-annual-report2020-21.pdf>
- Mercy for Animals.** (2020). *Mercy for animals in India: 2020 year in review.* <https://mercyforanimals.in/blog/mercy-for-animals-india-2020-year-in-review/>
- One Health Commission.** (n.d.). *Why One Health.* https://www.onehealthcommission.org/en/why_one_health/what_is_one_health/
- Open Philanthropy.** (n.d.). *Farm animal welfare.* <https://www.openphilanthropy.org/focus/us-policy/farm-animal-welfare>
-
- Philanthropy is Increasingly Embroiled in the Culture Wars**
- Anderson, B.** (2021, November 4). Critical race theory is a flashpoint for conservatives, but what does it mean? *PBS News Hour.* <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/education/so-much-buzz-but-what-is-critical-race-theory>
- Bradner, E.** (2021, September 8). The new Texas voting law includes these 7 major changes. *CNN.* <https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/07/politics/what-texas-voting-bill-doesdex.html/in>
- Brooklyn Community Foundation.** (n.d.) *Our racial justice lens.* <https://www.brooklyncommunityfoundation.org/about/our-racial-justice-lens>
- Daniels, A.** (2019, November 4). Carnegie Corporation urges fellow grant makers to support voting rights. *Chronicle of Philanthropy.* <https://www.philanthropy.com/article/carnegie-corporation-urges-fellow-grant-makers-to-support-voting-rights/>
- Election Integrity Foundation.** (2021). *Mission.* <https://electionintegrityfoundation.org/#mission>
- Ford Foundation.** (2021). *Justice begins where inequality ends.* <https://www.fordfoundation.org>
- Georgia Secretary of State.** (2021). *Georgia voter identification requirements.* https://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/georgia_voter_identification_requirements2
- Hackney, P.** (2018, April 15). The real IRS scandal has more to do with budget cuts than bias. *The Conversation.* <https://theconversation.com/the-real-irs-scandal-has-more-to-do-with-budget-cuts-than-bias-95026>
- Heritage Foundation.** (2020) *Culture wars.* <https://www.heritage.org/culture-wars>
- Hermann, K.** (2021, August 3). *Landmark lawsuit challenges race-based programming in schools.* <https://www.philanthropyroundtable.org/home/blog/post/roundtable/2021/08/03/landmark-lawsuit-challenges-race-based-programming-in-schools>
- Hunter, J. D.** (1991). *Culture wars: The struggle to define America.* BasicBooks.
- Kennedy, J.** (2021, September 16). *A department for culture wars will not help charities or the country.* Directory of Social Change. <https://www.dsc.org.uk/content/a-department-for-culture-wars-will-not-help-charities-or-the-country/>
- MacArthur Foundation.** (2021). *Strengthening American democracy.* <https://www.macfound.org/programs/democracy/>
- Matthiessen, C.** (2021, August 26). As conservatives stoke the critical race theory culture wars, where is philanthropy? *Inside Philanthropy.* <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2021/8/26/as-conservatives-stoke-the-critical-race-theory-culture-wars-where-is-philanthropy>
- National Conference of State Legislatures.** (2021). *Voter ID laws.* <https://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/voter-id.aspx#Details>
- National Network of Abortion Funds.** (2021). *Texas abortion funds bring show of power as six-week ban faces challenges at Supreme Court.* <https://abortionfunds.org/tx-funds-show-of-power/>
- Olivarez, J., & Staroneck, L.** (2020). Philanthropy and reparations: Righting the past. *11 trends in philanthropy for 2020.* Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/philanthropy-and-reparations-righting-the-past/>
- Payton, R. L., & Moody, M. P.** (2008, March 26). *Understanding Philanthropy.* Indiana University Press.
- Philanthropy Roundtable.** (2021). *True diversity.* <https://www.true-diversity.com>
- Rendon, J.** (2021, September 8). The Philanthropy Roundtable's CEO opposes 'Woke Philanthropy', prompting some grant makers to feel and others to give more. *Chronicle of Philanthropy,* 33(11). <https://www.philanthropy.com/article/the-philanthropy-roundtables-ceo-opposes-woke-philanthropy-prompting-some-grant-makers-to-leave-and-others-to-give-more>
- Schouten, F.** (2021, July 22). Eighteen states have enacted new laws that make it harder to vote. *CNN.* <https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/22/politics/voting-restrictions-state-laws/index.html>
- Sekulow, J.** (2017, April 17). Lois Lerner got off easy in the IRS scandal. It's time to reexamine the targeting of conservatives. *Fox News.* <https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/lois-lerner-got-off-easy-in-the-irs-scandal-its-time-to-reexamine-the-targeting-of-conservatives>
- Texas Legislature Online.** (2021) Bill: SB 8. <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/Text.aspx?LegSess=87R&Bill=SB8>
- Travers, J.** (2020, April 8). Abortion foes are scoring more wins. Here's who is funding a powerful movement. *Inside Philanthropy.* <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2020/4/8/abortion-foes-are-scoring-more-wins-heres-who-is-funding-a-powerful-movement>
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation.** (n.d.). *Priorities.* <https://www.wkkf.org/what-we-do/overview>
- Waldman, M.** (2021, December 14). *The big lie and state courts.* Brennan Center for Justice. <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/big-lie-and-state-courts>
-
- Innovations in Talent Investment for Individuals, Organizations, and Communities**
- Callanan, L.** (2014, February 11). *Under-investing in social sector leadership.* Foundation Center. <https://pndblog.typepad.com/pndblog/2014/02/underinvesting-in-social-sector-leadership.html>
- Dimovska, D., Sommer, S., & Segura, F.** (2021, June 14). Can co-leadership be the future of philanthropy? *Alliance Magazine.* <https://www.alliancemagazine.org/analysis/can-co-leadership-be-the-future-of-philanthropy/>

- Dorsey, C., Bradach, J., & Kim, P.** (2020, May 4). *Racial equity and philanthropy: Disparities in funding for leaders of color leave impact on the table*. The Bridgespan Group and Echoing Green. <https://www.bridgespan.org/insights/library/philanthropy/disparities-nonprofit-funding-for-leaders-of-color>
- Equity in the Sector.** (2020). *Awake to woke to work: Building a race equity culture*. <https://equityinthecenter.org/aww/>
- Fund the People.** (2017, September 19). *Intro to Fund the People Toolkit*. <http://fundthepeople.org/toolkit/about/>
- The Journal Record.** (2021, September 24). *Tulsa Remote initiative spreading to other cities, regions*. <https://journalrecord.com/2021/09/24/tulsa-remote-initiative-spreading-to-other-cities-regions/>
- Lee, J.** (2020, January 28). The Chrysalis Continues. In *Allied Media Projects*. <https://alliedmedia.org/news/chrysalis-continues>
- Linnell, D. S., & Wolfred, T.** (2009). *Creative disruption*. Third Sector New England and CompassPoint Nonprofit Services. https://www.tsne.org/sites/default/files/Creative-Disruption_0.pdf
- Molinski, M.** (2021, July 30). Summer of move: More Americans now migrating than any time in years. *Investor's Business Daily*. <https://www.investors.com/news/moving-during-covid-turns-into-great-migration-americans/>
- National Council of Nonprofits.** (2021, November 15). *The scope and impact of nonprofit job vacancies*. <https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/sites/default/files/documents/nonprofit-job-vacancies-report-preliminary-results.pdf>
- Perkins, O.** (2021, September 21). Foundations offer incentives to help cities attract workers willing to relocate. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. <https://www.philanthropy.com/article/foundations-offer-incentives-to-help-cities-attract-workers-willing-to-relocate>
- Reynolds, B. W.** (2021, April 12). *The environmental impacts of remote work: Stats and benefits*. Flexjobs. <https://www.flexjobs.com/blog/post/telecommuting-sustainability-how-telecommuting-is-a-green-job>
- Salamon, L. M., & Newhouse, C. L.** (2020, June). *2020 nonprofit employment report*. Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies. http://ccss.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2020/06/2020-Nonprofit-Employment-Report_FINAL_6.2020.pdf
- Thomas-Breitfeld, S., & Kunreuther, F.** (2020, June 18). The race gap: Opportunities to lead nonprofits are still unequal. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Retrieved from <https://www.philanthropy.com/article/The-Race-Gap-Opportunities-to-249011>
- Thomas-Breitfeld, S., & Kunreuther, F.** (2020). *Race to lead revisited: Obstacles and opportunities in addressing the nonprofit racial leadership gap*. Building Movement Project. https://buildingmovement.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/RTL_Revisited_National-Report_Final.pdf
- Thomas-Breitfeld, S.** (n.d.). *About*. LinkedIn. Retrieved January 7, 2022, from https://www.linkedin.com/in/seandtb?trk=author_mini-profile_title
- TSNE.** (n.d.) *Report: Creative disruptions*. TSNE MissionWorks. <https://www.tsne.org/creative-disruption>
- Tulsa Remote.** (n.d.). *Benefits*. <https://tulsaremote.com/>
- Wolfe, D.** (2021a, July 29). Nonprofit leaders need a break. Will more funders start backing sabbaticals? *Inside Philanthropy*. <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2021/7/29/nonprofit-leaders-need-a-break-will-more-funders-start-backing-sabbaticals>
- Wolfe, D.** (2021b, August 3). Funders who back sabbaticals for nonprofit leaders. *Inside Philanthropy*. <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2021/8/3/need-a-break-heres-the-short-list-of-funders-who-back-sabbaticals-for-nonprofit-leaders>
- Yadav, N. & Johnson, V.A.** (Eds.). (2020). *Fellowship industry report: Industry trends and promising approaches to impact evaluation and diversity, equity and inclusion*. ProFellow, LLC. <https://www.profellow.com/2020-fellowship-industry-report>
- Increasing Attention to the Decline in Household Giving to Nonprofits**
- Albrecht, L.** (2021, April 5). This is how many Americans gave away their stimulus check money. *MarketWatch*. <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/americans-increased-their-charitable-giving-in-2020-helped-by-stimulus-checks-and-a-stock-market-recovery-11617372478>
- Bernholz, L.** (2021, October). *How we give now: A philanthropic guide for the rest of us*. The MIT Press.
- Blackbaud Institute.** (2021, November). *Tipping point: Aligning with supporters in a changing world*. <https://institute.blackbaud.com/tippingpoint/>
- Cause and Social Influence.** (2021, Fall). *Influencing young America to act*. <https://www.causeandsocialinfluence.com/2021fallresearch>
- Daniels, A.** (2021, October 12). As charitable giving rates sag, foundations back ambitious new effort to ignite generosity by all Americans. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. <https://www.philanthropy.com/article/as-charitable-giving-rates-sag-foundations-back-ambitious-new-effort-to-ignite-generosity-by-all-americans?>
- Duquette, N.** (2020, December 21). The evolving distribution of giving in the United States. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 50(5), 1102–1116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764020977691>
- Faulk, L., Kim, M., Derrick-Mills, T., Boris, E. T., Tomasko, L., Hakizimana, N., Chen, T., Kim, M., & Nath, L.** (2021, October 7). *Nonprofit trends and impacts 2021: National findings on diversity and representation, donation trends from 2015-2020, and effects of 2020*. Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/nonprofit-trends-and-impacts-2021>
- Fidelity Charitable.** (2021). *The new definition of philanthropy includes any act of social good*. <https://www.fidelitycharitable.org/insights/2021-future-of-philanthropy/new-definition.html>
- Fundraising Effectiveness Project.** (2021, November 10). *2021 fundraising slightly ahead of 2020 figures, buoyed by new donor retention*. <https://afpglobal.org/2021-fundraising-slightly-ahead-2020-figures-buoyed-new-donor-retention>
- Generosity Commission.** (2021, October 12). *The Generosity Commission to explore the "Reimagination" of philanthropy, volunteerism and community in America in times of national need* [News Release]. https://www.thegenerositycommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/TGC-Launch-Press-Release-FINAL_for-website.pdf
- Generosity Commission.** (n.d.). *Literature review findings: Understanding the past and the present to ignite America's spirit of generosity*. <https://www.thegenerositycommission.org/literature-review-findings/>
- Giving USA 2021.** (2021). *The annual report on philanthropy for the year 2020*, a publication of the Giving USA Foundation. Researched and written by the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. [https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/news-events/news-item/giving-usa-2021-in-a-year-of-unprecedented-events-and-challenges-charitable-giving-reached-a-record-\\$471.44-billion-in-2020.html?id=361](https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/news-events/news-item/giving-usa-2021-in-a-year-of-unprecedented-events-and-challenges-charitable-giving-reached-a-record-$471.44-billion-in-2020.html?id=361)
- Independent Sector.** (2021, July). *Trust in civil society: Understanding the factors driving trust in nonprofits and philanthropy*. <https://independentsector.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/trust-report-2021-8421.pdf>
- Martin, T.** (2019, October 5). *Is philanthropy paying attention to the student loan debt crisis?* Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/is-philanthropy-paying-attention-to-the-student-loan-debt-crisis>
- Martin, T.** (2021, January 19). The nonprofit sector has a unique opportunity to build public trust. *11 Trends in Philanthropy for 2021*. Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/the-nonprofit-sector-has-a-unique-opportunity-to-build-public-trust>
- Montañez, A.** (2020, June 9). *Independent Sector submits written testimony ahead of the Joint Economic Committee hearing on charitable giving*. Independent Sector. <https://independentsector.org/news-post/independent-sector-submits-written-testimony-ahead-of-the-joint-economic-committee-hearing-on-charitable-giving/>
- Moody, M.** (2019, August 20). The wealth gap is becoming a giving gap. *11 Trends in Philanthropy for 2019*. Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/the-wealth-gap-is-becoming-a-giving-gap/>

Osili, U., Zarins, S., Han, X., Kou, X., Shrestha, S., Daniels, D., & Davis Kalugyer, A. (2021, July). *The giving environment: Understanding pre-pandemic trends in charitable giving*. Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/26290/giving-environment210727.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Payton, R., & Moody, M. (2008). *Understanding philanthropy: Its meaning and mission*. Indiana University Press.

Putnam, R. D., & Romney Garrett, S. (2020). *The upswing: How America came together a century ago and how we can do it again*. Simon and Schuster.

Rojc, P. (2021, October 14). An ambitious new commission sets out to diagnose civil society's ills. But will it make a difference? *Inside Philanthropy*. <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2021/10/14/an-ambitious-new-generosity-commission-faces-questions-with-few-easy-answers/>

Rooney, P. M. (2019, December 4). Where have all the donors gone? The continued decline of the small donor and the growth of megadonors. *Nonprofit Quarterly*. <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/where-have-all-the-donors-gone-the-continued-decline-of-the-small-donor-and-the-growth-of-megadonors/>

Donors of Color are Mobilizing for their Communities – Often at the Forefront of Emerging Trends

Akanjo, O. (2021, July 22). Black women in philanthropy: The art of everyday giving as activism. *NPQ*. <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/black-women-in-philanthropy-the-art-of-everyday-giving-as-activism/>

Ashley, S., & James, J. (2018, February 28). *Despite the racial wealth gap, black philanthropy is strong*. Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/despite-racial-wealth-gap-black-philanthropy-strong>

Blackbaud Institute. (2021). *Tipping point*. New donors and more diversity. <https://institute.blackbaud.com/tippingpoint/>

Borealis Philanthropy. (n.d.). <https://borealisphilanthropy.org>

Collective Giving Research Group. (2018, November). *Giving circle membership: How collective giving impacts donors*. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/17743/giving-circle-membership18.pdf>

Community Investment Network. (n.d.). <https://www.thecommunityinvestment.org>

Donors of Color Network. (n.d.). <https://www.donorsofcolor.org>

Duran, L. (2001, September, October). Caring for one another. *Grassroots Fundraising Journal*. https://coco-net.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/20_5_PhilCommOfColor.pdf

Elkind, E. (2021, May 3). New foundation gives record \$125 million to AAPI causes as anti-Asian hate crimes surge in 2021. *CBS News*. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/hate-crime-surge-asian-american-foundation-launch/>

Freeman, T. M. (2019, August 22). 400 years of black giving: From the days of slavery to the 2019 Morehouse graduation. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/400-years-of-black-giving-from-the-days-of-slavery-to-the-2019-morehouse-graduation-121402>

Give 8/28. (2021). <https://www.give828.org/giving-events/ybgb21>

Mays Institute on Diverse Philanthropy. (2021, August). *Everyday donors of color*. Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/26496/donors-color-report.pdf>

NORC. (2021, July 22). *More than one in ten Americans surveyed invest in cryptocurrencies*. NORC at the University of Chicago. <https://www.norc.org/NewsEvents/Publications/PressReleases/Pages/more-than-one-in-ten-americans-surveyed-invest-in-cryptocurrencies.aspx>

Philanthropy Together. (n.d.). *What is a giving circle?* <https://whatisagivingcircle.com>

Ross, J. (2021, October 15). Inside the world of Black bitcoin, where crypto is about making more than just money. *Time*. <https://time.com/6106706/bitcoin-black-investors/>

Schaeffer, K. (2020, February 7). *6 facts about economic inequality in the U.S.* Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/02/07/6-facts-about-economic-inequality-in-the-u-s/>

Vaid, U., & Maxton, A. (2017). *The apparitional donor: Understanding and engaging high net worth donors of color*. The Advancement Project and The Vaid Group LLC. <https://www.donorsofcolor.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/FinalAppDonreport4.17.pdf>

Vespa, J., Medina, L., & Armstrong, D. M. (2020, February). *Demographic turning points for the United States: Population projections for 2020 to 2060*, Current Population Reports. U.S. Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2020/demo/p25-1144.pdf>

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2012, January). *Cultures of giving energizing and expanding philanthropy by and for communities of color*. https://www.giarts.org/sites/default/files/Cultures-of-Giving_Energizing-and-Expanding-Philanthropy-by-and-for-Communities-of-Color.pdf

Expanding the Definitions of Philanthropy and Philanthropist

Bernholz, L. (2021, October). *How we give now: A philanthropic guide for the rest of us*. The MIT Press.

Bernholz, L., & Pawliw-Fry, B. (2020). *How we give now: Conversations across the United States*. Stanford Center on Philanthropy & Civil Society, Stanford University. https://pacscenter.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/HWGN-Report_FINAL_DIGITAL.pdf

Buy Nothing Project. (2021). *Buy less and share more*. <https://buynothingproject.org>

Carnegie, A. (1889). *The gospel of wealth*. Carnegie Corporation of New York. https://media.carnegie.org/filer_public/0a/e1/0ae166c5-fca3-4adf-82a7-74c0534cd8de/gospel_of_wealth_2017.pdf

Carson, E. D. (1993). *A hand up: Black philanthropy and self-help in America*. University Press of America.

Freeman, T. M. (2020). *Madam C. J. Walker's gospel of giving: Black women's philanthropy during Jim Crow*. University of Illinois Press.

Freeman, T. M., & Williams-Pulfer, K. (2021, September 20). Liberating the archive, emancipating philanthropy: Philanthropic archival layering as a critical historical approach for researching voluntary action in marginalized communities. *Voluntas*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-021-00402-1>

Hosseini, C. S. (2020, March 24). Mutual aid and physical distancing are not new for Black and racialized minorities in the Americas. *HistPhil*. <https://histphil.org/2020/03/24/mutual-aid-and-physical-distancing-are-not-new-for-black-and-racialized-minorities-in-the-americas/>

Kasper, G., Marcoux, J., Holk, J., & Morshed, J. (2020). *What's next for philanthropy in the 2020's: Seeing philanthropy in a new light*. Monitor Institute by Deloitte. <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/about-deloitte/wn4p-report-final.pdf>

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Layton, M. (2021). *Giving circles: A way forward for democratizing philanthropy*. Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/giving-circles-a-way-forward-for-democratizing-philanthropy/>

Layton, M. D. (2016, May). Philanthropy at the community level: Supporting community empowerment. In J. Harrow, T. Jung, & S. Phillips (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to philanthropy* (pp. 139–150). Routledge.

Layton, M., & Martin, T. (2021, September). Book review: The upswing: How America came together a century ago and how we can do it again. *The Foundation Review*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1581>

Mangrulkar, L., & Behrens, T. (2013). *Michigan Community Foundations' Youth Project (MCFYP) 20th anniversary report*. Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://www.michiganfoundations.org/sites/default/files/resources/MCFYP-Final-Report.pdf>

Mays Family Institute on Diverse Philanthropy. (2021, August). *Everyday donors of color. Diverse philanthropy during times of change*. Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/26496/donors-color>

Mottino, F., & Miller, E. D. (2005). *Pathways for change: Philanthropy among African American, Asian American, and Latino donors in the New York City metropolitan region*. Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society at The Graduate Center, The City University of New York. <https://perma.cc/NG9R-3PES>

Neugebauer, A. (2021, November 9). *Kids are philanthropists, too!* Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/kids-are-philanthropists-too/>

New England Blacks in Philanthropy. (2021). *Giving Black starts with you*. <http://www.nebip.org/>

Payton, R. L., & Moody, M. P. (2008). *Understanding philanthropy: Its meaning and mission*. Indiana University Press.

Putnam, R. D., & Romney Garret, S. (2021, September, 7). *The Upswing: How American came together a century ago and how we can do it again*. Simon & Schuster.

Smith, B., Shue, S., Vest, J. L., & Villareal, J. (1999). *Philanthropy in communities of color*. Indiana University Press.

Vaid, U., & Maxton, A. (2017). *The apparitional donor: Understanding and engaging high net worth donors of color*. The Advancement Project and The Vaid Group LLC. <https://perma.cc/7874-ZL9V>

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (n.d.) *Catalyzing community giving initiative*. (<https://www.wkkf.org/what-we-do/catalyzing-community-giving>)

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2012, January). *Cultures of giving energizing and expanding philanthropy by and for communities of color*. https://www.giarts.org/sites/default/files/Cultures-of-Giving_Energizing-and-Expanding-Philanthropy-by-and-for-Communities-of-Color.pdf

Zunz, O. (2012). *Philanthropy in America: A history*. Princeton University Press.

Philanthropy is Entering a New Era of Engagement with Native Communities

American Indian College Fund. (n.d.). <https://collegefund.org>

American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES). (n.d.). <https://www.aises.org>

Association on American Indian Affairs. (n.d.). *Protecting sovereignty, preserving culture, educating youth, building capacity*. <https://www.indian-affairs.org>

Barron, J., Egan, E., & Foxworth, R. (2020, December 3). Starting with hiring: How to welcome native leaders to the philanthropic sector. *Nonprofit Quarterly*. <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/starting-with-hiring-how-to-welcome-native-leaders-to-the-philanthropic-sector/>

Chitnis, R. (2018, November). Indigenous funds lead the way to decolonize philanthropy. *Cultural Survival Quarterly Magazine* 42(4). <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/indigenous-funds-lead-way-decolonize-philanthropy>

Council on Foundations. (2021). *2021 grantmaker salary and benefits report*. <https://www.cof.org/content/2021-grantmaker-salary-and-benefits-report>

Delgado, L. T. (2006, January 1). *A demographic profile of independently incorporated Native American foundations and selected funds in the United States*. Native Americans in Philanthropy. <https://nativephilanthropy.candid.org/reports/a-demographic-profile-of-independently-incorporated-native-american-foundations-and-selected-funds-in-the-united-states/>

Ellenwood, C. & Foxworth, R. (2021, November 18–20). *Leadership and Gender Dynamics in the Native American Nonprofit Sector* [Conference presentation]. ARNOVA 50th annual conference, Atlanta,

GA, United States. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.arnova.org/resource/resmgr/2021conference/2021_conference_program.pdf

Estes, N. (2021, January 1). The battle for the Black Hills. *High Country News*. <https://www.hcn.org/issues/53.1/indigenous-affairs-social-justice-the-battle-for-the-black-hills>

Ford Foundation. (2021, November 1). *Governments and private funders announce historic US \$1.7 billion pledge at COP26 in support of Indigenous Peoples and local communities*. <https://www.fordfoundation.org/the-latest/news/governments-and-private-funders-announce-historic-us-17-billion-pledge-at-cop26-in-support-of-indigenous-peoples-and-local-communities/>

Frontline. (2018, July). *We need to change how we think*. First Nations Development Institute. <https://www.firstnations.org/publications/we-need-to-change-how-we-think-perspectives-on-philanthropys-underfunding-of-native-communities-and-causes/>

Hedgpeth, D. (2021, November 28). Two American Indian tribes in Delaware get help in buying back part of ancestral homelands. *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2021/11/28/native-american-land-buy-nanticoke-lenape/>

Kan, L. M. (2021, August). *The 2020 diversity among philanthropic professionals report*. CHANGE Philanthropy. https://changephilanthropy.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/The_2020_Diversity_Among_Philanthropic_Professionals_Report.pdf

Kavate, M. (2020, July 28). Native American activists make gains, but philanthropy “Continues to scratch the surface.” *Inside Philanthropy*. <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2020/7/28/native-american-activists-make-gains-but-philanthropy-continues-to-scratch-the-surface>

Konzen, K. (2019). *Native American philanthropy*. Learning to Give. <https://www.learningtogive.org/resources/native-american-philanthropy>

Kunze, J. (2021, June 15). Indigenous nonprofits included in philanthropist MacKenzie Scott's latest \$2.74B round of donations. *Tribal Business News*. <https://tribalbusinessnews.com/sections/economic-development/13526-indigenous-nonprofits-included-in-philanthropist-mackenzie-scott-s-latest-2-74b-round-of-donations>

Martin, H., Gehling, K., & Buteau, E. (2021, June). *Persevering Through Crisis: The state of nonprofits*. The Center for Effective Philanthropy. https://cep.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/CEP_Persevering-through-Crisis_2021.pdf

Native Americans in Philanthropy; & Candid. (2019). *Investing in Native communities*. <https://doi.org/c9wj>

Native Land Digital. (n.d.). <https://native-land.ca>

Northwestern University. (2021). *Land Acknowledgment*. Native American and Indigenous initiatives. <https://www.northwestern.edu/native-american-and-indigenous-peoples/about/Land%20Acknowledgement.html>

Rendon, J. (2021, September 28). \$5B conservation plan offers new approach, but faces hurdles. *AP News*. <https://apnews.com/article/climate-change-science-business-philanthropy-oceans-6ca70181c532be88358cbedda72dce1>

Scott-Enns, I. (2020). *Indigenous ways of giving + sharing: Indigenous-led Funds landscape scan report*. International Funders for Indigenous Peoples. <https://internationalfunders.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IFIP-Indigenous-Ways-of-Giving-and-Sharing-Landscape-Scan-Report-1.pdf>

Sogorea Te' Land Trust. (n.d.). *The East Bay is traditional Lisjan Ohlone land*. <https://sogoreate-landtrust.org>

Timko, K. & Penn, M. (n.d.). *2021 virtual conference*. Alliance for Nonprofit Management. <https://allianceonlinecommunity.org/page/indigenous-peoples-day-acknowledgment>

Villanueva, E. (2018). *Decolonizing Wealth*. Berrett-Koehler Pu

Nonprofits are Finding New Ways to Get the Data They Need

Bauer, K., & Borashko, R. (2020, January 15). Equity mapping tools combine the power of data and narrative change. *11 trends in philanthropy for 2020*. Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/equity-mapping-tools-combine-the-power-of-data-and-narrative-change/>

Data Drive Detroit. (2018). *Metro Detroit's community data hub*. <https://datadrivedetroit.org/>

Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. (2021). *Your community. Powerful insight*. <https://data.johnsoncenter.org/community-insight>

Fruchterman, J. (2016). Using data for action and for impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 14(3), pp. 30–35. <https://doi.org/10.48558/24MM-J709>

Garcia-Herranz, M., Martini, A., Sekara, V., & Kim, D.-H. (2020, October 10). *COVID-19 MagicBox report*. UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.org/innovation/media/14331/file>

Gerlin, A. (2018, August 2). *Data philanthropy offers new avenues for solving old problems*. Mastercard Center for Inclusive Growth. <https://www.mastercardcenter.org/insights/data-philanthropy-offers-new-avenues-solving-old-problems-report-finds>

Google. (2021). *COVID-19 community mobility reports*. <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>

Hoang, F. (2020, February 24). How artificial intelligence improves predictive analytics for nonprofit fundraising. *NonProfit PRO*. <https://www.nonprofitpro.com/article/how-artificial-intelligence-improves-predictive-analytics-for-nonprofit-fundraising/>

IRS. (2019, December 13). *IRS: Recent legislation requires tax exempt organizations to e-file forms*. <https://www.irs.gov/newsroom/irs-recent-legislation-requires-tax-exempt-organizations-to-e-file-forms>

Lee, N. T., Resnick, P., & Barton, G. (2019, May 22). *Algorithmic bias detection and mitigation: Best practices and policies to reduce consumer harms*. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/algorithmic-bias-detection-and-mitigation-best-practices-and-policies-to-reduce-consumer-harms/>

Levy, D. (2021, October 6). How nonprofits are using machine learning to support those in need. *NonProfit PRO*. <https://www.nonprofitpro.com/article/how-nonprofits-are-using-machine-learning-to-support-those-in-need/>

McKeever, B., Greene, S., MacDonald, G., Tatian, P. A., & Jones, D. (2018, July 24). *Data philanthropy: Unlocking the power of private data for public good*. Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/data-philanthropy-unlocking-power-private-data-public-good>

Open990. (2021). *1.9 million nonprofits. Zero paywalls*. <https://www.open990.org/>

OpenCorporates. (2021). *The largest open database of companies in the world*. <https://opencorporates.com>

Paz, A. (2020, January 15). Data science for social impact. *11 trends in philanthropy for 2020*. Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy. <https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/data-science-for-social-impact/>

Salesforce. (2021). *Nonprofit Trends Report* (3rd ed.). <https://www.salesforce.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/ngo-trends-report-third-edition-122120-v2.pdf>

Szalavitz, M. (2021, August 11). The pain was unbearable. So why did doctors turn her away? *WIRED*. <https://www.wired.com/story/opioid-drug-addiction-algorithm-chronic-pain/>

Tiernan, K., & Singh, G. (2019, January 10). Predictive analytics. *The NonProfit Times*. https://www.thenonprofittimes.com/column_database/predictive-analytics/

Western Pennsylvania Regional Data Center. (2017). *Tools*. <https://tools.wprdc.org/>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). *American Community Survey (ACS)*. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs>

Nonprofits are Questioning Their Use of Facebook

Allyn, B. (2021, October 5). Here are 4 key points from the Facebook whistleblower's testimony on Capitol Hill. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2021/10/05/1043377310/facebook-whistleblower-frances-haugen-congress>

Edelman, G. (Oct. 5, 2020). Ad tech could be the next Internet bubble. *WIRED*. <https://www.wired.com/story/ad-tech-could-be-the-next-internet-bubble/>

Fontelera, K. (Oct. 21, 2021). Why nonprofits are leaving Facebook [Web log]. *NonProfit Pro*. <https://www.nonprofitpro.com/post/why-nonprofits-are-leaving-facebook/>

Fung, B. & Kim, A. (June 22, 2020). Patagonia joins growing Facebook advertiser boycott over the site's failure to stop 'hateful lies and dangerous propaganda'. *CNN*. <https://www.cnn.com/2020/06/22/tech/facebook-boycott-hate-trnd/index.html>

Hitlin, P. & Rainie, L. (Jan. 16, 2019). *Facebook algorithms and personal data*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2019/01/16/facebook-algorithms-and-personal-data/>

Howtostopfacebook.org. (n.d.).

Jackson, S. (2021, October 13). A group of nearly 50 nonprofits has launched a campaign to 'effectively end Facebook's current business model' in the wake of whistleblower testimony. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/dozens-of-nonprofits-how-to-stop-facebook-frances-haugen-testimony-2021-10>

Kairos Fellowship. (2021, September 22). *Kairos calls on millions of coalition members to log off Facebook to demand the company stop profiting off racism and hate* [Press release]. <https://www.kairosfellows.org/news/2021/9/23/kairos-calls-on-millions-of-coalition-members-to-log-off-facebook-to-demand-the-company-stop-profiting-off-racism-and-hate>

Levey, R. (June 9, 2020). Nonprofits mull leaving Facebook amid multiple concerns. *The NonProfit Times*. <https://www.thenonprofittimes.com/technology/nonprofits-mull-leaving-facebook-amid-multiple-concerns/>

Matthews, T. (April 29, 2019). *Facebook fundraising hurts nonprofits: How, why, and what to do about it, from Mightycause's CEO* [Web log]. *Mightyblog*. <https://blog.mightycause.com/facebook-fundraising-hurts-nonprofits/>

Meta. (2021, October 28). *Introducing Meta: A social technology company*. <https://about.fb.com/news/2021/10/facebook-company-is-now-meta/>

Momentum Nonprofit Partners. (2021, October 14). *Hi Friends! We wanted to let you know that Momentum Nonprofit Partners will no longer be actively posting on Facebook*. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/MomentumNonprofit/>

Sample Ward, A. (2020, July 2). *NTEN says goodbye to Facebook*. *NTEN*. <https://www.nten.org/article/nten-says-goodbye-to-facebook/>

Smith, C. (2011, May 25). Delete your Facebook account: 'Quit Facebook Day' wants users to leave. *Huffpost*. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/delete-facebook-account-q_n_576956

Statista. (2021). *Number of monthly active Facebook users worldwide as of 2nd quarter 2021*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/>

The NonProfit Times. (March 29, 2021). *Facebook-generated fundraising hits \$5 billion since inception* [Web log]. <https://www.thenonprofittimes.com/fundraising/facebook-generated-fundraising-hits-5-billion-since-inception/>

Warren, C. (June 1, 2010). 'Quit Facebook Day' falls flat. *Mashable*. <http://www.cnn.com/2010/TECH/social.media/06/01/quite.facebook.day.falls.flat.mashable/index.html>



WANT MORE?

Explore previous years' reports online at johnsoncenter.org/trends.



Dorothy A. Johnson Center

FOR PHILANTHROPY

201 Front Ave SW, Suite 200

Grand Rapids, MI 49504

P: 616.331.7585

johnsoncenter.org



**GRAND VALLEY
STATE UNIVERSITY**

gvsu.edu