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Introduction

The Working Towards Diversity IV research study presents an exciting opportunity to build on Minnesota’s ongoing commitment to diversity in philanthropy, as well as to contribute to the growing national knowledge base in the field. The goal of this research project was to collect and report valuable data that paint a comprehensive picture of demographics, policies and practices on diversity and inclusion of Minnesota grantmakers.

The project updated MCF’s past work on this topic, while also placing it within the context of recent research on diversity in philanthropy conducted in other states around the nation. Ultimately, MCF seeks to share information that sparks meaningful conversations, facilitates peer learning, and enables grantmakers to become more effective today and in the future.
Methodology

From July to August, 2010, the University of Minnesota’s Office of Measurement Services hosted MCF’s *Working Towards Diversity IV* survey, which gathered data on demographics, policies and practices of Minnesota foundations and corporate giving programs. Of the 185 invited organizations, 80 completed the survey for a completion rate of 43.24%.

The survey addressed multiple areas of diversity and inclusion, including each organization’s demographic make-up, diversity and inclusion policies and practices, specific constituencies supported by each organization, capacity-building practices and support for minority-led nonprofits, and data collection policies and practices.

Data for comparisons were sourced from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2009 population estimates and from the Foundation Center, including its 2008 research regarding the state of diversity in philanthropy in New York, California, and Michigan. The survey was administered online, with emailed invitations and reminders sent to participants over the course of the data collection period. See Appendix A for the complete survey.

Grantmaker focus groups and interviews were conducted to directly discuss diversity and inclusivity policies and practices, efforts that worked well and did not work well, measures of effectiveness, and opinions and perceptions regarding implementation challenges and possible areas of improvement.

Eight focus groups were held in July and August of 2010, concurrent with survey data collection, and were grouped by grantmaker type (community/public, corporate, family and independent) and demographic (population) type (LGBTQ, Asian, Native American, and African American). Attempts were made to convene two additional demographic focus groups -- Hispanic and Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy – but recruitment efforts were unsuccessful. Individual interviews were conducted with nine chief executives to identify areas of best practice and create profiles from which recommendations and suggestions for improvement could be gleaned. See Appendix B for the focus group and interview outlines.

Survey Analysis

Once the data were collected, quantitative findings were analyzed to determine frequencies and percentages of responses to survey questions, as well as to examine the statistical significance of differences by respondent subgroups. Respondent subgroups were selected based upon four grantmaker types (community/public, corporate, family and Independent) and three grantmaker sizes (less than $1 million, $1 to $10 million, and greater than $1 million granted annually).

In addition, because the population demographics of urban and rural Minnesota demonstrate significant differences, subgroups were formed for two localities – by the 7-County Metro area (Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott and Washington counties) and the Greater Minnesota area (the remaining 80
counties). Seventeen respondents were located in Greater Minnesota (21.3% of the sample), while the remaining 63 respondents were located in the 7-County Metro (78.7% of the sample). Table 1 shows the cross-section of respondents in number and percentage of sample size.

Table 1: Working Towards Diversity IV Respondent Cross-Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantmaker Type:</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Grants Size Categories</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-County Metro</td>
<td>Greater MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community / Public Grantmakers</td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (41.7%)</td>
<td>30.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Grantmakers</td>
<td>23 (88.5%)</td>
<td>5 (19.2%)</td>
<td>32.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Grantmakers</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
<td>12 (57.1%)</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Grantmakers</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage</td>
<td>78.70%</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons of current findings to previous survey results, field level data, and demographic proportions were made. The data sets used in these comparisons include Foundation Center 2008 data, previous years’ data from MCF Working Towards Diversity surveys (1995, 2000, 2005), and Minnesota state workforce estimates compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau. Qualitative findings were analyzed using emerging themes and frequencies.

Demographic comparisons were made between respondents’ reporting and the 2009 Minnesota Workforce Population Estimates, as well as the 2009 Minnesota General Population Estimates, both additionally broken out by locality. Table 2 demonstrates the objective measures for comparison by demographics and locality. For final reporting, the 2009 Minnesota Workforce Estimates by locality were used for their finer granularity, as they better represent the composition of the labor force, as defined by all individuals ages 16 and older (rather than those currently employed or between 16 and 64 years of age).

Table 2: Demographic Comparison Data for Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>General Population Percentage</th>
<th>Workforce Population Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN Overall 7-County Metro</td>
<td>MN Overall 7-County Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>3.7 5.91 1.26</td>
<td>3.2 5.0 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>4.5 7.72 1.25</td>
<td>3.8 6.2 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>4.3 5.35 3.07</td>
<td>3.1 4.0 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native (%)</td>
<td>1.1 0.9 1.69</td>
<td>0.95 0.61 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.05 0.09 0.05</td>
<td>0.04 0.05 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>84.8 83.42 86.38</td>
<td>86.6 81.1 93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.5 1.97 1.11</td>
<td>1.1 1.3 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race / Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td>1.2 1.7 0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional demographic comparisons were made to the Foundation Center data that were collected from New York (Foundation Center, 2009b) and California (Foundation Center, 2009a), as well as the Council of Michigan Foundations findings (Council of Michigan Foundations, 2009). Comparison data on policies and procedures and capacity-building were also obtained from Foundation Center (Foundation Center, 2008) to compare trends at a field level. It should be stressed that these data are used to provide a baseline, but are not necessarily nation- or field-wide, as little regional or national level research has yet been published on diversity in philanthropy.

Limitations

As with all statistical analysis and reporting, there are limitations inherent to sample size, measurement error, and a variety of other factors. In this case, the sample size is relatively small and represents less than half of all the sample list members. Further, responses were collected from one individual at all responding organizations, which may reduce the validity of the data. Also, as is standard in research, responses were not required for every question, which introduces variability in the number of responses to different questions. For each question reporting a percentage, the valid percentage of each response is presented, regardless of total respondent size.

Likewise, focus group participation was somewhat limited. And as noted above, two of the population-based focus groups were not held at all, due to a lack of participants. These groups – Hispanic / Latino / Latina professionals and members of Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy – may have presented points of view not expressed in other groups.

Another limitation in the reporting of the quantitative findings is introduced in the interpretations. The statistical procedures employed in the analysis are relatively strong, but due to the low sample response numbers for some categories and questions, caution must be taken in the interpretation of these findings.
Executive Summary

The findings of MCF’s Working Towards Diversity IV research provide a snapshot of the current state of diversity in philanthropy in Minnesota, including demographic compositions, policies and procedures, and efforts of foundations and corporate giving programs to build capacity in constituent-led nonprofits. The fourth five-year study hosted by MCF to describe diversity and inclusion efforts in the state, the Working Towards Diversity IV research took a more comprehensive approach than past efforts, using mixed methods to gather data and conducting a deeper statistical analysis of quantitative data. This enhanced effort has revealed new insights about the demographic compositions, policies and procedures, and nonprofit capacity-building activities of Minnesota grantmakers.

Board and Staff Demographics

- Minnesota grantmaking staffs and boards largely mirror the state workforce population estimates in terms of race and ethnicity. Black/African American and Native American populations often exceed state percentages, while Hispanic/Latino/Latina and Asian or Asian American populations are often underrepresented.
- Staff size and staff diversity are significantly negatively correlated, indicating that as staff size increases, the racial/ethnic diversity of the staff decreases.
- While demographic compositions of staffs are typically more diverse than board chairs or board members, in Greater Minnesota the trend is reversed, with greater diversity in board roles.
- While women fill the majority of executive and all-staff positions in grantmaking organizations, men predominate as board members and, particularly, as board chairs.
- In comparison analyses of data from 17 organizations that responded to all four of the Working Towards Diversity surveys (1995, 2000, 2005 and 2010), diversity of staff increased slightly for some racial/ethnic groups, but few gains and some losses were shown in racial/ethnic diversity of board members. Some sharp declines in board diversity were noted between 2005 and 2010.
- Focus group participants identified potential drivers of decreasing racial/ethnic diversity of boards and staffs. These included burnout and turnover related to feelings of isolation and concern that diverse viewpoints are not heard, as well as economic pressures that have led to layoffs of employees who were hired for their diversity characteristics but not recognized for their complete skill sets.

Policies, Procedures and Capacity Building

- Only 30 to 40 percent of survey respondents have staff, board or vendor diversity policies.
- Grantmakers with racially/ethnically diverse board chairs or chief executives were more likely to have formal board and staff diversity policies: 83 percent of grantmakers with a chief executive of color had a board diversity policy, compared to 46 percent of grantmakers with a white/non-Hispanic chief executive.
• Significant differences in common diversity and inclusion practices were found when results were analyzed by grantmaker types, grants size categories, locality and chief executive and board chair diversity and inclusion factors. These differences were also observed in capacity-building activities aimed at building nonprofit leadership in historically underrepresented communities.

• Only 61 percent of responding organizations specifically named a beneficiary group in their mission statements or grantmaking guidelines. Most often cited among the named groups were economically disadvantaged, youth or children, and racial or ethnic populations in general.

• Large grantmakers (grants of $10 million or more annually) and community/public foundations were more likely than smaller grantmakers and other grantmaker types to support nonprofit capacity building.

• Some survey respondents expressed lack of understanding about how building capacity of constituent-led nonprofits might advance diversity/inclusion initiatives. But responses to open-ended questions and comments from the focus groups and CEO interviews indicated a growing awareness of the complex relationships between grantmakers’ diversity/inclusivity activities – as funders, employers, business entities and community citizens – and nonprofit outcomes and community advancement.
Demographics: What Do Minnesota Grantmakers Look Like?

Overall Demographics

Comparisons of Minnesota grantmaker demographics and U.S. Census Bureau 2009 Minnesota Workforce Population Estimates and demographic percentages use the following coding scheme:

**RED** = Below state population estimate percentages  
**GREEN** = Above state population estimate percentages  
**BLUE** = Equal to or within .5 percentage points of state population estimate percentages

Table 3: Overall Demographic Composition of Minnesota Grantmakers, *Working Towards Diversity IV*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity:</th>
<th>MN Workforce Population Percentage</th>
<th>Chief Executives</th>
<th>Board Chairs</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>Executive Staff</th>
<th>All Staff</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latina / Latina (%)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native (%)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGBTQ Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons who identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Other” responses include “French”, “Indian American”, “Cypriot”, “From India” and “Unsure”**

Caution should be used in interpreting data for persons with disabilities. When the coding scheme applied to demographic workforce percentages (ages 16 and older) is used, persons with disabilities comprise approximately 11.4 percent of the state population. But when only persons between the ages of 18 and 64 are calculated, the workforce percentages of persons with disabilities drops dramatically to 3.5 percent, which is far closer to the demographics reported by Minnesota grantmakers.

Further, gender identities other than male and female and LGBTQ status are also not tracked by the U.S. Census Bureau, so comparisons with state workforce percentages cannot be made. It is apparent, however, that transgender and other gender identities are represented only at the staff level (and none in the executive staff positions). LGBTQ individuals make up a larger portion of chief executives, executive staff, total staff and consultants than board chairs or board members.
In terms of overall demographic composition of Minnesota grantmakers, responding organizations demonstrate varying degrees of racial/ethnic diversity by organizational role. Forty-six of the 79 respondents that answered the question reported having a paid chief executive, 86.8% of which identified as white/non-Hispanic persons, and 13.2% of which identified as persons of color, which is comparable to the Minnesota state workforce population percentages of 13.4% persons of color and 86.6% white/non-Hispanic persons.

There are clearly deficits, however, in demographic representation in Hispanic/Latino/Latina and Asian or Asian American categories when compared to Minnesota workforce estimates. These trends are particularly evident in the reported race/ethnicity of board chairs. Overall, 89.6% white/non-Hispanic persons and 10.4% persons of color serve as board chairs.

In terms of gender representation, board chairs are more likely to be male than female. The gender balance is more equal in chief executive, board member and executive staff roles. Females make up the majority of overall staff and consultants.

**Board Composition**

There were significant differences overall in regards to board chair and board member racial/ethnic diversity and staff LGBTQ diversity. Data indicated that, for organizations with a person of color as board chair, boards are much more racially/ethnically diverse (61.75% persons of color, as opposed to 16.34% persons of color serving on boards with a white/non-Hispanic board chair). Further, for organizations that reported having a person of color as board chair, 43.30% of the staff identify as LGBTQ, as opposed to 17.12% of staff identifying as LGBTQ for organizations with a white/non-Hispanic board chair.

Seventy-seven of the 80 respondents reported having boards; they ranged in size from 1 to 57 persons, with a mean board size of 10 persons. Total board and staff sizes were significantly positively correlated, indicating that larger boards serve grantmaking organizations with larger staffs.

Board demographic composition is also comparable to the overall Minnesota workforce estimates in terms of race and ethnicity. But, again, it is below average for Asian or Asian American, Hispanic/Latino/Latina, multiracial and ‘other’ races or ethnicities. Also, more males serve on boards than females.

Board racial/ethnic diversity is highly positively correlated with board LGBTQ diversity as well as staff LGBTQ diversity, but is not correlated with disability status of staffs or boards, or racial/ethnic diversity for executive staff or all staff. When interpreting these data it is important to remember that board members may be serving on multiple boards simultaneously, which may cause over- or under-representation of any specific population or demographic.
Staff Composition

Regarding staff demographic reporting, only 48 of the 80 respondents reported having staff at all (60% of the total sample), as a large portion of the sample was family grantmakers that may not employ staff. Of those reporting staff, staff sizes ranged from 1 to 110 persons, with a mean of 15.

In terms of executive staff, persons of color represent 11.8% of the reported sample, while white/non-Hispanic persons make up 88.2%, demonstrating variances from Minnesota state workforce averages, particularly in regards to Hispanic/Latino/Latina, Asian or Asian American, multiracial and ‘other’ race or ethnicity categories.

Native American or Alaska Native individuals comprise higher than expected workforce percentages at all levels.

Board and executive staff are quite similar in their composition except in gender distribution, with more females being represented in executive staff positions than males. For all staff combined (including executive staff), significantly more females than males are reported (73.5%, as opposed to 26.2%). Transgender and ‘other’ individuals were represented only in the total staff roles (.14% each).

In terms of race and ethnicity of all staff, white/non-Hispanic representation actually falls below Minnesota state workforce averages. Persons of color represent 16.5% of the responding sample, with only ‘other’ race or ethnicity populations falling below the state estimates.

One of the more interesting findings of the study is that staff size and staff diversity are significantly negatively correlated, indicating that, as reported staff sizes increased, the racial/ethnic diversity of those staffs actually decreased.

Consultant Questions

Regarding consultant data, MCF asked grantmakers whether they are hiring diverse consultants in regards to race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability status, but the survey did not ask how many consultants are being employed by Minnesota grantmakers. For this reason, consultants could easily be over- or under-represented along diversity and inclusion factors, as the nature of their positions means that they could potentially be working with multiple responding organizations at once. While this is similar to the precaution regarding board members, extra consideration should be given regarding consultants, as their livelihoods may depend upon having multiple clients at once.

Only 23.8% of the total sample reported hiring consultants at all. Of those reported, consultants are by far the most racially/ethnically diverse group, with 75.2% reported as being white/non-Hispanic persons and 24.8% persons of color. Still, in keeping with general trends, fewer Hispanic/Latino/Latina and multiracial individuals were reported as consultants. In terms of gender, 61.9% of reported consultants were female (as opposed to 30.9% males), 3.8% identified as persons with disabilities, and 6.7% identified as LGBTQ.
Comparisons to the Field

In comparison with data from Michigan (CMF, 2009), California (FC, 2009a) and New York (FC, 2009b), Minnesota chief executives and board members appear to follow similar trends, with white/non-Hispanic persons representing 83 to 90% of individuals in these roles and persons of color representing approximately 10 to 17%. In Minnesota and Michigan these percentages are similar to the population demographic estimates. But in New York and California, where there is much greater racial/ethnic diversity, racial/ethnic demographic percentages are still quite similar to the other states.

The figures below illustrate the relative comparisons between the states, but caution is merited in their interpretation, as the research was designed and conducted in varying political climates and at various times. Further, there are differences in sample sizes, with Michigan data representing a sample of 89 foundations, New York findings representing a sample of 95 Philanthropy New York members, and California findings representing a sample of 115 foundations.

Figure 1: Chief Executives by State

Figure 2: Board Members by State

In terms of staff composition, executive staff members are more racially/ethnically diverse in California and New York than in Minnesota and Michigan, in keeping with their respective demographic population estimates. But executive staff members in California and New York are still significantly much less diverse than total staff. Minnesota and Michigan also show greater diversity at the total staff level than at the executive staff level. Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the comparisons between states for persons of color and white/non-Hispanic persons at the executive and all-staff levels.
Comparisons to Earlier Minnesota Research

Due to MCF’s long-time commitment to diversity and inclusivity in philanthropy, three previous surveys (1995, 2000 and 2005) of demographics, practices and policies in Minnesota grantmaking are available for comparisons across multiple data collection points.

Figures 5 and 6 illustrate trends in the reporting of persons of color by organizational roles. While racial/ethnic data for board members and staff were collected across all four survey administrations, inclusion factors such as persons with disabilities and persons identifying as LGBTQ were not aligned in every survey and are not reported here. Further, overall consultant data were collected only in the three most recent surveys, and so fewer data points are available for comparisons.

In terms of board membership, there have been sharp declines over the past five years in the representation of Black or African American, Native American or Alaska Native, and Hispanic/Latino/Latina populations. Smaller but still significant decreases have also been evidenced in Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander and ‘other’/multiracial populations. Possible contributing factors to this shift include burnout, tokenism, the recent economic downturn, board term limits, changes in sample sizes, and varying respondent motivations in taking the survey in previous years. Thus, one should use caution in interpreting the data, and various factors should be considered carefully for all roles.
In terms of staff demographic trends, there has been relative stability in the representation of ‘other’/multiracial populations and a slight increase in the representation of Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander populations. But representation of Black or African American individuals has trended downward over the past ten years. Native American or Alaska Native individuals declined sharply in the past five years, along with Hispanic/Latino/Latina individuals decreasing slightly. Again, the potential multiple reasons for these shifts should be considered in interpretation of the data.

Comparisons of 17 Minnesota Grantmakers

For the overall respondent data comparisons across survey years, the size and composition of samples varied. But 17 grantmaking organizations responded to all four surveys, allowing for benchmarking and comparisons across data collection points and trends. It should be noted that, while these organizations have completed the survey four times, their size and focus may have changed over time. Therefore, these data should be interpreted with the same precautions as with the overall survey results.
Figures 7 and 8 illustrate trends in demographic composition over time for the 17 common respondents. In board membership, percentages of Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino/Latina, and Native American or Alaska Native populations have decreased over the past five years. Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander and ‘other’/multiracial populations have increased.

In terms of staff demographics, there have been increases in the past five years in representation of Hispanic/Latino/Latina and Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander populations, relative stability in Native American or Alaska Native populations, and decreases in Black or African American and ‘other’/multiracial individuals.

Figure 7: Board Demographic Trends over Time – Seventeen Common Respondents

Figure 8: Staff Demographic Trends over Time – Seventeen Common Respondents
Differences in Demographic Composition by Grantmaker Type, Size, and Locality

Given that there are substantial differences in grantmaker types, sizes and geographies, it follows that there may be differences in the demographic compositions as well. Tables 4 – 10 illustrate the reported demographic compositions of chief executives, board chairs, board members, executive staff and all staff broken out by grantmaker type (community/public, corporate, family and independent), size (< $1 million, between $1 and $10 million, and > $10 million in grants annually), and locality (7-County Metro and Greater Minnesota). The reported demographic percentages are again compared to the 2009 Minnesota Workforce Population Estimates provided by the U.S. Census Bureau, with red indicating below average, blue indicating similarity/stability and green indicating above average percentages of each population demographic.

Table 4: Chief Executives by Grantmaker Type and Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity:</th>
<th>MN 2009 Workforce Population Estimates</th>
<th>Grantmaker Type</th>
<th>Grants Size Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community / Public Grantmakers</td>
<td>Corporate Grantmakers</td>
<td>Family Grantmakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who Identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Board Chairs by Grantmaker Type and Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity:</th>
<th>MN 2009 Workforce Population Estimates</th>
<th>Grantmaker Type</th>
<th>Grants Size Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community / Public Grantmakers</td>
<td>Corporate Grantmakers</td>
<td>Family Grantmakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who Identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race / Ethnicity:</td>
<td>MN 2009 Workforce Population Estimates</td>
<td>Community / Public Grantmakers</td>
<td>Corporate Grantmakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who Identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Executive Staff by Grantmaker Type and Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity:</th>
<th>MN 2009 Workforce Population Estimates</th>
<th>Community / Public Grantmakers</th>
<th>Corporate Grantmakers</th>
<th>Family Grantmakers</th>
<th>Independent Grantmakers</th>
<th>&lt;$1 Million in Grants</th>
<th>Between $1 and $10 Million in Grants</th>
<th>&gt;$10 Million in Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who Identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: All Staff by Grantmaker Type and Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity:</th>
<th>MN 2009 Workforce Population Estimates</th>
<th>Community / Public Grantmakers</th>
<th>Corporate Grantmakers</th>
<th>Family Grantmakers</th>
<th>Independent Grantmakers</th>
<th>&lt;$1 Million in Grants</th>
<th>Between $1 and $10 Million in Grants</th>
<th>&gt;$10 Million in Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who Identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9: Roles by Locality – 7-County Metro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Chief Executives</th>
<th>Board Chair</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>Executive Staff</th>
<th>All Staff Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native (%)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who Identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Roles by Locality – Greater Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Chief Executives</th>
<th>Board Chair</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>Executive Staff</th>
<th>All Staff Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (%)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino / Latina (%)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native (%)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (%)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races / Multiracial (%)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Ethnicity (%)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who Identify as LGBTQ (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences in Staff, Board Sizes

Overall, there are obvious differences in staff sizes, with community/public grantmakers reporting a mean of 20 staff members and independent grantmakers reporting a mean of 18 staff members, as opposed to the mean staff sizes reported by corporate (M = 8) and family (M = 5) grantmakers. But differences in staff sizes were not statistically significant, primarily due to the small sample size. Differences in reported board membership were, however, statistically significant, with community/public grantmakers reporting a mean board size of 16 and corporate (M = 8), family (M = 6) and independent (M = 9) grantmakers reporting smaller board sizes.

Respondents in the greater than $10 million in grants category reported statistically significantly larger staff and board totals, as noted in Table 11. By locality, reported staff sizes were not significantly different, but board sizes were, with Greater Minnesota grantmakers reporting larger board sizes (M = 14) as opposed to those from the 7-County Metro (M = 9). This may be related to the fact that 50% of Greater Minnesota respondents were from community/public grantmakers and family grantmakers were not represented in the Greater Minnesota respondent sample.

Table 11: Staff and Board Mean Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants Size Category</th>
<th>Mean Staff Size</th>
<th>Mean Board Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$1 Million in Grants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $1 and $10 Million in Grants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;10 Million in Grants</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board racial/ethnic diversity was found to be significantly positively correlated with total staff racial/ethnic diversity for community/public grantmakers. These factors were not significantly correlated for corporate, family or independent grantmakers. Other correlations occur in the <$1 million in grants category, where board racial/ethnic diversity was highly correlated with board LGBTQ inclusion.

In regards to locality, grantmakers from Greater Minnesota reported having greater racial/ethnic diversity in their boards than in their overall staffs, which is a reversal of the trend seen in the 7-County Metro area respondents, as well as the overall trends seen in Michigan, California and New York.

Further, Greater Minnesota respondents reported having 100% white/non-Hispanic programming and development staffs, and they did not report hiring any consultants. In fact, Greater Minnesota board racial/ethnic diversity and staff racial/ethnic diversity were perfectly negatively correlated, indicating that respondents who reported having a racially/ethnically diverse board had no racial/ethnic diversity within their total staffs.
Subgroup Demographic Differences by Roles

Overall, chief executives were reported as primarily white/non-Hispanic (86.8%), but there are substantial differences in chief executive race/ethnicity by grantmaker type. All independent grantmakers reported having a white/non-Hispanic chief executive, but these findings must be qualified by stating that only six (of a total of eight) independent foundations in the sample reported having a paid chief executive.

Corporate grantmakers reported having the most racially/ethnically diverse chief executives of those responding to the survey, with 20% reporting having a person of color in the chief executive role. Community/public and family chief executives were also much more racially/ethnically diverse than independent chief executives. But it must be noted that persons of color in chief executive positions were reported as being Black or African American or ‘other’ race or ethnicity for corporate and family grantmakers, while community/public grantmakers reported a greater distribution of persons of color, including Hispanic/Latino/Latina and Native American or Alaska Native chief executives as well as Black or African American.

In terms of grants size categories, the less than $1 million in grants category demonstrates greater racial / ethnic diversity than either of the two other groups. The greater than $10 million category demonstrated greater racial/ethnic diversity than the between $1 and $10 million category, which reported primarily white/non-Hispanic chief executives (95.7%), with 4.3% ‘other’ race or ethnicity.

Regarding gender, community/public grantmakers and the between $1 and $10 million in grants categories were on par for male/female distribution, while corporate and family grantmakers and respondents in the less than $1 million and greater than $10 million in grants categories reported more females in chief executive roles. Independent chief executives were reported as being primarily male (66.7%), in addition to being primarily white/non-Hispanic.

Community/public, family, less than $1 million and between $1 and $10 million in grants respondents reported having more individuals that identify as LGBTQ as chief executives, followed by corporate grantmakers. No chief executives identifying as LGBTQ were reported in independent grantmakers or in the greater than $10 million in grants size category. Finally, no chief executives of community/public, independent, less than $1 million or greater than $10 million in grants categories were reported as persons with disabilities.

Again, board chairs were reported as primarily white/non-Hispanic, although independent grantmakers reported the most racially/ethnically diverse board chairs (42.9% persons of color), followed by community/public grantmakers (16.7% persons of color). Independent grantmakers also reported higher percentages of board chairs identifying as LGBTQ (14.3%), and they also reported that 100% of board chairs were females, a significant reversal of the trend seen in all other grantmaker types and size categories.
Regarding the racial/ethnic diversity of board chairs for grants size categories, board chairs in the less than $1 million category were much more diverse (22.2% persons of color) than those in either of the other two categories, and they represented a broader range of races/ethnicities. Only family grantmakers and those in the between $1 and $10 million in grants category reported having board chairs with disabilities.

Overall, board members were reported as being primarily white/non-Hispanic males, but independent grantmakers reported having a much more racially/ethnically diverse board composition (39.06% persons of color), followed by community/public grantmakers (15.5% persons of color). Interestingly, while members of the between $1 and $10 million in grants category reported the least racially/ethnically diverse board composition, they were more representative of the Minnesota workforce population estimates for Hispanic/Latino/Latina populations than either of the two other categories.

Executive staff demographics are more racially/ethnically diverse than either chief executive or board chair demographics, with greater racial/ethnic diversity in independent and corporate grantmaking organizations, as well as in the less than $1 million and greater than $10 million grants categories. In a reversal of the board membership trends, racial/ethnic diversity is lowest among community/public grantmakers. Further, there is no executive staff racial/ethnic diversity in family grantmaker respondents, but most family grantmakers reported little to no staff at all, and therefore these results are based on only 5 reported executive staff members.

For other inclusion factors, there were no reported persons with disabilities serving in executive staff roles. In regards to sexual orientation, members of the less than $1 million in grants category reported more individuals identifying as LGBTQ (22.2%), followed by members of the greater than $10 million in grants category (10%). Community/public and independent grantmakers also reported having individuals identifying as LGBTQ in executive staff positions, while neither corporate nor family grantmakers, or members in the between $1 and $10 million in grants size categories reported individuals identifying as LGBTQ in these roles.

When total staff demographics are compared, it is clear that corporate and independent grantmaking staffs are more racially/ethnically diverse (22.7 and 22.4% persons of color, respectively), although community/public and family grantmakers are very similar to state demographic percentages, as well. In regards to grants size categories, respondents in the less than $1 million and greater than $10 million in grants size categories reported much greater staff racial/ethnic diversity (33.8% and 20.1% persons of color, respectively) than the between $1 and $10 million in grants category.

In regards to gender, many more females than males are represented in staff demographics. Transgender or other gender identities are reported as staff, but they aren’t represented in chief executive, board chair, board member or executive staff roles. Persons with disabilities are underrepresented in staff roles, while individuals identifying as LGBTQ comprise 2.3 – 10.3% of those reported as staff.
Demographic compositions were compared to the locality workforce population demographics obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2009 population estimates. Trends in the 7-County Metro area follow the overall trend, with less racial/ethnic diversity in the chief executive, board chair and board member roles than at the total staff level. In addition, there are far more females in staff roles than at the board chair or board member levels. Persons with disabilities and persons identifying as LGBTQ are most represented at the chief executive level, though persons identifying as LGBTQ are also represented to a greater extent in executive and total staff levels than in board chair or board member roles.

Greater Minnesota data demonstrate a departure from this trend, however, with greater racial/ethnic diversity in the chief executive and board member roles than in executive or total staff roles. In fact, Greater Minnesota respondents reported having 100% white/non-Hispanic programming and development staffs, with most racial/ethnic diversity appearing at the other and executive staff levels. Additionally, in the chief executive and board chair roles, the only racial/ethnic group represented other than white/non-Hispanic is Black or African American individuals. Board member composition is much more racially/ethnically diverse. Further, persons with disabilities and persons identifying as LGBTQ appeared only in the board member role, and no ‘other’ or transgender gender identities were reported.
Chief Executive and Board Chair Roles

In regard to hiring policies and practices followed by Minnesota grantmakers, survey findings indicate that, for organizations with a paid chief executive, only 22.6% of those chief executives had previously served on the organization’s board of trustees or directors, and 28.3% had been employed by the grantmaking organization prior to being hired as chief executive.

There are significant differences between subgroups, however, with 66.7% of corporate grantmakers reporting that the current chief executive had been last employed by the organization, as opposed to 8.7% of community/public grantmakers, 25.0% of family grantmakers and 16.7% of independent grantmakers.

In regard to board member term limits, 41.8% of respondents reported a three-year term limit, but another 41.8% selected ‘other’ and included details regarding limits that ranged from unlimited to staggered or rotational, and especially for family grantmakers, for life or until retirement. Other responses to the question about length of board terms included both 2- and 4-year limits, and other longer time periods. Differences by grantmaker type were found to be significant, with the majority of community/public (70.8%) and independent (62.5%) grantmakers reporting 3-year term limits.

Concerning the number of consecutive terms board members were allowed to serve, again there were significant differences by grantmaker type, with 81.1% of corporate grantmakers and 60% of family grantmakers reporting either no limits or indefinite limits – as long as the board member was employed by the organization, or until the foundation was spent down or transferred, or until a successor was determined. On the other hand, community/public and independent grantmakers (37.5 and 62.5%, respectively) reported three consecutive term limits for board members.

Additional information supplied by survey respondents confirmed that family grantmaker board members are often family members and serve without term limits or restrictions on the number of consecutive terms served, and that corporate grantmaker board members are also often company executives and do not have set term limits. Further, some respondents noted that trustees were subjected to peer review processes or re-election/reappointment, and therefore their organizations’ did not have established term limits.
Diversity and Inclusion Policies

Survey respondents were asked whether their grantmaking organizations have formal, written diversity and inclusion policies for their boards, staffs, executive staffs, and vendors. Overall, 36.3% of respondents reported having board policies, 40% reported having staff policies, 25% reported having executive staff policies, and 30% reported having vendor policies regarding diversity and inclusion (Figure 9).

Figure 9: Percentages of Minnesota Grantmakers with Formal Diversity and Inclusion Policies

When data are analyzed by subgroups, substantial differences exist in the presence of formal diversity and inclusion policies (Figures 10 – 12). Far more community/public foundations than other grantmaker types report having formal board diversity and inclusion policies (62.5%).

Community/public (50%) and corporate grantmakers (57.7%) and members of the greater than $10 million in grants category (68.8%) were much more likely to have formal staff diversity and inclusion policies. Further, organizations with a female chief executive (60%) were significantly more likely to report having formal staff diversity and inclusion policies than those with a male chief executive (39.1%).

In terms of formal executive staff diversity and inclusion policies, again, corporate grantmakers (42.3%) were significantly more likely to report having policies in place than other grantmaker types. And respondents in the between $1 and $10 million and greater than $10 million in grants categories were more likely to report having formal executive staff diversity and inclusion policies. In addition, grantmakers with a female chief executive (43.3%) were more likely to report formal executive staff diversity and inclusion policies than organizations with a male chief executive (21.7%).
Finally, in regard to formal vendor diversity and inclusion policies, significantly more community/public (29.2%) and corporate (57.7%) grantmakers reported having formal policies than other grantmaker types, and respondents in the greater than $10 million in grants category (43.8%) reported significantly more formal vendor diversity and inclusion policies.

Greater Minnesota grantmakers, who reported greater racial/ethnic diversity in their boards than in their staffs, are more likely than 7-County Metro grantmakers to have board and staff diversity and inclusivity policies (Figure 12).

Figure 10: Diversity and Inclusion Policies by Grantmaker Type

Figure 11: Diversity and Inclusion Policies by Grants Size Categories
Figure 13 illustrates the percentages of formal diversity and inclusion policies by race/ethnicity of the chief executive and board chair. While the sample size was too small to perform deeper statistical analysis, interesting differences appeared between groups with and without persons of color in higher level positions regarding whether the organization has formal diversity and inclusion policies. For example, grantmakers with a chief executive who identifies as a person of color were substantially more likely to report having formal board (83.3%), staff (83.3%) and executive staff (50.0%) diversity and inclusivity policies than those with a white/non-Hispanic chief executive (45.7%, 47.8%, and 32.6%, respectively). Further, this trend is repeated with board chairs of color, in regards to board (75.0%) and staff (62.5%) diversity and inclusion policies (as compared to 33.3% and 37.7%, respectively, for white/non-Hispanic board chairs).

While organizations with a board chair of color are more likely to have vendor diversity policies than those with a white/non-Hispanic board chair, organizations with a white/non-Hispanic chief executive are more likely than those with a chief executive of color to have such policies. In general, fewer organizations have vendor diversity policies than have board and staff policies.
A wealth of qualitative information was also obtained from survey respondents regarding their diversity and inclusion policies, both formal and informal. Included were examples of diversity and inclusion policies, mission statements, and factors that define diverse and inclusive for different types of organizations, such as geographic, age and socioeconomic factors that are considered informally or alongside formal policies.

Some respondents cited an overall nondiscrimination policy, as opposed to role-specific diversity and inclusion policies, and noted their current efforts around writing such formal policies and increasing diversity and inclusivity of their boards and staffs. Finally, in regard to vendor diversity and inclusion policies, many of the smaller or family grantmakers stated that they had no vendors and, therefore, had no formal policies regarding vendor diversity or inclusivity.

The characteristics most often included in formal diversity and inclusion polices were reported as race (46.3%), gender (46.3%), age (41.3%), color (40.0%), disability (40.0%), and sexual orientation (38.8%). The characteristics least frequently included were marital status (26.3%) and diverse social/political ideology (11.3%), although other responses (11.3%) included creed, ancestry, maternity, socioeconomic and education status, geography and professional background.
Key Constituencies Supported

In order to determine the diversity and inclusivity of their grantmaking, survey respondents were asked to identify key constituents or targeted populations listed in their mission statements or grantmaking guidelines. Results indicated that economically disadvantaged (45.0%) and youth or children (43.8%) are most frequently cited as key constituents of grantmaking, followed by racial or ethnic populations in general (22.5%). However, 22.5% reported that no specific populations were mentioned and 18.8% cited other populations, which included social justice issues, regardless of population, employee volunteerism and industry relationships, financial literacy, vulnerable individuals, and cross-sections of minority populations. Figure 14 illustrates the relative percentages for the overall sample.

Figure 14: Key Constituencies/Targeted Populations in Mission Statements or Grantmaking Guidelines
In regard to differences by subgroups, community/public and corporate grantmakers (20.8 and 38.5%, respectively) were more likely to report racial or ethnic populations in general as key constituents, as were respondents in the greater than $10 million in grants category. Respondents in the largest size category were also more likely to report Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino/Latina, Asian or Asian American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and LGBTQ populations as key constituents in their grantmaking.

By locality, respondents from Greater Minnesota (41.2%) were more likely to report not having specific populations mentioned in their grantmaking guidelines than those from the 7-County Metro (17.7%).

In regard to the race/ethnicity of the chief executive and board chair, grantmakers with a board chair of color (50.0%) were much more likely to report naming racial/ethnic populations in general, and Native American or Alaska Native populations as key constituents. Respondents with a chief executive of color were also more likely to report Native American or Alaska Native populations as key constituents (50.0%, as opposed to 13.0% of those with a white/non-Hispanic chief executive).

The racial/ethnic diversity and gender, disability status and LGBTQ inclusivity of boards, executive staff and total staff were also examined in relation to named key constituencies, and some significant differences were revealed. Of those citing Native American or Alaska Native populations as a key constituency, board racial/ethnic composition was much more diverse, with 45.78% of the board identifying as persons of color, as opposed to a composition of 18.49% persons of color on boards that did not cite this population as a key constituency. This trend was also evident in staff racial/ethnic diversity for respondents who cited immigrant communities as key constituents; the reported staffs were composed of 59.20% persons of color for those who selected this population, as opposed to 31.88% persons of color for those who did not cite immigrant communities.

**Addressing Diversity, Inclusivity and Equity in Nonprofits and the Community**

When asked whether their grantmaking organization actively seeks out and supports nonprofit programs that specifically address diversity, inclusivity and equity issues, 51.3% of respondents reported that they did. These percentages remained relatively stable across all subgroups, but several respondents added depth to their responses by sharing specific information regarding programs their organizations are leading or developing to address these issues. Responses ranged from crisis funding for the working poor, to building social capital that brought together disparate groups, to the promotion of community-building efforts with minority populations. Other comments stated that issues of diversity, inclusivity and equity may not be explicitly sought out by the grantmaker but that minority populations benefit from grantmaking simply by the nature of the programs and nonprofits they do support.
Practices Related to Collecting Data from Nonprofits

Survey respondents were also asked whether their organizations collect specific types of data from nonprofit grant applicants, and if they did collect these data, whether they were used to determine grant funding. Overall, Minnesota grantmakers were most likely to collect data regarding the population(s) served by the nonprofit, with the race/ethnicity of the population(s) served by the nonprofit (61.3%) and the gender composition of the population(s) served by the nonprofit (47.5%) being the most common.

Figure 15: Nonprofit Grant Applicant Data Collection Practices of Minnesota Grantmakers

When subgroup differences were analyzed, significant differences in data collection practices emerged. For data regarding the sexual orientation of the nonprofit’s board of directors/trustees, community/public grantmakers were the only organizations that collected this type of data, resulting in a significant finding. Significant differences were also found in the collection of data regarding the disability status of the nonprofit’s staff, with community/public grantmakers (20.8%) and respondents in the greater than $10 million in grants category (12.5%) much more likely to collect these data. Further, community/public grantmakers (20.8%) were
also much more likely than others to collect data regarding the sexual orientation/gender identity of the nonprofit’s staff.

There were significant differences in regard to gathering data about the racial/ethnic composition of the population(s) served by the nonprofit, with respondents in the greater than $10 million in grants categories (87.5%) more likely to collect these data than respondents in the other two grants size categories. There were also significant differences in the collection of these data by locality, with 7-County Metro grantmakers (69.4%) much more likely to collect these data than Greater Minnesota respondents (35.3%).

Respondents in the greater than $10 million in grants category (37.5%) were also significantly more likely to collect data regarding the sexual orientation/gender identity of the population(s) served by the nonprofit. In regard to collection of data about the gender composition of the population(s) served by the nonprofit, differences were again significant by locality, with grantmakers from the 7-County Metro area more likely to collect these data (54.8%) than Greater Minnesota grantmakers (23.5%).

Differences also appear when data collection practices are analyzed by sexual orientation of the chief executive, as well as by the race/ethnicity of the chief executive and board chair of the grantmaking organization. Figures 16 – 18 illustrate the significant comparisons based on these factors.

In regard to the race/ethnicity of the chief executive, organizations with a chief executive identifying as a person of color were much more likely to collect data regarding the race/ethnicity of the board members, chief executives, staff, and population(s) served by the nonprofits than organizations with a white/non-Hispanic chief executive. Chief executives of color were also much more likely to collect data regarding sexual orientation and disability status at the board and staff levels and sexual orientation/gender identity of the population(s) served by the nonprofits.

Organizations with board chairs of color were also much more likely to report collecting data regarding the race/ethnicity of the board of directors, chief executives and staff of the nonprofits, following much the same trend as the organizations with chief executives of color. Finally, in terms of sexual orientation of the chief executive, organizations with an LGBTQ chief executive were much more likely to report collecting data regarding the sexual orientation/gender identity of the board, staff and population(s) served by the nonprofits, as well as gender composition of the staff and population(s) served and disability status of nonprofit staffs.
Figure 16: Data Collection Practices by Chief Executive Race/Ethnicity

Figure 17: Data Collection Practices by Board Chair Race/Ethnicity
Several survey respondents also mentioned collecting other types of data from grant applicants, including age of population(s) served, geographic focus, income of population(s) served, poverty as determined by free/reduced lunch programs, family and educational attainment status, chemical dependency rates, and immigrant leadership.

Of those who reported that they collect demographic data of grant applicants, 62.5% reported that their organization sometimes uses this data in making grant decisions, and 29.2% stated that their organization always uses the data collected in grantmaking decisions.

In terms of grantmaker subgroups, 50% of independent grantmakers report always using the demographic data collected in grantmaking decisions, followed by corporate (37.5%), family (23.1%) and community/public (15.45). Community/public (76.9%) and family (76.9%) grantmakers most frequently reported sometimes using the demographic data collected to inform grantmaking, while 50% of independent and 43.8% of corporate grantmakers reported only sometimes using these data.

All grants size categories reported sometimes using the data from 57 – 62.5% of the time, and always using the data 22 – 42.9% of the time to inform their grantmaking. The largest difference in data use to inform grantmaking occurs when reviewed by locality, with 100% of Greater Minnesota respondents reporting only sometimes using these data, and 33.3% of 7-County Metro respondents reporting always using these data.
Capacity-Building Activities

The final section of the *Working Towards Diversity IV* research survey focused on capacity building. Questions about capacity building were added to the survey to evaluate the types and levels of non-program-related support that Minnesota grantmakers provide to nonprofits, specifically those that are constituent-led. These questions aligned with studies that were conducted in other states following questions being raised about whether foundations were funding minority-led nonprofits at equitable rates.

The questions were further designed to identify best practices and trends in types of support provided to constituent-led organizations. The rationale for exploring differences in types and amounts of capacity-building support is that, to the extent that a grantmaker believes that constituent-led nonprofits are uniquely positioned to provide services within a particular community, the grantmaker may also question the capacity of such organizations to serve effectively, when compared to mainstream, non-constituent-led organizations.

Constituent-led organizations, like many small nonprofits, often face challenges with low budgets and minimal grant support for training, education, equipment, strategic planning support/consultants, organizational development, board development and fundraising.

Relevant Conclusions

Of those who responded that their organization either sometimes or frequently provides non-grant capacity-building support (n = 41, 51.2% of sample):
- 88% have provided capacity-building support to nonprofits led by persons of color
- 42% have provided capacity-building support to nonprofits led by persons who identify as LGBTQ
- 42% have provided capacity-building support to nonprofits led by persons with disabilities
- 85% have provided capacity-building support to nonprofits led by women.

Of those who responded that some, most or all of their organization’s focus was on providing capacity-building support (n = 54, 68.4% of sample):
- 80% reported providing capacity-building support to nonprofits led by persons of color
- 41% reported providing capacity-building support to nonprofits led by persons who identify as LGBTQ
- 41% reported providing capacity-building support to nonprofits led by persons with disabilities
- 82% reported providing capacity-building support to nonprofits led by women

There are several limitations in interpreting capacity-building support findings, particularly as the survey did not ask what percentage of all grant funds is directed toward capacity building, or what percentage of capacity-building grants is given to constituent-led organizations.
**Capacity-Building Data**

Overall, Minnesota grantmakers were most likely to report providing capacity-building support through operating support (77.5%), training or scholarship grants (61.3%), program development and implementation (52.5%) and sponsoring or hosting convenings (50.0%).

There were significant differences between responses by grantmaker type:

- Community/public and independent grantmakers were much more likely to provide training or scholarship grants
- Corporate grantmakers were much less likely to provide low- or no-interest loans
- Community/public grantmakers were much more likely to provide fiscal management
- Community/public grantmakers were much more likely to provide both board development and fundraising or special events planning as forms of capacity-building support.

Figure 19 illustrates the differences in capacity-building support provided by grantmaker types. Differences by grants size categories were also found to be significant, with members of the greater than $10 million in grants category much more likely to provide specific forms of capacity-building support (Table 12).

There were also significant differences by locality, with 7-County Metro grantmakers much more likely to provide operating support, and Greater Minnesota area grantmakers much more likely to provide board development and program development as forms of capacity-building support.
Figure 19: Capacity-Building Support Activities by Grantmaker Type

Table 12: Capacity-Building Support Provided by the Greater than $10 Million in Grants Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity-Building Support Activities</th>
<th>Percentage Offering Type of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Support</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training or Scholarship Grants</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Development</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Development</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Programs or Services</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Service Grants</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Assessment</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Support</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grantmaker Focus Groups

As noted in the Methodology section, focus groups were conducted to directly discuss diversity and inclusion policies and practices, efforts that worked well and did not work well, measures of effectiveness, and opinions and perceptions regarding implementation challenges and possible areas of improvement.

Eight focus groups were held. Four were grouped by grantmaker type (community/public, corporate, family and independent) and four by demographic (population) type (LGBTQ, Asian, Native American, and African American). See Appendix B for the focus group discussion outlines. Following are two summaries of the focus group discussions – one for the grantmaker-type groups and one for the population-based groups.

Grantmaker-Type Focus Groups Summary

Policies, Procedures & Practices

- Efforts made to embrace inclusive practices that worked well?
  - Several programmatic efforts by all types of foundations
    - New targeted grants
    - Seeking funds from other funders for targeted programming
  - Discussions among board members/staff about diversity and inclusion that have strengthened the organization as a whole and opened doors to new strategies, programs, and donors

- Efforts made to embrace inclusive practices that did not work well?
  - Training: Specifically when asking staff volunteers to develop and offer training who aren’t trained in diversity and inclusion
  - Board development and diversification: Retention, full engagement, inclusion, equality in voices
  - Measurement: Establishing meaningful measurements, reporting

- Measures of Effectiveness?
  - Members struggled to identify measures of effectiveness at first and then identified experiential measures such as:
    - Increased comfort with discussing issues of diversity and inclusion
    - Increased questions/comments from community members about the foundation’s commitment/engagement with diversity and inclusion
    - Putting measures in place
    - General feeling that the organization was more progressive/diverse/inclusive than others

- Do you have specific targets or benchmarks against which your diversity efforts are measured? If so, how did you select those targets or benchmarks?
  - Members also struggled with specific targets or benchmarks -- both with whether foundations should have benchmarks or targets and with whether having them is important.
  - Some members measuring staff/board diversity
  - Some (particularly corporate) measuring EEO-type data
  - Some are collecting data related to disparities from grantees, but have not set targets/benchmarks.

- In your opinion, is your organization addressing diversity, inclusion or equity? Which do you feel the organization/field should be addressing?
  - Members struggled to define these words in relation to their work.
  - Members are more likely to be addressing disparities.
Members are more comfortable with the word “inclusion” than diversity or equity, though not necessarily fully aware of the definition of inclusion or what it looks like in action.

- MCF adopted strategic goals to create a climate of inclusivity in philanthropy and to recognize, eliminate and prevent racism in philanthropy. Do you believe the Minnesota grantmaking community has not done enough, has done about the right amount, or has done too much vis-à-vis diversity? What about your own organization?
  - Members struggle to be critical of the field and most often simply say “we can always do more”

In your opinion, what other actions can grantmakers take to create and promote a climate of inclusivity in philanthropic practice?

- Members struggle to identify actions their own foundation type can take on. However, independent, community, and family foundations felt that corporate foundations and very large foundations could lead the way. This was largely attributed to a perception that corporate foundations would be operating in concert with their Diversity Offices or EEO/Affirmative Action Offices and would therefore have more advanced strategies.

In your opinion, what other actions can MCF take to help grantmakers create and promote a climate of inclusivity in philanthropic practice?

- Members also struggled to identify actions without feeling critical of MCF.
  - Members identified past opportunities for action that the MCF board has not embraced.
  - Members have mixed feelings about the impact of MCF’s programming in diversity and inclusion, but when specifically prompted, did identify 1:1 technical assistance as a valuable service MCF could offer.
  - Members identified continuing discussions like the focus groups as valuable so that members could learn from each other.

The MCF Diversity Framework encourages grantmaking organizations to address diversity and inclusion in four roles: Funders, Employers, Economic Entities, Citizens of the Community: Which of these roles has your organization had the most success in? Why?

- Members are most likely to identify with the funder role, which supports their comfort with addressing disparities rather than diversity or inclusion.

Which of these roles has been most challenging for your organization/the field? Why? What can be done to advance success in that role?

- The role as economic entities is most confusing for members. Many were not aware that they could ask diversity and equity-related questions of their investment managers, for instance.
  - Members also expressed challenges with the role of employers -- not knowing where/how to find diverse candidates or how to prioritize diversity in the hiring process. Members also struggle with this if they have a small staff or low turnover.

**Capacity Building**

- Does your organization play a leadership role in addressing community/civic issues related to diversity and inclusion? If so, what issues and what role do you play?
  - Members across the state have very unique examples of playing a leadership role in addressing community issues -- both as funders, conveners, and champions. (e.g., Rochester, Alexandria, Minneapolis) Some members who are not advanced in addressing diversity internal to their organization are willing – as funders – to address diversity and inclusion challenges within the community or region they serve.
Has your organization engaged in capacity building related to diversity and inclusion? If so, what populations does your organization target with this work?
- Limited responses or understanding of this question.

Who do you look to for best practices and successful models in addressing diversity and inclusion?
- National foundations
- Peers who readily share examples
- COF - Mixed reviews
- MCF - Have general positive feelings, but don’t look at a lot of what is distributed.

Population-Type Focus Groups Summary

Demographics

In what ways to do you feel the philanthropic field has become more diverse and inclusive over the last five years?
- LGBT: Progress in the talk, but not the outcomes.
- Native American: Increase in the number of trained Native Americans who are ready for roles in philanthropy, and some hiring -- but need more, faster.
- African American: Lack of progress. African Americans are not in decision-making roles (staff/board/CEO) and the numbers have not increased over the years.
- Asian: Little progress. Same faces. (Other segments felt improvements had occurred for this segment.)
- General feelings:
  - Depends on the field -- social justice foundations are more likely to hire diverse staff.
  - Also depends on who had the seat before: If a person of color had the role previously, it may be viewed as the people of color slot. So it may be easier to get it, but that also means other roles are not considered “open” to people of color.
  - More diverse boards would create more diverse staff
  - More diverse boards and staff would translate to more diverse funding.

In what areas do you feel the philanthropic field still needs significant progress related to diversity and inclusion?
- Staff and board diversity
- CEO diversity
- Targeted outreach to diverse communities when positions come open
- Shifting the definition of diversity within philanthropy to include factors other than race.
- Increase in funding to “our” organizations (each segment)
- Mainstream foundations need to be more willing to actually learn about the communities they fund. Actually understand the differences in how the communities operate, lead and execute their programs so that funding can be applied uniquely to get the best outcomes.
- Being more comfortable using explicit language to describe the population we’re discussing: Don’t say people of color if you only mean one race – e.g., African American or Hmong -- say that specific race.
- Foundations need to engage the voice of people who reflect the segments they are targeting with their funding. If you don’t have a representative staff, engage others. If you do, but not at the decision-making level, be sure you engage those front-line staff who have insight to offer.
- Foundations still need help balancing targeted diversity funding – e.g., funding an organization because they specifically serve a specific race/gender/age/sexual orientation – and inclusive funding that is issue-based – e.g., funding homeless youth initiatives, but being willing to fund an LGBT organization within that sphere because a large percentage of homeless youth are LGBT and those organizations are in a unique position to meet their needs.
- True inclusivity: Who defines it? How? An organization might feel it’s diverse and inclusive because of the organizations it funds, but if the board is still uncomfortable discussing some issues (e.g., gay marriage, disparities, racism, sexism) or addressing these issues internally, it’s hard to put faith in the organization’s funding commitment alone.
What can the field do to attract more diverse (racially, generationally, sexual orientation, gender, etc.) staff and trustees?

- Set goals by population type
- Put the goals and expectations in the by-laws for board and staff diversity
- Create a culture with more than “one” of any segment, so it’s more supportive and welcoming.
- Foundation leaders should stop seeing people of color/LGBT staff as only right for roles that involve their segment or a particular program type. Today, if a foundation changes its program priorities, the people of color are likely the first to go, as opposed to seeing their skills as transferrable and valuable to other parts of the organization.
- Address the perception that the field does not want diverse people
- Identify and support pipelines for getting people of color into leadership roles within foundations; value skills in non-traditional packages/resumes
- More opportunities for people of color to build allies with philanthropic leaders so that diversity is viewed as an imperative for everyone and not only people of color
- Internships, fellowships and other opportunities to expose young professionals to career paths in philanthropy
- A convening for CEOs to discuss the real challenges that prevent them from diversifying their staffs and developing solutions.
- Ongoing meetings among diverse groups (by segment) to not only discuss the challenges and develop support strategies, but to develop solutions and ways to challenge the status quo.
- CEOs and board chairs must first become aware that there is a problem. Many don’t discuss/address it now because they’ve convinced themselves it isn’t a big problem, so it’s not a regular topic of conversation internally or within the CEO networks.
- Diverse donors (women/ people of color/GLBT) should rally their dollars together and direct foundations (community/United Way) to directly allocate those dollars in certain ways, and direct the foundations to diversify their boards and staff in order to effectively serve those communities. Because they’re in the “inner” circle of donors they will be heard more than staff and other constituents.
- Value a “PhD in community” as much as an academic PhD or high-wealth individual when searching for new trustees.

What can the field do to retain and advance a more diverse staff and trustees?

- Develop a critical mass of diverse individuals so they’re not isolated;
- Prepare for diversity; don’t hire someone for the added diversity and then expect them to leave that at the door. Consider what parts of the organization may not be welcoming to that individual’s differences.
- Recognize the pressure and challenges people of color face when they are the only one representing the organization within their own community and provide supports for this. Balance between high engagement and independent thinking/decision making.
- Develop training programs for segments that are not advancing at the same rate as the majority.
- Create advancement opportunities; there aren’t many, but adding to a person’s responsibilities/scope can help with retention.
- Show value for the current diverse staff and trustees; find out what value looks like to them and develop practices to ensure that occurs.
- When diversity at senior levels increases, and people of color/LGBT individuals can connect with those who reflect their culture and can provide feedback, support and coaching to help them excel, retention will improve.
- Senior leaders should show they are willing to take a risk to drive diversity and inclusion efforts; builds trust and moves the organization forward without jeopardizing people of color.
- Diversify all roles in the field and drive inclusiveness at all levels; program roles are becoming more diverse and executive roles are becoming more diverse from an LGBT perspective. Support/operations roles like finance, marketing, etc. are not as diverse. Also, the organization must drive the board to be as inclusive as the staff is trying to be. Individuals shouldn’t have to be “in the closet” or quiet about diversity issues when they’re with the board.
- We need more balance between being okay with a person being hired who is different (race/sexual orientation/gender) and being okay with that person challenging/voicing ideals about their race/sexual orientation/gender.
Address white privilege and the issues that it allows leaders to ignore on a day-to-day basis; create strategies that change this.

Find a balance between ensuring that you diversify and not having “quotas” -- can be achieved by ensuring that diverse hires know that their skills and qualifications are valued on a regular basis, giving them an opportunity to contribute to issues/programs of their culture as well as broader organizational initiatives.

Policies, Procedures & Practices

In your opinion, is your organization addressing diversity, inclusion or equity? Which do you feel the organization/field should be addressing?

- Agreement across segments that organizations are much more likely to address one or all of these disciplines only in grantmaking than to fully address it throughout the organization (demographics, policies, procedures, etc.)
- Organizations use the words diverse and inclusive to mean other things that people may not be comfortable with … e.g., saying “diverse kids” when we mean African American kids, or “diverse patients” when we mean LGBT patients, which hurts the work and efforts and turns people off.
- Organizations tend to be using all three words without clear definitions for practice.

Grantmaking: All three.
- Equity: For organizations who are specifically addressing a population through grantmaking: e.g., Native American, LGBT, etc.
- Diversity and Inclusion: By words in the mission of the grantee as commitment

Internally:
- Inclusion: Assessing the culture for things like communication style differences, work style differences, etc.
- Diversity and inclusion: Training and conversation
- Diversity and inclusion policies -- but no goals, measurement, training, etc.

Stronger focus on race than other segments if the organization is addressing any of the three.

If you were to give your organization an “A” in diversity and inclusion, what would that look like?

- There would be no need for a discussion; we’d be there already
- Intentionality and activeness toward putting the words in our policies into reality.
- Clear understanding of what we’re working toward -- an agreement that it’s important throughout the field/organization.
- The foundation would be evaluating all of the diversity criteria we’re asking our grantees to evaluate and creating plans and goals to address gaps.
- I would feel valued for my (race/gender/sexual orientation)
- The work would be strategic and integrated into the organization’s priorities.
- Annual goals, measurements and scorecards to show progress and challenges
- Beyond the numbers, actually having representative, diverse staffs that change the grantmaking and the community outcomes.
- Going outside of the organization for insight; even if you have a diverse staff, CEO or board, you still need outside, reflective input.
- I can be who I am and be proud of the organization I work for because they value that, let me bring my full self to the role and employ my talents, skills, experiences.
- Full alignment: Mission, staff diversity, board diversity, equitable funding, etc.
- Nonprofits from diverse communities would feel comfortable approaching our foundation in the way that majority-led organizations do. The judgment factor wouldn’t exist.
- Nonprofits led by people of color would not have to justify their funding needs in ways that other organizations do not.
- Foundations would recognize the need for all of their staff (not just program staff) to know how to communicate effectively across cultures.
- The foundation would recognize the differences in priorities for each culture and value them, versus trying to impose mainstream values/strategies on that community.
How are cultural differences valued in your organization? In the field?
  o They are not; often even the few people of color who are invited to serve on boards are marginalized; their voice isn’t heard on all issues.

Capacity Building

What type of training is needed to help organizational leaders further embrace diversity and inclusion as an organizational imperative?
  o Experiential learning: Leaders need to get in the community; attend events and interact with diverse communities frequently.
  o Education that moves beyond knowing the surface information about a community to understanding the differences that exist within that community.
  o Peer-to-peer learning: CEOs meeting with each other and sharing experiences. Hearing from CEOs in other places who have successfully addressed diversity and inclusion.
  o Education about bias; how bias shows up in the language we use. Specifically for trustees.
  o Education that explains why diversity and inclusion are an imperative; we talk about them and say they are, but are they really? Why?
  o MCF needs efforts that are about moving the needle and not just talking about the issues to convey that we’re serious about the efforts and not just responding/reacting to criticism (e.g., Greenlining Report)
  o Need efforts to get people to attend who won’t normally attend (do they need to be lied to about the topic to participate?)

What do you/your peers need to further advance within the field?
  o LGBT: Opportunities. The rest is on the individual.
  o Education about the complexities of the philanthropic field.
  o Network of peers to support and encourage.
  o Mentors
  o Acceptance, value, inclusion

In what ways do you feel the philanthropic field has achieved equitable funding as it relates to underserved and underperforming populations?
  o It hasn’t. More organizations have added funding programs/language around specific disparity issues, such as education, employment, homelessness, health, but are hesitant to address them by population.

How can grantmaking organizations strengthen their relationships with communities funded by their diversity and inclusion gifts and further their understanding of the needs of such communities?
Chief Executive Interviews

In addition to conducting focus groups, MCF conducted individual interviews with nine chief executives to identify areas of best practice and create profiles from which recommendations and suggestions for improvement could be gleaned. Please see Appendix B for the interview outline.

Summary of Interviews

What does it take to effectively lead a foundation or corporate giving program toward success in diversity and inclusion? Like the age-old question of whether a leader is born or made, many foundation leaders and employees alike have asked this question as they ponder ways to strengthen efforts, transform programs into strategic initiatives and fulfill the ideals established in the Minnesota Council on Foundation’s principles and practices.

In these candid interviews, leaders spoke about their personal experiences, convictions, challenges and successes in advancing diversity and inclusion within their organizations. Leaders answered questions from the MCF’s 2005 Working Towards Diversity III research and from “CEO's Who Get It: Diversity Leadership from the Heart and Soul,” a book written by Mary Frances Winters in partnership with Diversity Best Practices that profiled 20 global business titans who “get it.” The following interview summaries indicate that our philanthropy leaders “get it,” too, and have real advice for other leaders who’d like to follow in their footsteps.

WHAT DOES COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY REALLY MEAN TO YOU?

- Living and doing the work. You think about it all of the time. No matter where you go it's the number one thing you notice. You speak out about diversity and call organizations to task who haven't diversified or created an inclusive culture.
- Ensuring that your grantees are fully committed to diversity and inclusion in an honest way.
- Not being afraid to have the tough discussions.
- You have a mind that operates automatically. As an individual you're committed by thinking about diversity and inclusion all of the time.
- A committed leader has diversity and inclusion built into everything they do. You don't have to constantly ask “Am I being inclusive?” It's not an add-on; it's natural.
- You lead with your head, heart and soul and give it all to the work.
- Minimally on our tongue, radar and consciousness. It's spoken, written in documents, stated objective or goal and part of a strategy and work plan. If we haven’t achieved this minimally, there’s not a commitment, let alone awareness. It must have evidence.
- You're continuously learning. You have a willingness to admit mistakes and understand your own biases and how they may be blocking the work.
- There is organizational time committed to it. “If you want to know what’s important, look at your checkbook and calendar.” If the organization isn't committing time to the topic, there’s no commitment. By time I mean the foundation allocates time at board and staff meetings to keep learning. Examples are using the IDI, diversity and inclusion education, using a consultant to help guide the work, guest speakers on various topics, staff and board training on inclusiveness. Commitment means you dedicate the time and money to learn and take advantage of experts in the field.
First, education. Being open to education and learning about yourself and the importance of the issue of diversity. It’s understanding that commitment is not something you do and take care of in the first quarter and check it off. It’s a lifelong learning process to understand what it means, why it’s important and what value it brings to you personally, your organization and your community as a whole. Second it’s putting the learning into practice -- how you work toward achieving diversity and the value it brings in the real world. Then it can take many different shapes in the work of the organization, the make-up and operations of the board and staff, the grantmaking and the work that we do.

WHY IS DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION SO IMPORTANT TO YOUR ORGANIZATION?

A corporate foundation must find ways to make diversity and inclusion important in philanthropic work, even if it’s not a top priority for the company. We look at the diversity of employees from a global perspective and find ways to draw attention to the shifts in cross-cultural communication, cultural competency and relationship-building. This requires us to learn the cultural elements of every country we do business in, and find new ways of approaching philanthropy and volunteerism that meet the needs and styles of that country. The lessons learned can be used as examples for addressing traditional domestic diversity and inclusion issues and motivating leaders to support our commitment.

It starts as a value to the family and translates to a value of the organization. Our founders grew up in poverty and learned about the value of generosity very early; view it as your legacy to others. Because they faced anti-Semitism it hard wired the organization to address all types of discrimination and barriers in order to provide opportunities to people.

There is an incredibly rich pool of ideas and ways of being but it’s easy to get stuck in one pool instead of drawing from all pools, which means we disenfranchise those groups of people. When this happens, we lose as an entire community, leaving so much untapped potential by not leveraging different communities. This work is even more important to us as a mono-cultural family foundation.

We are better, stronger, smarter and more effective because of our feeble, but sincere, baby steps of progress in this area. As outlined in the book “Wisdom of Crowds,” with facts and documentation each individual in a group can identify a solution to a problem that won’t fully address it, but when each person’s solutions are combined toward group consensus, the group can identify the best solution. This premise is strengthened even further when the group is as broad and diverse as possible. In essence, none of us is as good as all of us.

Because we are a community foundation and our community is diverse and therefore we as an organization need to value diversity. But it’s not just that. It’s diversity that adds richness to our life. If everything was the same, it would be a boring world. Diversity enriches our lives and gives us new and different ways of looking at things and helps us reach better decisions and outcomes. We have to be open to hearing those perspectives, internally and externally within the community. You can look at new and different cultures as a negative, or you can reach out and try to understand the value add of those cultures that we might not see on the surface. It’s a terrible world to live in if we don’t take advantage of that richness.
WHAT IS A DIVERSITY-COMMITTED LEADER? WHAT ARE THE BEHAVIORS, ATTRIBUTES, AND COMPETENCIES?

- You use your strengths to move the agenda in everything you do.
- You build your competencies by attending trainings, conferences and classes that position you to have true depth behind your commitment.
- Examine your internal policies and practices and use assessment tools to identify strengths and weaknesses and make it relevant to your organization. Data is critical in helping you soundly evaluate the impact you're making and what changes you may need to make.
- Take the time to listen to and engage grantees and use their feedback to improve your work.
- Don't be afraid to name the issues. Once you name something you can advance solutions.

HOW DO YOU CREATE A CULTURE OF INCLUSION?

- Intentionality. In 2000 we had no women of color on the board. We chose to make the value of inclusion a strategic goal for the organization – to actualize it, operationalize it. It starts with a strong commitment of living the value and showing commitment of leadership to develop and sustain the work. The board members lead the way when they set the vision and goals for the organization. After five years of intentionality, the value of inclusion is now embedded into everything we do. It's a lens for our grant review. If an organization cannot illustrate how it values diversity and inclusion, it cannot receive funds from us. This prompted us to fund a program at the YWCA to help organizations who want to diversify but need help.
- You must be willing to remind people of the challenges of diversity, and the challenges of people in the minority. You seek opportunities to give those in the majority or power positions opportunities to be in the minority so that they can learn.
- Foundation boards need diversity of all types – experience, background, race, gender, socioeconomic status – to be stronger and more effective. But you don't get the full benefits with one person from any one segment if that person doesn't feel fully empowered to contribute and engage at all levels. Boards need a critical mass of any given population in order for folks in the minority to feel comfortable fully contributing and sharing with the board.
- People have to be able to bring their whole selves to work; it's the only way they can fully contribute.
- As a community foundation we can create a culture of inclusion in the community. We have two metrics for our work: the first is to grow long-term financial capital and the second is to grow social capital -- the connectedness of people in the community. There are two types of social capital: bonding social capital where like-minded people connect with each other, and bridging social capital, when people from different cultures connect and discover unknown commonalities, as well as differences that can enrich each others’ lives. Bridging social capital offers the most substantial value back to the community. Robert Putnam shows that with a focus on bridging social capital, the entire community is enriched. We believe that as a foundation we can create a healthier community by promoting bridging social capital in a variety of ways. We funded programs that addressed bridging social capital. In the past, our annual dinner had a Christian-based, yet broad, invocation. This time we had a Christian invocation and an imam from the local mosque offered an invocation and it was the first time this has been done at any community event in our region. We were a bit nervous, but we only received positive feedback.
HOW DO YOU GET BEYOND A COMPLIANCE FOCUS TO THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND MORAL IMPERATIVE?

- This is tough for companies, given our strong legal focus on compliance and because it’s so much easier to focus on compliance. I think you need indirect approaches: Use the grantmaking process to discuss opportunities and issues; talk about it at board meetings; talk about the impact of grants on the clients of the organizations you’re funding and connect it to the moral imperative and the greater good.
- We need to identify and nurture individual leadership with organizations. When you have a leader who truly values diversity and inclusion it can be easier to move forward. By rallying committed organizational and community leaders we can move beyond token population representation on boards and staff to see a significant paradigm shift, such that people see the problem, name it and take it on directly.
- If you start with the numbers focus, you must also acknowledge that with limited representation there is limited empowerment, and therefore limited engagement and return. So, the representation must be such that under-represented segments of people know that their voice is valued and needed.

WHAT CAN PHILANTHROPIC LEADERS WHO WANT TO STRENGTHEN THEIR COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION DO TO ACHIEVE SUCCESS?

- Seek a mentor to focus on diversity and inclusion. There is no text book. You have to expose yourself and be willing to learn from other executive directors and board chairs who are doing good work.
- When you see organizations doing good work, ask them about their strategy, and what it took to get to that level.
- Work inside and outside your company. For example, membership in MCF is extremely important and it helps hold our feet to the fire in all of the right ways. The MCF Principles also give you a tool to motivate your board as you show them that diversity and inclusion are truly facets of effective philanthropy and a commitment we’ve made to the field and the association.
- Continue your own education. Just because you’ve been to one diversity training, don’t stop learning. We have to be open to educating ourselves. Don’t be afraid of having difficult conversations about the topic. If you happen to be a white male in America, you can’t apologize for the entire race, and you can’t make that be a barrier to having difficult discussions.

HOW DO PHILANTHROPIC LEADERS MAINTAIN A SENSE OF HOPE AND OPTIMISM IN THE MIDST OF SUCH DAUNTING, SEEMINGLY INTRACTABLE CURRENT DATA ON THESE ISSUES?

- There's a sense of urgency as more and more children and families are being left behind, so it's a moment for us to ask ourselves if we're ready to innovate.
- It's such a privilege to do this work that we owe it to our constituencies to figure out how to address ongoing issues with the resources we have. We're not satisfied with what the future holds, so we must adjust our focus.
- Maintain hope. Keep the sense that things are changing -- that will keep you motivated. But, realize that things don't change quickly and we need a multi-generational approach.
- Philanthropists get to link resources with the vision of the world we want to live in. It is critical that the vision and value of inclusion is executed and operationalized. We have to be able to feel the hope that the vision is possible everyday -- the staff, board, and the organizations we work with.
Harness the energy of the available resources you have to focus your work, which means you have to look for impact in non-traditional ways.
Because of generations that are coming behind us. I think in my years of work and my own learning process, generationally this is where the change will happen in a positive way. I’m hopeful as I interact with the next generation they don’t have many of the same “isms” that my generation and previous generations had. The world is becoming a smaller place and because of that we are economically dependent on one another, and it’s therefore harder to build up walls and live within them. We still have the silo effect, e.g., news media sources collecting all data from one source.

TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE BASIC DNA OF PHILANTHROPY (e.g., ROOTS IN CHARITY, PERCEIVED POWERS OF DONORS, IMPLICIT DEPENDENCIES OF GRANTEES) IMPEDE FOUNDATIONS’ EFFORTS TO ADVANCE THE WORK OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY?

You start with the fact that it’s the right thing to do and then that it’s good for business. You build the case with a broad focus on making the community better. For example, if we narrow our focus on education to one school, we can see day-to-day changes with individual children and the school population as a whole, learn best practices and develop a model that builds engagement.
This is where we need to understand white power and privilege and US-centric thinking. The DNA of corporate philanthropy assumes that the problem is somewhere else. But you have to tie it in by speaking about strategic philanthropy and partnerships instead of charity, as the board defines philanthropy for itself. You must seek the best opportunities to make an impact with the resources you have and help board members see that as meaningful and important work.

FOUNDATIONS HAVE SPENT BILLIONS OF DOLLARS ADDRESSING ISSUES OF RACE, POVERTY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND EQUITY, YET THEY PERSIST. SHOULD FOUNDATIONS CONTINUE TO TRY? WHY? WHY NOT?

Of course. We can do no less. If we don't, this country will fall backwards toward the race riots of decades ago. We are still at that pivotal point where things could go wrong, given continued bias and discrimination. This doesn't help us from a global perspective or as a country.
Challenges of inclusion are a part of our daily lives. We hope that the next generation has the knowledge, tools and confidence to ask the tough questions and create solutions.
Our community continues to experience major disparities and systemic discrimination against people of color, people with disabilities and others. We all lose when we're not able to fully realize the gifts, talents and resources of everyone in our community.
Absolutely. The journey is far from over. Women's rights and civil rights are still somewhat nascent on our journey. We have impacted laws but we haven't arrived yet. It will take all of us sustaining the hope and vision and learning from each other and knowing that we WILL get there.
Yes! Because the issues still persist. No one said it would be easy -- the issues are generational in nature and deep-seeded. Never before have we had the opportunities we do today, given the shrinking world and economic interdependence. This shows us the need for working together and the opportunities to do so. The money that has been spent has been invested wisely, and gotten us to where we are today, but we're not there yet. We may never be exactly where we want to be, but as long as we’re making progress it’s positive, and we need to continue to invest. Also, our very future depends on it. If we look at history, it’s not too long ago that we fought a civil war. To me, that was the
epitome of walls being built up and people wanting to believe in and do their own thing. History is and will repeat itself if we don’t continue to move forward by acknowledging the value of diversity and working together. The United States is a wonderful experiment in democracy and in bringing people from all over the world to live together. If we let divisions, such as political divisions, continue to polarize us, there’s a real danger to our entire society. We can’t risk telling ourselves that we no longer need to address these issues.
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Appendix A: Working Toward Diversity & Inclusion: 2010 Survey

(see next page)
a community of grantmakers

**Working Toward Diversity & Inclusion: 2010 Survey**

Comments or questions? Contact Juliana Tillema at jtillema@mcf.org or 612.335.3559 or Wendy Wehr at wwwehr@mcf.org or 612.335.3597.

Please do not leave any question blank.

**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

1. **Name of your organization:** __________________________________________________

2. **How many paid staff members** does your foundation or corporate giving program currently employ (not including consultants)? If you are not sure, please estimate.
   
   Part Time ________
   
   Full Time ________

   Total ________

3. **Does your foundation or corporate giving program currently have a paid chief executive (e.g., CEO, president, executive director)?**
   
   o Yes
   
   o No  ➔ If no, and your organization has no paid employees, skip to question 13.

4. **In what year was your current chief executive named to that position?**
   
    _______________________________________

5. **Was your current chief executive a member of your foundation’s Board of Directors/Trustees at any time prior to being named as chief executive?**
   
   o Yes
   
   o No
   
   o Not sure/Unknown

6. **Which of the following best describes your current chief executive’s last place of employment?**
   
   o Your organization
   
   o Another foundation or corporate giving program
   
   o A nonprofit organization (not a foundation)
   
   o A for-profit organization
   
   o Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

7. **Is the chief executive of your foundation or corporate giving program:**
   
   o Male
   
   o Female
   
   o Transgender*
   
   o Other

   *Note: Transgender is an umbrella term for people whose gender identity, expression or behavior is different from those typically associated with their assigned sex at birth, including but not limited to transsexuals, cross-dressers, androgynous people, genderqueers, and gender non-conforming people. *(Funders for LGBTQ Issues)*
8. Does the chief executive of your foundation or corporate giving program identify as any of the following? Please check all that apply.
   - Asian or Asian American
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic/Latino/Latina
   - Native American or Alaska Native
   - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   - White/Non-Hispanic
   - Two or more races/multi-racial
   - Person with disabilities
   - Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer
   - Other racial group or ethnicity, please specify: ______________________________

9. Excluding the chief executive of your foundation or corporate giving program, how many of the other paid employees (part-time and full-time) who hold executive level positions (such as COO, CFO, vice president or higher) identify as the following?

   On the “total” line at the top, please provide the total number of employees in executive level positions, broken out by gender. Below the “total” line, also indicate the number of individuals identifying as a member of one or more of these groups.

   If you are not sure, please estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Latina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races/multi-racial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other racial group or ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you selected “Other racial group or ethnicity,” please specify: ______________________________

10. Of the program staff at your foundation or corporate giving program, not including consultants, how many identify as the following? (Include full-time and part-time paid program staff with responsibilities for grant review and recommendation.)

   On the “total” line at the top, please provide the total number of employees in program staff positions, broken out by gender. Below the “total” line, also indicate the number of individuals identifying as a member of one or more of these groups.

   If you are not sure, please estimate.
11. If you have **fund development staff** at your foundation (not including consultants), how many identify as the following? (Include full-time and part-time paid development staff with responsibilities for fundraising.)

On the “total” line at the top, please provide the total number of employees in fund development staff positions, broken out by gender. **Below** the “total” line, also indicate the number of individuals identifying as a member of one or more of these groups.

*If you are not sure, please estimate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Latina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races/multi-racial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other racial group or ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you selected “Other racial group or ethnicity,” please specify: ________________________________

12. **Of all other staff** at your foundation or corporate giving program who were not accounted for in your responses to the previous four questions, how many identify as the following? (Include full-time and part-time staff with responsibilities for administration, operations, technology, finance, communications, research, etc.)

On the “total” line at the top, please provide the total number of employees in all other staff positions, broken out by gender. **Below** the “total” line, also indicate the number of individuals identifying as a member of one or more of these groups.

*If you are not sure, please estimate.*
13. Does your foundation or giving program employ consultants to review and/or recommend grants?

- Yes
- No  Skip to Q 14

13a. How many of the consultants that your foundation or giving program currently employs identify as the following?

On the “total” line at the top, please provide the total number of consultants, broken out by gender. Below the “total” line, also indicate the number of individuals identifying as a member of one or more of these groups.

If you are not sure, please estimate.

14. How many members of your foundation’s or corporate giving program’s Board of Directors/Trustees identify as the following?

On the “total” line at the top, please provide the total number of Board of Directors/Trustees, broken out by gender. Below the “total” line, also indicate the number of individuals identifying as a member of one or more of these groups.
If you are not sure, please estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Latina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races/multi-racial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other racial group or ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you selected “Other racial group or ethnicity,” please specify: ________________________________

15. Is the Board Chair of your foundation or corporate giving program:
   - Male
   - Female
   - Transgender
   - Other

16. Does the Board Chair of your foundation or corporate giving program identify as any of the following? Please check all that apply.
   - Asian or Asian American
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic/Latino/Latina
   - Native American or Alaska Native
   - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   - White/Non-Hispanic
   - Two or more races/multi-racial
   - Person with disabilities
   - Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer
   - Other racial group or ethnicity, please specify: ________________________________

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

17. What is the length of the term that Board members serve at your foundation or giving program?
   - 1 year
   - 2 years
   - 3 years
   - 4 years
   - Other, please specify: ________________________________
18. For how many consecutive terms may your foundation’s or giving program’s Board members serve?

- 1 term
- 2 terms
- 3 terms
- 4 terms
- Other, please specify: ________________________________

19. Please share any additional information about your foundation’s or giving program’s procedures related to Board term length or limits:

20. Thinking of your board selection, staff hiring and contracting practices, does your organization have written policies or guidelines related to:

   a. Board diversity or inclusivity      Yes  No  Not sure
   b. Staff diversity or inclusivity      Yes  No  Not sure
   c. Executive staff diversity or inclusivity      Yes  No  Not sure
   d. Vendor diversity or inclusivity      Yes  No  Not sure

20a. Please select the characteristics that are included in your diversity or inclusivity policies. Please select all that apply.

- Race
- Color
- Religion
- Gender
- Age
- Disability
- National origin
- Marital status
- Sexual orientation
- Diverse social/political ideology
- Other, please specify: ________________________________

21. If you so choose, please expand on your answers to the above questions by sharing any additional information on your written or unwritten/informal policies or guidelines related to diversity or inclusivity:
22. In your organization’s mission statement or grantmaking guidelines, which of the following populations, if any, are specifically named as key constituencies that you aim to serve through your U.S. grantmaking? Please check all that apply.

Note: Although your grants may benefit all population groups, in this question, please indicate only the population groups that your grantmaking intentionally targets.

- Racial or ethnic minority populations in general
- Black or African American
- Hispanic/Latino/Latina
- Asian or Asian American
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Native American or Alaska Native
- Women or girls
- People with disabilities
- Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer
- Economically disadvantaged
- Youth or children
- Senior citizens/aging populations
- Immigrant communities
- Other “at risk” populations (i.e., homeless, etc.)
- No specific populations are mentioned
- Not sure
- Other, please specify: ________________________________

23. If you so choose, please expand on your answer(s) to the above question by sharing additional information on your mission statement or grantmaking guidelines, as they relate to specific population groups.

24. Thinking about your U.S. grantmaking, does your foundation or corporate giving program seek out and support nonprofit programs that specifically address diversity, inclusivity and equity issues.

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

25. If you so choose, please expand on your answer to the above question by providing context or background that would be important for us to know, information on specific diversity, inclusivity or equity programs that your foundation is developing or leading, etc.
Recently, there has been some public discussion about the amount of support foundations provide to nonprofit organizations led by historically underrepresented populations. Various research, advocacy and nonprofit organizations have different definitions of “led by” and some refer to these nonprofit organizations as “minority-led” or “constituent-led.” Questions 26 & 27 refer to your foundation’s or corporate giving program’s definition of “led by.”

26. When seeking to determine whether a nonprofit is minority-led or constituent-led, which of the following characteristics is most important to your foundation or corporate giving program? (Please select one.)
   o The nonprofit’s executive leader (or volunteer board leader for non-staffed organizations) is a member of a historically underrepresented group.
   o At least fifty percent of the nonprofit’s board members are members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o At least fifty percent of the nonprofit’s management staff are members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o At least fifty percent of the nonprofit’s staff members are members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o The mission statement of the nonprofit is to serve and empower members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o The nonprofit serves specific historically underrepresented groups.

27. If your foundation or corporate giving program takes other characteristics into account when determining whether an organization is minority-led or constituent-led, please identify those here. (Please select all that apply.)
   o The nonprofit’s executive leader (or volunteer board leader for non-staffed organizations) is a member of a historically underrepresented group.
   o At least fifty percent of the nonprofit’s board members are members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o At least fifty percent of the nonprofit’s management staff are members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o At least fifty percent of the nonprofit’s staff members are members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o The mission statement of the nonprofit is to serve and empower members of a historically underrepresented group.
   o The nonprofit serves specific historically underrepresented groups.

28. If you so choose, please expand upon your answers to Questions 26 & 27 by sharing additional information about how your organization defines “minority-led” or “constituent-led”.
29. Does your foundation or corporate giving program ever gather data from nonprofit *grant applicants* about the following topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic composition of the nonprofit’s board of directors/trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status of the nonprofit’s board of directors/trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation/gender identity of the nonprofit’s board of directors/trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender composition of the nonprofit’s board of directors/trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity of the nonprofit’s chief executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status of the nonprofit’s chief executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation/gender identity of the nonprofit’s chief executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of the nonprofit’s chief executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic composition of the nonprofit’s staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status of the nonprofit’s staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation/gender identity of the nonprofit’s staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender composition of the nonprofit’s staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic composition of population(s) served by the nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status of the population(s) served by the nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation/gender identity of the populations served by the nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender composition of populations served by the nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29a. If your foundation or corporate giving program collects demographic data from grant applicants about the composition of their boards or staff, or the population(s) they serve, does your organization use that information in grant decision-making?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Never
- Not sure

30. If your foundation or corporate giving program collects other demographic data from grant applicants, please specify that here:

CAPACITY BUILDING

The following questions focus on “capacity-building” support; that is, support aimed at helping recipient organizations improve their overall effectiveness or their ability to achieve their missions. Please answer to the best of your ability.

Questions 31-36 refer to your foundation’s or corporate giving program’s U.S. Grantmaking ONLY.

31. The following types of assistance are sometimes considered capacity-building activities. Within the past year, has your foundation or corporate giving program supported nonprofit organizations in any of the following areas, through grantmaking or non-grantmaking activities? Please check all that apply.

- Operating support
- Endowment building grants
- Consulting service grants
- Equipment/hardware grants
- Training or scholarship grants
- Low- or no-interest loans
- Sponsoring or hosting convenings
- Legal assistance
- Fiscal management
- Information technology support
- Strategic planning
- Other, please specify: ________________________________

- Marketing support
- Organizational development
- Organizational assessment
- Human resources management
- Leadership development
- Board development
- Fundraising or special events planning
- Program development and implementation
- Evaluation of programs or services

- Not sure
- Not Applicable/None Apply
32. Thinking further about the types of capacity-building support mentioned in the previous question, to what extent does your foundation’s or corporate giving program’s *grantmaking* focus on “capacity-building”?

- All of our grantmaking focuses on nonprofit capacity-building
- Most of our grantmaking focuses on nonprofit capacity-building
- Some of our grantmaking focuses on nonprofit capacity-building
- Very little of our grantmaking focuses on nonprofit capacity-building
- None of our grantmaking focuses on nonprofit capacity-building
- Not sure

33. Does your foundation or corporate giving program ever provide capacity-building support to nonprofit organizations *that is not in the form of grants* (such as technical assistance, training, low- or no-interest loans, etc.)?

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never
- Not sure

For the purposes of this question, please refer to all definitions of *minority-led* or *constituent-led* nonprofits that you selected in Questions 26 & 27.

34. Over the past five years, has your foundation or corporate giving program provided capacity-building support (either in the form of grants or non-grant support) to *any* nonprofit organizations led by the following population groups? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons who identify as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or queer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this question, please refer to all definitions of *minority-led* or *constituent-led* nonprofits that you selected in Questions 26 & 27.

Over the past five years, to about *how many* nonprofit organizations led by the following population groups has your foundation or corporate giving program provided capacity-building support? If you are not sure, please estimate.

34a. Persons of color: _____________

34b. Persons who identify as LGBTQ: _____________

34c. Persons with disabilities: _____________

34d. Women: _____________
35. Does your foundation or corporate giving program ever award grants or provide non-grant support for programs or initiatives *designed to build nonprofit leadership among any of the following population groups*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Over the past five years, to what extent has the issue of building nonprofit leadership in historically underrepresented communities been a topic of discussion at Board or staff meetings at your foundation?

- Frequent topic of discussion
- Occasional topic of discussion
- Infrequent topic of discussion
- Not a topic of discussion
- Not sure
- Not applicable

37. If you have any additional comments regarding any of the topics discussed in this survey (or related to the subject matter of this survey), please indicate those here:

38. May we contact you if we need to clarify a given answer or have any follow-up questions?

- Yes
- No

Please provide your name, phone number and email address:

Name:_____________________________________________________

Phone: _____________________________________________________

Email: _____________________________________________________
Appendix B: Focus Group and Interview Outlines

Purpose: MCF will add focus groups and interviews/site-visits to this year’s Diversity & Inclusivity Research Project in order to deepen our knowledge and understanding of the perspectives, challenges, processes, programs and success in the field. Information received during these focus groups and interviews may be used in future MCF programming and reporting in addition to the Working Toward Diversity and Inclusion 2010 Research Project.

Types of Focus Groups:

Grantmaker-Type Focus Groups: Senior Leaders & Trustees
- Family Foundation Focus Group
- Community Foundation Focus Group
- Independent Foundation Focus Group
- Corporate Foundation/Giving Program Focus Group

Population-Based Focus Groups (Recruited via Affinity Groups)
- Hispanic/ Latino Professionals
- LGBT Professionals
- Asian Professionals
- Native American Professionals
- Young Professionals
- African American Professionals

Time: 2 Hours
Size: 8-12 people

Participant Selection: Members will be invited to participate via MCF communication channels. Members will be targeted based on recommendations and survey feedback. We will offer online registration (managed by Annette) with a cut-off at 12 people for each session.

Format: Questions will be asked verbally. Focus groups will be recorded by audio recorded and comments will be transcribed. Participants will also receive numbered note cards for each question to provide additional information. (Note: will plan to contract out transcription services)

Theme Identification: Themes will be identified both during and after each focus group. During focus groups, the facilitator will summarize key pieces of feedback and ask for consensus on recurring comments. These will be noted on flip charts throughout the focus groups. Once focus group recordings are transcribed, we will electronically count repeated comments for theme identification. For reporting purposes we will then need to identify common and separate themes for each group. At this point, I am anticipating focusing more on the unique responses for each segment- but this could change based on actual feedback.

Follow-up: Individuals who offer compelling statements, examples, or testimonies may be asked separately if we can use their name with a quote. We will obtain written permission to do so.

Evaluation: Participants will be asked to evaluate the focus group experience in a Zoomerang survey, 24-48 hours post event.

Promotion:
- Targeted Emails: MCF will send targeted emails to MCON’s by organization type starting 6/28/10.
- E-News: MCF will promote all focus groups on 6/30, 7/14, 7/28
- Network/Affinity Group Promotion: MCF will ask the affinity groups and appropriate networks to promote the Population Based Focus Groups to their members starting on 7/1/10.
- Board/Committee’s: MCF will ask board and committee members to promote the focus groups and invite staff to attend starting 7/1/10.

GRANTMAKER-TYPE FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS:

Policies, Procedures & Practices
- What effort has your foundation/corporate giving program made to embrace inclusive practices that you believe worked well?
- What effort has your foundation/corporate giving program made to embrace inclusive practices that you believe did not work well?
- How does your foundation/corporate giving program determine the effectiveness of its diversity efforts? What measures or methods are being used?
- Do you have specific targets or benchmarks against which your diversity efforts are measured? If so, how did you select those targets or benchmarks?
- In your opinion, is your organization addressing diversity, inclusion or equity? Which do you feel the organization/field should be addressing?
- As part of its strategic plan, the Minnesota Council on Foundations adopted goals to create a climate of inclusivity in philanthropy and to recognize, eliminate and prevent racism in philanthropy. Do you believe the Minnesota grantmaking community has not done enough, has done about the right amount, or has done too much vis-à-vis diversity? What about your own organization?
- In your opinion, what other actions can grantmakers take to create and promote a climate of inclusivity in philanthropic practice?
- In your opinion, what other actions can the Minnesota Council on Foundations take to help grantmakers create and promote a climate of inclusivity in philanthropic practice?
- The Minnesota Council on Foundations Diversity Framework encourages grantmaking organizations to address diversity and inclusion in four roles: Funders, Employers, Economic Entities, Citizens of the Community: Which of these roles has your organization had the most success in? Why?
- Which of these roles has been most challenging for your organization/ the field? Why? What can be done to advance success in that role?

Capacity Building
- Does your organization play a leadership role in addressing community/civic issues related to diversity and inclusion? If so, what issues and what role do you play?
- Has your organization engaged in capacity building related to diversity and inclusion? If so, what populations does your organization target with this work?
- Who do you look to for best practices and successful models in addressing diversity and inclusion?

POPULATION-BASED FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Demographics
- In what ways do you feel the philanthropic field has become more diverse and inclusive over the last five years?
- In what areas do you feel the philanthropic field still needs significant progress related to diversity and inclusion?
- What can the field do to attract a more _____ diverse staff and trustees? (racially, generationally, sexual orientation, gender, etc.)
- What can the field do to retain and advance a more _____ diverse staff and trustees?

Policies, Procedures & Practices
- In your opinion, is your organization addressing diversity, inclusion or equity? Which do you feel the organization/field should be addressing?
- If you were to give your organization an “A” in diversity and inclusion, what would that look like?
How are cultural differences valued in your organization? In the field?

**Capacity Building**
- What type of training is needed to help organizational leader’s further embrace diversity and inclusion as an organizational imperative?
- What do you/ your peers need to further advance within the field?
- In what ways do you feel the philanthropic field has achieved equitable funding as it relates to underserved and underperforming populations?
- How can grantmaking organizations strengthen their relationships with communities funded by their diversity and inclusion gifts and further their understanding of the needs of such communities?

**CEO/ BOARD CHAIR INTERVIEWS**

Interviews with senior leaders with an exhibited or self-expressed passion for championing diversity and inclusion initiatives will be offered.

**Goal:** 8 interviews

**Time:** 1 hour per interview

**Potential Interviewees:** Identified as persons who either self-identify as diversity and inclusion champions or have been identified by others as such. Invitation only opportunity.

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**
- What does “commitment” to diversity really mean to you?
- What is your diversity story?
- (If applicable) When did you have your epiphany or “aha” moment? What was the situation? How did it change you?
- Why is diversity and inclusion so important to your organization?
- What is a “diversity committed leader?” What are the behaviors, attributes and competencies?
- How do you, as a leader create a culture of inclusion?
- How do you get beyond a compliance focus to the organizational and a moral imperative?
- How do you get all of your organization’s leaders to “get it”?
- What can philanthropic leaders who want to strengthen their commitment to diversity and inclusion do to achieve success?