

A NEW WAY FORWARD

Bringing an Equity Lens to the Work of Reducing
the Influence of Money in Our Democracy

PIPER FUND

a proteus fund initiative

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Piper Fund and its funding partners for their deep commitment and engagement in the money in politics and fair courts movement. We also extend gratitude to Piper Fund funding partners and national thought leaders who were generous with their time, insightful perspectives and collective wisdom to provide the opportunity to move the field forward. This final report was enhanced by Piper Fund Program Associate Sofia Jarrin-Thomas' deft project coordination and production skills, and the careful review and critique of Shireen Zaman, Proteus Fund's Security and Rights Collaborative director. Hollis Hope and Tammy Dowley-Blackman thank the Piper Fund for offering the opportunity to assist in the exploration of these issues and this important learning moment on its behalf.

All research and writing by Hollis Hope and Tammy Dowley-Blackman.

Production & management:

Piper Fund
15 Research Drive
Suite B
Amherst, MA 01002
www.proteusfund.org

Design & layout:

Sofia Jarrin-Thomas

© November 2015

Table of Contents

Foreword	3
Executive Summary	6
Introduction	10
Methodology	12
Clarification of Terms	14
The Frame: Money in Politics or Democracy?	15
Piper: The Power to Connect and Influence	19
Building Bridges by Accelerating Leaders	23
Don't Go Tell It on the Mountain—Listening for Authentic Collaboration	26
The Accountability Conundrum of an Unaccountable Sector	30
Participatory Democracy: Correcting the Power Imbalance Is a Tall Order	32
Recommendations for Future Piper Fund Action and Exploration	35
Conclusion	37
Appendix A: Piper Fund Interviewee List	39
Appendix B: Resources for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion; Leadership; and Movement Building	41

Piper Fund is a funder collaborative that strategically invests in leading edge efforts to address undue special and corporate interest influence on our political and judicial system. It is an initiative of the Proteus Fund, founded in 1997 to advance justice through human rights, democracy, and peace.

Foreword

On behalf of the Piper Fund, I'm excited to share with you "A New Way Forward: Bringing an Equity Lens to the Work of Reducing the Influence of Money in Our Democracy".

In April 2015, the Piper Fund held a two-day convening for our donor partners and allied funders. Our purpose was to take stock of the money in politics and fair courts fields, and of our roles as funders, to determine how we might best help build the fields to win reform. Piper believes that winning reform will require, among other things, building a much broader and more powerful movement—one that empowers the New American Majority—by addressing the systemic concerns of those constituencies, and one suffused with a diversity of leadership as spokespeople and strategists.

The convening intentionally opened with a session on how we as funders can better engage with communities of color—a theme that reverberated throughout the two days. Hearing from thought leaders including Ludovic Blain of Color of Democracy, Greg Moore of the NAACP, Montague Simmons of Organization for Black Struggle, Heather McGhee of Demos, and Saru Jayaraman of ROC United, the funders in the room accepted the challenge to consider rethinking our approach to grantmaking. Several themes arose in our discussions: the need to break down silos between money in politics, fair courts and other issues, including democracy issues; the need for communities of color to be at the table to develop strategies and priorities, rather than after these have been already set; the question of whether we as funders should respond to movement moments such as Black Lives Matter, and if so, how; and the need to build a sustainable infrastructure of grassroots organizations in low-income communities and communities of color.

As the event drew to a close, it was clear that we only had scratched the surface of this discussion and identified important questions to explore. Knowing that we needed to dig deeper to inform future discussions and decision-making, the Piper Fund engaged consultants Hollis Hope and Tammy Dowley-Blackman to conduct interviews with Piper Fund donor partners as well as thought leaders in philanthropy, organizing and movement building. This forward-looking report is the result of those remarkable conversations.

The April event was not Piper's first foray into this conversation. Back in 2010 at the time of the *Citizens United* decision, Piper and our donor partners made a decision to structure the fund's grantmaking around building a broader and more powerful movement that would be poised to win reform. Through a set of regional and national grants, the Piper Fund has supported, for example, the engagement of economic justice organizing networks around money in politics. In the area of fair courts, too, Piper has

looked to better understand the connection between judicial independence and issues such as voting rights and reproductive justice, funding research and toolkits to engage diverse groups in these areas.

And yet, we also recognize that there is much work to be done, and that the movement has failed overall to authentically engage communities of color. While it is well documented that the influence of wealthy interests on public policy disproportionately impacts communities of color, both the main spokespeople for the movement and those setting the strategies remain primarily white men. Increasingly, both funders and lead advocates are recognizing the need to bring new voices to the effort if we are to build an impactful movement. It was with this understanding that we structured our briefings and conversations in April. It was also with this understanding that our staff has taken the following steps, even as the research for this report was underway:

- We have begun to review our grantmaking, particularly at the state level, with an eye towards whether Piper’s grantees are led by and represent the New American Majority.
- We have begun to shift our grantmaking in several key states, providing grants to groups working in communities of color at the state and municipal levels.
- We have supported—both financially and through strategic partnership—the Inclusive Democracy Project at Demos, which is building a cohort of leaders of color in key states across the country, who will take action to win money in politics and other democracy reforms.
- In partnership with the Mertz Gilmore Foundation and the Funders’ Committee for Civic Participation Money in Politics Working Group, we are launching a project to map the money in politics and fair court sectors that aims to understand the current funding and advocacy ecosystem, identify emerging strategies for advancing reform, learn about opportunities for funders to align, and collaborate and assist new funders to identify opportunities that fit with their strategy and add value.

Our work is certainly not done. The Piper Fund held a meeting on October 8th to share an initial draft of this report and continue the conversation with our funding partners and close allies, and began a discussion of the recommendations in the report. In ongoing conversations and meetings in early 2016, we will dig deeper into these recommendations to determine how we can work together to support the development of a field that truly reflects our country’s demographics and that has the power to create meaningful change.

Finally, on behalf of my colleagues at the Piper Fund, I want to thank everyone who participated in this process. Our deep gratitude goes out to our funder partners who were interviewed—we greatly value your self-reflection, candor and readiness to engage in collaborative thinking and grantmaking as we work to build a stronger and more diverse movement. We would also like to express our appreciation to the thought leaders who so generously gave their time and shared unique and important perspectives to help inform our discussions moving forward. And finally, we'd like to thank Hollis and Tammy, who took on this project with integrity and intellectual rigor, and who have produced a document that we believe will embolden shifts in our grantmaking and within the field to shape an inclusive, representative, and successful movement to reclaim our democracy.

—Melissa Spatz, Program Director
Piper Fund

Executive Summary

This research report comes in the wake of the Piper Fund's April 2015 Grants Committee Meeting and Funder Briefings held April 29-30, 2015, at the Brennan Center for Justice in New York City. The meeting was intended to serve as a retrospective of accomplishments and lessons learned over the last five years, as well as an opportunity for participants to think together about what lies ahead for money in politics and fair courts reforms. The dialogue's overarching theme was how to broaden the movement to win. Specifically, participants were challenged to think about how to engage communities of color and build power in underrepresented communities.

A Moment for Deep Reflection

By all accounts, the meeting was perceived to be a watershed moment for the funding collaborative. The nature and intensity of the conversation signals a readiness and an exciting moment for the Piper Fund and its funding partners to reflect deeply on a number of key issues, including:

- What it means to “win” and where the money in politics and fair courts agenda fits against the landscape of broader democracy reform movements.
- Balancing the demands for short-term victories with the need for long-term capacity and infrastructure building, and the associated implications for resource allocation.
- The Piper Fund's role in:
 - » developing and incorporating a diversity, equity, and inclusion framework into the money in politics and fair courts theory of change; and
 - » building capacity and power in communities of color and among organizations led by people of color, women, and young people;
- Effective collaboration and the difference between transformational versus transactional relationships.
- Implications of participatory democracy and “movement moments” for money in politics and fair courts reforms.

Leading by Example

Both its funding partners and influential observers of the money in politics and fair courts field hold the Piper Fund in high regard as a leader. It is credited with laying a

solid foundation for thinking about how to move the field in relation to others. Examples of that work include:

- Partnering with economic justice advocates to connect the dots between money in politics and basic issues of economic fairness.
- The creation of the Collaborative Communications Initiative that provides nonprofits nationwide access to tools, trainings, and communications expertise.
- Support of state and local ballot initiatives.
- Early strategic support of the formation of the Democracy Initiative, which brings labor, environmental justice, and advocacy groups together around money in politics and voting rights issues.
- Support of coalitions to protect state courts from the undue influence of moneyed interests and to defend merit selection, judicial public financing, disclosure, and recusal reforms.

Piper is lauded for leading by example and is strongly urged to continue to showcase and “model” new approaches in grantmaking and what it takes to win. In fact, according to several of those interviewed for this research, leading by example may be the single most important role that Piper Fund staff and the Proteus board leadership can play. Its funding partners expressed gratitude and great faith in Piper’s leadership and other new allies are waiting in the wings to be consulted and engaged on issues of mutual interest.

A Call to Action

At the same time, there is a clear call to the Piper Fund to take action on the following areas:

- Shift how the work gets done. This point was expressed in different ways by different individuals but generally refers to the strategy driving the work: how the work gets defined and by whom; and how it is organized, funded, and executed.
- Support the rise of new leaders among communities of color, women, and young people.
- Engage different allies at multiple levels including: at the strategy development stage; mobilizing the ground game; and creating new opportunities to learn from peer changemakers engaged in other movements like economic justice, climate, human rights and health care.

- Increase transparency around funding recommendations, decisions, and resource allocation.
- Take risks and not be afraid to fail.

This research reveals that Piper funding partners and thought leaders note with dismay a profound and pervasive lack of accountability in the field of philanthropy. This perception affects some Piper funding partners' and thought leaders' views on the practicality of holding one another accountable to standards for diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Shifting Paradigms

At the same time, we heard a concern that the current strategies to reduce the influence of money in politics aren't working as well as they should be. To many, it is perceived as a self-reinforcing, perpetual cycle of funding the same "doers" who aren't succeeding as well as they could be. This analysis, rightly or wrongly, is driving the desire to examine and reconsider what constitutes "victory" and how we get there. There may be a need, according to some interviewees, to reevaluate current funding strategies and allocation of resources, with an eye toward potentially directing some funds toward different organizations than traditionally funded.

Many of the thought leaders with whom we spoke challenged the notion of viewing money in politics and fair courts as a singular issue rather than as part of a broader democracy reform agenda. This perspective was echoed by some funding partners who believe the strategy should be expanded and more inclusive in focus.

All recognize the sensitivity and challenges associated with shifting funding allocations away from some to give to others, but there is hope that a middle ground or balance can be found between being "stuck" and averse to changing the status quo, and turning everything upside down to fund and strengthen chronically under-resourced groups.

Curiosity and Collaboration Fuel Innovation

Piper funding partners are hungry for new ideas, inspiration, innovation, and wins. They feel as though they are on a journey with the Piper team. As a funding collaborative, Piper's funding partners are eager to dive in and improve their ability to have tough conversations that lead to breakthroughs for the movement. They believe they will be more effective at doing this work both individually and collaboratively in a way that is truly transformative—with each other as well as with existing and new allied organizations.

We hope the insights and emergent draft recommendations contained in this report might set a baseline, or a starting point, from which the Piper Fund, with its funding partners, can set the course for future action that can help to enhance its impact.

Introduction

We should be listening if we are concerned about the crisis of racism in America because acting on that concern must begin with consideration of our own racism.

—Scot Nakagawa, *Race Files*, August 13, 2015

In April 2015, the Piper Fund (Piper) convened a meeting of its Grants Committee and other allied funders in New York City. Established in 1997, Piper has pioneered philanthropic efforts to reduce the undue influence of special interests on the nation's political and judicial systems. The Piper Fund has grown tremendously in the wake of the 2010 *Citizens United* Supreme Court decision, from annual investments totaling \$1.1 million in 2010 to more than \$4 million in 2014. With 32 funding partners compared to 19 in 2010, it now engages the field in 17 states and supports both 501(c)3 and 501(c)4 nonprofits.

The April meeting was intended to provide a moment of reflection on the last five years' accomplishments and challenges related to four interrelated, priority strategies to:

- advance money in politics reform, including small donor public financing, in states and municipalities;
- build infrastructure, nationally and at the state level, to protect state courts from the undue influence of political money or special interests;
- build communications infrastructure for the movement; and
- broaden the movement by engaging new constituencies whose issues are impacted by money in politics.

Over the course of the April 29-30, two-day meeting, Piper led a dialogue geared to break down silos, better engage communities and leaders of color, and recalibrate its approach to building a stronger and more effective movement. After hearing from a diverse set of inspiring speakers, drawing examples from the challenges and outcomes of their work in specific states and localities or on particular issue areas, participants and speakers challenged one another to reflect on cultural bias and structural racism, and rethink their engagement with communities of color.

Meeting participants, both then and subsequently in interviews, have variously described the meeting as “energizing”, “engaging”, “agitating”, “groundbreaking”, “innovative”, “provocative” and as having “shifted the tone” in a way rarely experienced in funder gatherings. At the end of day two, the conversation concluded with a spirited discussion about how to capture all that had been learned and next steps for the collaborative. Many felt it was just the beginning of an important conversation, rather than the end.

As a follow-up to the meeting, Piper invited consultants Hollis Hope of Hope Strategies and Tammy Dowley-Blackman of tdb group to assist the staff in capturing the reflections and ideas of Piper colleagues and thought leaders in the field. Their insight was sought on cultural issues related to systemic bias and racism, in relation to the philanthropic investments that fuel the money in politics and fair courts movement. This has been an extraordinary and enriching opportunity to dig deeper into these issues and questions raised about **framing, collaboration, Piper Fund’s role, leadership development, accountability, and participatory democracy.**

These are not new issues to the field of philanthropy or the money in politics/fair courts funding community. Grappling with them today is no less challenging than it ever was. As noted by one of the key informants interviewed, applying a race and equity framework to the money in politics and fair courts agenda can help funders think about organizing and community engagement in very different ways, find common ground and be better allies. Additionally, Piper funding partners acknowledged that the depth and openness of the conversations that took place in April reflect an increasing level of *trust* and willingness to change among the participants around the table. Piper has reached a new point of readiness or a tipping point to begin this work—both with its existing funding partners and allies, and potential new ones.

Finally, we want to note that we asked every person interviewed to reflect upon and share their broad thinking about issues of race and equity. For some it was a conversation stopper; for others, it proved to open a floodgate for stories—real time and historic—as people described their experiences and thoughts on this important and timely topic. It was, in a sense, a leveling of the playing field and provided important context for us to hear all the different ways that people think about race in America today. Not surprisingly, interviewees offered a plethora of thoughtful insights—far too many, in fact, for us to summarize here in a useful way. But we would be remiss not to mention and thank our participants for their fascinating and frank perspectives on discrimination, power imbalances, and inequality in the United States of America.

We hope that the perspectives and resources shared in this report might help Piper and its funding partners realign their critical path forward, toward power-building for

Our brains like to be right. Our hearts strive to be good. The very experience of identity differences, however, can send these basic human impulses atwitter. Biased behavior often leads to discrimination. Anxiety – the fear that biases exist and may be revealed, or that someone else’s biases may invalidate our life experiences – leads to cognitive shutdown instead of conversation.

– Excerpt from the Perception Institute’s “Theory of Change”

communities and leaders of color, young people, LGBTQI populations, and women—while reducing the power and influence of special interests on our political and judicial systems for the long term.

Methodology

Hollis Hope attended the Piper meeting in her capacity as philanthropic advisor to a Piper funding partner. She collaborated with Tammy Dowley-Blackman, a consultant to the Proteus Fund who did not attend the meeting, to provide a balanced perspective and approach to the research design, implementation, and analysis. To gather a variety of perspectives, they interviewed a total of 40 key informants, engaging not only the Piper Fund’s “funding partners” but influential stakeholders (“thought leaders”) across the greater social justice philanthropy and grassroots organizing fields.

The research consisted of the following data collection activities:

- Review of the Piper Grants Committee (PGC) April 29-30 Meeting Synopsis.
- Interviews with 19 PGC funding partners and allies who attended the meeting.
- Interviews with 4 PGC funding partners who were not in attendance.
- Interviews with 17 thought leaders, including leaders of philanthropic affinity groups, foundations, grassroots organizations, coalitions, and think tanks (see Appendix A).
- Landscape scan to collect recent articles and literature concerning bias and structural racism in society; diversity and inclusion; leadership and movement building (see Appendix B).

All interviews were conducted between June and September 2015. For simplicity and the purposes of this report, two sets of interview respondents are referred to: “Piper funding partners” or “thought leaders” to distinguish the “internal” from “external” perspectives. Verbatim quotes appear in quotation marks or italics, but no direct attribution has been provided in order to preserve the confidentiality and anonymity of all respondents.

A tremendously rich and diverse set of data emerged from this endeavor and, in all honesty, it is challenging to do justice to the feedback received in a single report. We have attempted to capture each unique perspective, idea, and opinion in a balanced way.

The passion with which people engaged in these conversations and the broad spectrum of opinions shared reflect how deeply people care about these issues and their commitment to strengthening the Piper Fund collaborative.

In the sections that follow, we have done our best to synthesize, organize and highlight the most relevant findings, implications and emergent recommendations for further exploration and action by Piper and its funding partners. The findings are organized thematically around these topics: framing, collaboration, Piper Fund's role, leadership development, accountability, and participatory democracy.

Clarification of Terms

In the course of conducting this research, several key informants interviewed noted that language matters to developing shared bases of understanding. For instance, if you were to ask a group of 10 people to define the words diversity, equity, and inclusion you would likely get 10 different answers. Thus, for the purposes of this report and to ground ourselves and our readers, we have borrowed a series of definitions from the D5 Coalition—an organization whose mission it is to grow “diversity, equity, and inclusion in philanthropy”. We could have chosen definitions crafted from any number of people and organizations that may have included additional types of diversity. We believe the D5 Coalition’s lexicon holds the most relevance for our work.

Diversity: The word “diversity” can mean different things to different people. We’ve defined it broadly to encompass the demographic mix of a specific collection of people, taking into account elements of human difference but focusing particularly on:

- Racial and ethnic groups: Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, Hispanics/Latinos/Latinas, African Americans and blacks, and American Indians and Alaska Natives
- LGBT[QI] populations
- People with disabilities
- Women
- [Youth]¹

D5 uses this broad definition of diversity for three reasons. First, this is what diversity looks like in the 21st century. Second, our definition encompasses populations that historically have been—and remain—underrepresented in grantmaking and among practitioners in the field, and marginalized in the broader society. Third, to be a national leader, organized philanthropy must get in front of diversity, equity, and inclusion issues and do so in a comprehensive way. We acknowledge and respect that this is one of many ways to define diversity, a concept that can encompass many other human differences as well.

Equity: Improving equity is to promote justice, impartiality and fairness within the procedures, processes, and distribution of resources by institutions or systems. Tackling equity issues requires an understanding of the underlying or root causes of outcome disparities within our society.

Inclusion: Refers to the degree to which diverse individuals are able to participate fully in the decision-making processes within an organization or group. While a truly “inclusive” group is necessarily diverse, a “diverse” group may or may not be “inclusive.”

—D5 Coalition²

¹ The D5 definition of terms does not include youth; however, we add it here for the purposes of the Piper Fund since it includes youth as a priority constituency for money in politics and fair courts issues.

² <http://www.d5coalition.org/tools/dei/>

The Frame: Money in Politics or Democracy?

How do State Voices or other intermediaries fit in? Is the data infrastructure there? Who's doing the capacity building? The trainings on fundraising? Are there enough leadership development opportunities? All of those questions never get answered if we just focus on campaign-specific funding, but those pieces are kind of the secret sauce that allows for a complex ecosystem of advocates to work well together, to create synergies, and to be really effective in moving policy forward.

— Piper funding partner

In a moment of self-reflection that is particularly timely and poignant with the emergence of the Black Lives Matter movement and civil rights challenges of the last year, Piper convened its April Grants Committee meeting with multiple objectives, including to:

- Examine the role of funders in building and broadening a movement to win on money in politics and fair courts;
- Identify the most impactful strategies being employed by funders;
- Discover crucial missing pieces and how strategies might be honed; and
- Identify opportunities to coordinate and deepen efforts.

In diving deeper on these issues, interview respondents often voiced strong opinions about the perception of Piper Fund's *framing* of the money in politics and fair courts movement as a siloed or singular issue. Many thought leaders and Piper funding partners alike believe that the framing and narrative are limiting and need to change. Exactly what needs to change and how, however, varied widely among respondents: ranging from the relationship between money in politics/fair courts and the democracy reform movement more broadly (e.g., voting rights, redistricting, participatory democracy, criminal justice, and civil rights); to examining the Piper Fund and funding partners' vision for success and "winning"; to defining diversity as it applies to money in politics and fair courts.

Both at the meeting and in interviews, some wondered if the money in politics label serves the

One thing we know as organizers, you go where the energy is. You don't go scream from the mountaintop and hope people come to your position. And people are open to understanding the connection between money in politics if it is part of a much larger story about equal voice in our society. Right now the way money in politics is talked about it's as if it is some legislative reform effort as opposed to a fight about equal voice and participation. Having the same size microphones in our democracy as a billionaire, even if I'm the grandchild of a sharecropper – that's what is at stake.

— Thought leader

movement and suggested it might be called something else. Others questioned if money in politics is the right frame at all. “The issue is really about corporations and their power overreaching our lives,” said one thought leader. “But there are not the people at the table to raise those voices and tell those stories which would force political actors to see this is an issue they should care about. If it’s not connected to the most visceral issues of our time—mass incarceration, lobbying, and all those issues related to criminal justice and the economic issues in communities of color—if you are not raising the voices of those most impacted, you are not doing the work.”

We need a new narrative, a meta narrative that connects all of the troubles and challenges that we as a country face that relate to democracy. We have a lot of people who are incarcerated and when they come out can't participate in our democracy because of their felony convictions. We have young people in schools who would be active citizens but they get caught up in the school-to-prison pipeline. We have immigrants in the country who face all kinds of barriers because of their immigration status to being full members of our democracy. All of these pieces along with money in politics really are about expanding political opportunity.

— Thought leader

We heard questions at the meeting that were echoed in the interviews regarding how the money in politics movement is defined and whether people are excluded as a result of how it is talked about. Is it about campaign finance reform? Anti-corruption? Fixing a system that is broken or restoring faith in government? “What is the overall policy goal?” asked one Piper funding partner. “It’s hard to know what it is so I don’t know if I can actually call it a movement.” Another asked if a strategy’s goal is public campaign financing, does it resonate with communities of color and economic justice groups? If it is framed as a tool to build power for underrepresented groups, perhaps yes. Not so much, surmised another funding partner, if it is promoted as the end goal in and of itself since many people already feel disconnected and uninvited by a voting process and politicians that are not oriented to their needs and concerns.

Some funding partners urge Piper to adopt more of a “systems” and nuanced perspective as opposed to focusing on specific campaign or policy outcomes that rely heavily on just one or two organizations to accomplish the mission. “I just feel that’s an overly simplistic way of looking at how policy change happens,” noted one funding partner, adding that engaging at the state level with State

Voices tables and other organizing networks offer spaces to collaborate on broader issues related to democracy and underrepresented communities. Other thought leaders and funding partners encourage the Piper Fund to look to recent victories on health care, affordable housing, marriage equality, and climate change for movement building lessons.

Funding partners argued that there is a perception that the money in politics movement is elitist and belongs to a few well-established, well-funded national political advocacy

organizations. As a result, if Piper’s funding strategy is geared toward such groups, it risks excluding and even alienating potential allies. But one funding partner believes that state- and local-level networking holds the promise to develop the capacity and analysis to shift the field in new directions. As an example, in the fair courts community, he suggested it would be possible to create an agenda “which has a huge racial justice component to it, with regard to sentencing and how judges are more punitive the closer they get to reelection.”

Similarly, one thought leader believes the money in politics fight will only be won as part of a “big tent” democracy reform movement. “I think we will see a massive wave of young people taking on the mantle of the civil rights movement and the demand for true democracy in this moment. And we’re going to need our legal strategists and people who do ballot initiatives, funders, people who’ve been doing this work for a long time to be in relationship with the activists for when that moment comes.”

Others pointed out that the idea of “winning” in this work tends to be limited in focus to “campaigns”, and that this mentality drives the allocation of resources to victories in the short term at the expense of longer-term investments in power-building and infrastructure for local communities. One funding partner echoed a common theme when he expressed hope for “more intentionality to look for ongoing opportunities to start expanding the way people are thinking about this work and create more opportunities to start integrating alternative ways in which the work around money in politics can happen, is inclusive, and can win.”

Instead of thinking “campaign-by-campaign” and what victories can be achieved in the next two years, how might Piper strike a balance that both achieves some near-term goals while building “a healthy field” of democracy advocates for the long term? Interviewees feel strongly that both traditional reform groups as well as people-of-color-led organizations are all part of a broader community working on political reform that encompasses but extends beyond money in politics.

One thought leader believes that funders’ traditional evaluation metrics are an impediment to winning. He noted that if the funding community (both philanthropy, in general, and the money in politics and fair courts movement in particular) is going to fund organizations led by people of color, it may need to shift its view of what victory looks like and thus create new metrics for measuring success that are within reach of traditionally underrepresented communities.

Piper Fund is recognized as a leader among its peers in philanthropy at forging more authentic and inclusive relationships – and they encourage Piper to continue to seek and welcome new allies at all stages of strategy formation and execution.

Particularly with regard to civic engagement strategies, he noted, “If your metrics are, who has the most voter registration, or who can move the most policy or all of these various quantitative metrics that look for scale, the communities that have been historically underresourced are not going to be able to meet those metrics. Even as [funders] try and have a different outcome in terms of equity and winning, or... because our metrics are essentially sink or swim and don’t take into account historical disadvantages that we say we want to overcome, we end up funding the same organizations and actually making the problem worse. So we need different metrics of evaluation that help measure the success or performance of groups over time. [...] And I think having that kind of way of

thinking about both metrics and impact would open the door for more communities of color and young people to participate and plug in.”

That’s the challenge to this, the drumbeat of inclusion actually is too narrowly framed. [...] If philanthropy wants to have a conversation about inclusion, then maybe it ought to have that conversation with the people who are already influential in philanthropy. That’s maybe where the inclusion needs to start, at home. This notion of jumping over the peers to go and include the less fortunate is a kind of a liberal do-good mentality that may make people feel good, but it rarely does anything that’s really helpful. And it undermines and devalues the training, the talent, and the expertise of the potential influence of the people who could be peers.

— Thought leader

Funding partners and thought leaders alike cautioned us to think carefully about the objectives of “diversity” and “movement building”. Sometimes well-intentioned efforts on the part of social change funders and advocates to “diversify” or expand the base appear to be for diversity’s sake and thus generate cynicism. A point sounded repeatedly by funding partners and thought leaders, as it relates to social change philanthropy in general, not the money in politics and fair courts movement in particular, is that too often outreach to grassroots organizations has come so late in the game that it is perceived as, at best, opportunistic and, at worst, tokenistic. Early and meaningful engagement of the audiences most affected by the undue influence of moneyed and special interests will prevent unhealthy relationship dynamics that could thwart efforts to broaden the base and mobilize the masses.

Another thought leader reminded us that the terms *race* and *equity* are highly charged words because there is an “uneven competency and understanding” around them. Few people have had the opportunity to be in productive conversations around race and equity, she explained. “By productive, I mean that they actually lead to some action or set of activities that can move a community or institution forward.” Some funding partners shared their own discomfort in talking about these issues and questioned their own ability to “show up” and be effective allies when working with underrepresented communities. But it’s fair to say that although a level of discomfort was acknowledged by Piper funding partners, their unease pales in comparison to their drive to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion—both in their

own individual work as well as in the collaborative efforts in which they are engaged with Piper and others.

According to multiple thought leaders, those foundations that are intentionally uplifting the issues of race and equity in their work typically develop a shared language and point of view or a theory of change about racial equity. Articulating why racial equity matters and how it aligns with the mission of the foundation is viewed as an essential “building block” to applying a racial equity lens to the institution’s work.

These framing issues are critical and beg for resolution, particularly in light of the implications for collaboration, accountability, and defining success.

The trouble with frames is that they have a general preference about how you create cultural change and they never absorb their inequities about how society works.

— Thought leader

Piper: The Power to Connect and Influence

Piper can be a leader on how we reframe how we talk about money and politics.

—Piper funding partner

The Piper Fund, the staff, and the grantees it brings to the forefront are highly valued by the funding partners and thought leaders interviewed. The April Grants Committee Meeting signaled funding partners’ readiness to welcome increased representation of perspectives on money in politics. Piper has a history and credibility that enables it to stand humbly at the nexus of wide-ranging approaches, issues, and stakeholders. Many in philanthropy tend to work in silos as they respond to the pressure to remain strategically focused. Given Piper’s unique ability to convene such disparate allies and thinkers, its funding partners are asking, “Why aren’t we having a broader conversation when these issues are so connected?” Is there a different way to do this work that would allow for greater alignment across a multitude of overlapping issues (e.g. broader democracy reforms, climate, economic justice, etc.)?

Through its extensive due diligence process, Piper is able to educate and build buy-in that funding partners indicate would not be possible if they worked alone. Many voiced hope that Piper will continue to broaden the base of “who gets to be at the table, as a way to deepen the conversation and expand the possibilities for being effective.” Thought leaders were ready with suggestions of others who are doing brilliant thinking and creating evidence-based approaches and models, many of whom, they encouraged Piper to consider for collaboration and learning if they seek substantive change and

wins. The research team is providing Piper Fund staff with a list of individuals that interviewees recommend engaging as appropriate and needed.

Funding partners expressed overwhelming excitement about what is possible. Where trepidation existed, it focused on questions about the ability to garner additional fundraising support and Piper staff capacity given a relatively small team. The core interest was in the need to bring more individual and institutional allies to the table who believe in and are willing to commit financial resources to the money in politics and fair courts issues. In addition there is an awareness of the amazing work done by the Piper staff, but a concern they may already be stretched and/or pressured to remain committed to funding the more established organizations that are responsible for significant gains, but are clearly not as linked to leadership in communities of color.

The data from the 2014 elections tells us that when we talk about millennials and women that align with a progressive agenda, we are really talking about African American, Latino, and Asian American, and Pacific Islander voters. The challenge for all of us as donors and strategists is to figure out how to engage them so they can demonstrate power.

— Thought leader

Two specific areas related to Piper's role that received significant attention from those interviewed were collaborative leadership and education. It was in these areas that respondents explicitly highlighted Piper's influence and value, while also making specific requests for Piper to provide a greater level of education for continuous learning and improvement. Respondents believe this knowledge transfer will result in deeper commitment and better outcomes related to greater inclusion and overall agenda success.

Piper's collaborative leadership supports funding partners in their ability to execute both their internal and external strategy as well as implementation. Interviews indicate significant reliance on Piper to conduct extensive research and vetting of potential grantees that many individual and institutional donors would find difficult to conduct on their own. "The field work Piper does is important!"

A number of funding partners shared concerns that funder collaboratives have been labeled an outdated business model, particularly by larger national funders who have become more inclined to work solo on issues and have concerns about the high costs of maintaining group work. In spite of this worry, they urge Piper to continue to expand its efforts to bring more funders to the table, as they see great value in having Piper continue to enlarge the list of organizations and leaders that could provide additional ideas, expertise, and talent. Funding partners noted that the April 2015 meeting included more diverse voices and perspectives than had ever previously been present. Attendees unanimously cheered this on as both necessary and right. As one attendee reported, "having other voices gave an opportunity to see how this work plays out in other environments. Getting more people involved is something we must do. Very encouraging

to see the diversity of people who attend these meetings [...] it is dramatically improved even from three years ago.”

Education was discussed by funding partners and thought leaders as a tool for transformation. Just as Piper is looked to for collaborative leadership, it could also serve as a critical resource for the design and delivery of high-quality educational opportunities to support the learning of current and potential funding partners and grantees. Piper is positioned to expand the understanding of money in politics, and its broad and insidious impact on democracy, by helping funders, grantees, and potential organizational allies see its influence in unlikely places. This leads to greater potential for broadening the movement for the inclusion of equally important overlapping issues and their stakeholders. Piper has the credibility and the contacts and can help build the case for continuous and expanded learning, particularly for their funding partners.

In response to questions about prior anti-racism trainings, workshops, and other learning opportunities outside of the Piper Fund as well as their interest in participating in future educational opportunities, funding partners indicated a wide range of needs and possibilities, but indicated little interest in participating in traditional more formal diversity trainings. Many have done both mandatory and voluntary anti-bias trainings and prefer to avoid these types of workshops that often times leave participants feeling badly and misunderstood. “Even the most honest people are going to try to be conscious of hurting feelings. How to not have it devolve into a self-flagellation exercise. Also, regardless of class it is difficult to get people of color to see their privilege in a mixed room.” Instead, multiple funding partners suggested an implicit bias training as an effective tool for structuring more productive and useful conversations about race and equity. “Implicit bias touches most on the burgeoning movement and gets to the root cause of the harassment and killings we have seen. The racial narrative is a falsehood of white supremacy, people of color as the antagonist, the story of deficiency in communities of color.” By moving toward these more nuanced conversations, Piper can provide funding partners with the assistance they require to make the transition from diversity and inclusion to a deeper understanding of race and equity.

The interviews also suggest an interest in having Piper begin to look at the issue of money in politics through multiple lenses (e.g. gender) and to provide corresponding educational opportunities at Grants Committee meetings. Piper was asked to consider inviting other funders to meetings to share their work, process, and learning as a way of helping the Piper team and funding partners in their own efforts. Also, there was a request for assistance in helping funding partner program officers to create the case statements that will help them push back internally, for the purposes of continuing to build an understanding of collaboration and re-granting as a tool. “There is a role to play for funders who understand this more deeply and are committed to it more deeply.

Philanthropists can see themselves as much more than grantmakers/check writers and being more collaborative with one another and grantees.”

We also heard a request from a thought leader that attention be paid to building relationships and learning, targeted specifically to benefit trustees of funding partner institutions and grantee organizations. In many cases this group, the trustees, hold the

key to breaking through to the next level of learning, engagement, and support. Trustees taking more ownership of driving these conversations on the board is vitally important. “CEOs are important but overrated and inflated, while the importance of trustees is underappreciated and underrated.” Might the Piper Fund gain from convening a group of executive directors and trustees from nonprofits and philanthropic institutions (including its funding partners), that are closely aligned with Piper’s issues and approaches, to share thoughts about lessons learned and potential collaboration?

We heard from funding partners a recognition of how much they don’t know, especially about what is happening in and impacting communities of color. Ultimately, they want the Piper Fund to make a decision about the most effective framing of the work going forward. With confirmation of the strategy, other important deliberations about their role, potential strategies, grantmaking decisions and future collaboration are easier. “There are things happening on the ground that aren’t related to what the philanthropic community has been funding.” With more of a laser focus on collaborative leadership coupled with education the Piper Fund might show other funders how to go beyond what is currently being funded.

Thought leaders shared their approaches to trustee learning, with a story from the Hill-Snowdon Foundation being a stand-out. The foundation had been hearing about the incredible level of disparities in some of the southern states. To discover where the greatest needs existed trustees took a bus trip through the south to visit organizations affiliated with the statewide civil rights network. This trip changed their funding decisions based on their observations of the high level of disinvestment in the region coupled with the growing population and voting power of people of color. In addition, it led Hill-Snowdon to partner with other foundations to establish the Grantmakers for Southern Progress. This is a powerful example of trustee leadership emanating from education.

Building Bridges by Accelerating Leaders

The questions are, why is it so difficult to do this? How to go about making a serious effort to be inclusive? It is necessary because we aren't winning. If we want to win we must build our constituency in terms of support and leadership.

—Funding partner

The Piper Fund asked what it could do specifically to encourage and support new activists in joining the money in politics and fair courts movement, as well as how to be more intentional about investing in emerging and existing leadership development. Funders and thought leaders have both been hard at work on this front, though with mixed success, and had suggestions and lessons learned to offer the Piper Fund. What we found is an equal interest and commitment to uplift funder learning and pipeline development. It isn't a one-way street about what leaders on the ground could/should learn, but what is needed on both sides to finally move the needle toward a more inclusive movement that wins.

It was evident how strongly respondents felt about Piper playing a role in the support and development of leaders from all sides and at all levels. “We need hundreds of leaders,” one of them told us. Thought leaders offered examples of where they have seen some important investments. It is notable that many of their suggestions are specific to women, faith-based leaders and/or focused in the south, all of which have seen some level of transition and growth. The south is of particular importance as it has seen the fastest growing population of people of color. Approaches, examples, and potential models for Piper to consider for continued learning and leadership development include:

- Succession was cited as an important element of organizational leadership. “Not enough people are thinking about their legacy, not in terms of their work, but who they brought along and mentored.”
- Other existing groups were also noted as potential resources for Piper because of their strong leadership development and civic engagement examples: Auburn Seminary, American Friends Service Committee, Black Women’s Roundtable, Black Youth Project 100 (BYP100), Georgia Stand Up, South Carolina Association for Community, among others.
- Build relationships with local researchers in regions where Piper is doing/planning to work. This reliance on local research and data instead of national data would open the door to learning more about the local issues and leaders on the ground.

It would be interesting if funders recognized their position of power.

—Funding partner

- Create a Piper Fund supported series of gatherings for leaders designed to further build their leadership through trainings, provide opportunities for shared learning, and create access to funders and larger conversations. “Figure out how there might be an exchange... something that creates an opportunity for substantive change over the course of a year to have thoughtful conversations.”
- Create convenings that allow access to both funders and organizations/leaders that focus on coalescing people in a safe space and provide education and training for both. “Most folks fall into the panel model and that’s not necessarily the best way to go about it.”
- Also consider a convening for new funders interested in money in politics and fair courts issues, as well as those working on overlapping issues but have previously seen no connection between their work and Piper’s. “Would it be persuasive if Piper also had a non-convert group?”
- Prioritize long-term leadership investment (not just “one-off” approaches) and be sure to define and establish clear metrics for outcomes.
- Consider support of community organizing vs. advocacy; it helps to create and support a “built-in monitoring loop that if you have the right leaders who have helped to create policy changes, then they are on the ground trying to make sure it all comes together.”
- In addition, there was a willingness to share concerns about where leadership development isn’t enough and a call to Piper to push further. One interviewee cautioned against “going retro and simply counting the heads of diverse people.” Changing the complexion of people at the table has been proven repeatedly to be a limited and even insulting approach that does not make substantive and impactful change in the long term. Others challenged Piper to do something that at many turns has been difficult for philanthropy, to spend time listening to communities of color and meet people where they are, with no assumptions about their needs.
- A thought leader added: “This is an opportunity to lift up these organizations that are multi-issue, multi-constituent, and doing the work. Move to help organizations do deeper statewide work.”

You have to meet people on the issues they care about as well. You can’t just co-opt them for your own purposes.
 – Thought leader

Grassroots leaders have routinely been the least able to afford or offer leadership development. Those who are long-time organizers point to feeling pressure from funders to force their work and their leadership into a framework that fits the funder’s ideas of success, but that seemingly has little regard for the community’s proven approach.

“You are trying to build power in your community by meeting the immediate need with no luxury of working on single issues, particularly around civic engagement.” Funders must remember to allow communities the space to share their own best practices, which many times, by virtue of necessity, has meant working and responding at the intersection of multiple community issues that don’t fit neatly in the singular focus requested by the funder. There is value and effectiveness in the work on the ground that may not appear as one of the checked boxes presented by the funder.

Multiple funding partners interviewed mentioned the conservative right as an example of comprehensive and sustained leadership development and fundraising success. “I am always shocked at how the right does such a better job of investing in future leaders and training them. Trouble is we don’t have places to say our organization (our work) does that. This would call for a larger alliance beyond money in politics that would support the leadership of emerging leaders. It would be important to think about how to develop people [...] the next generation of leaders.”

Thinking about this generation of leaders and Piper’s expressed interest in broadening who sits at the table requires facing the concern cited by some funding partners that the organization remains insular, with most of its funding still going to the larger organizations run by white men. The Piper docket, though more diverse with the inclusion of some important national grantees, must be committed to using its leverage to share more and more diverse grantee possibilities to funding partners. “Historically the grantmaking has been pretty middle of the road—supporting the major players doing good work in the democracy field, but then the realization is that they were all run by white men.”

National organizations such as D5, the Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity (PRE), and the National Center for Responsive Philanthropy have worked to help philanthropic institutions be attentive to leadership and encourage that while individual leader support is important, it is equally critical to strengthen the entire organization and related networks for greater ongoing gains. There are funder examples, such as the work conducted by the Marguerite Casey Foundation and their strategy focused on emergent ideas in the context of strategic convenings. The motto of the work was “Ask, Listen, Act.” The strategy included engaging organizations about their needs and invested in bringing their teams together. In these mostly self-facilitated convenings, teams presented their work, participated in foundation-provided technical assistance opportunities, and shared key learning with one another. Over time, networks have expanded and deepened, and ten years later the foundation has found that many of these groups are organically coalescing around important catalytic issues.

Some foundations have decided to be more explicit about creating a level playing field and greater access. A number of them have embedded a race and equity lens throughout all of their work, while others have created diversity principles and policy statements that are used across the institution, including hiring, board recruitment, and procurement. “If you believe that diversity should have value then, how is that value recognized and expressed in the DNA of the organization?” Others have invested in providing mentoring, fellowship programs, and other opportunities to encourage new ideas, models of leadership and outcomes.

Don't Go Tell It on the Mountain—Listening for Authentic Collaboration

All the work we do is relationally built. Prioritizing time to be sure that relationships are built in an authentic way is really key.

—Thought leader

Effective collaboration was cited as one of the biggest challenges in the fight to reduce the influence of money in politics and on the courts. For some, collaboration is key to envisioning deeper representation and inclusion of racially diverse communities. Others argue that the framing significantly affects collaboration because it dictates who is at the table in the first place. “I think that funders who are talking about voting rights are not in the same room as the folks who are talking about money in politics,” said one thought leader, “and that’s a severe weakness. Because most innovation doesn’t come from genius, it comes from collaboration.”

When asked what funders can do to encourage broader participation in money in politics, several respondents were quick to declare, “funders don’t make movements, activists do” and that Piper needs to meet people where they are and understand how the interests of others relate to money in politics. By *listening to* and *joining with* the constituencies it wants to reach, it may also help Piper redefine what it means to “win”—a theme heard repeatedly.

Piper and its funding partners have a role to play by helping to connect the dots between the issues others care about and the role of money in politics. “Trying to nudge people of color-led organizations to take on money in politics feels a little hollow,” noted one funding partner. “We can help them to make some connections and then they need to follow their own path forward. If they see those connections, that’s great. Then we can support them. But if they are just chasing the dollars it is not going to lead to long-term, meaningful collaboration.”

Piper funding partners and thought leaders alike cited a history of “missed opportunities” within the money in politics and fair courts field when it comes to building a multi-racial, multi-generational movement. Several attribute this to the “campaign mentality” (mentioned above in framing) that is driving funding decisions and seems at odds with creating sustainable social change.

One funding partner noted that having a goal of long-term transformation requires a different mindset about how to make that happen and identifying the players leading and doing the work. Some funders are already directing capacity-building support to communities of color so they can engage in a more intentional and powerful way with other progressive forces, but the need is far greater than the pace at which investment patterns are shifting.

Consequently, many emerging people of color-led organizations and those that serve underrepresented communities are caught in a catch-22, under-resourced and underequipped, and therefore unable to secure the support necessary to help them build skills, expertise, and capacity. And yet, funders continue to be challenged to find ways to begin to move more money in this direction because they are looking for organizations that can work at scale and deliver results. Several interviewees suggest it is time to break this vicious cycle.

Other funding partners and thought leaders view these as excuses or “code” for an inability to look beyond the “monochromatic sphere”, or as a manifestation of a fundamental lack of trust in organizations led by people of color.

“It’s still sort of an underlying trust of white leadership for getting things done, even when the Black organizations you are talking to have a strong track record for getting things done,” noted one thought leader. The solution may lie in the funding community needing to revisit its vision and expectations of success and performance. It also needs to align its expectations with the state of the organizing field and be willing to experiment, take risks, and invest to close gaps.

A thought leader pointed to the Net Neutrality coalition as an example of a successful multi-faceted effort that achieved an important ruling by the FCC last February, to reclassify broadband as a utility under Title II of the Communications Act. “The work could’ve been owned by Silicon Valley types, wonky technocrats, the good-government, Green Party, anti-corporate people,” he said. Instead, a group of forward-thinking funders provided support for coordination and participation to ensure from the get-go that “there was a wide range of people at the table. Not trying to force an organization that doesn’t serve Black people suddenly to serve Black people, but funding Black people to work on the issue.” Doing the right work and the right outreach, he explains, will yield authentic leadership that is representative of the community. Without that, you’ll have relationships that “feel more artificial” and are unlikely to result in the policy outcomes desired.

Performance expectations can be tricky to manage and balance in the grantmaking world. They come from different places—boards of directors, trustees, staff leadership and program officers, and allied organizations. Metrics for success and evaluation, both their development and application relative to money in politics and fair courts grantmaking, are topics worthy of further exploration by the Piper Fund and its funding partners.

What would it look like to do the work differently? One Piper funding partner put it simply: “We could fund groups that are run by and serving folks who look different than we do. And we could think really differently about size and scale.” She cited a recent article by Vu Lee, author of the blog *Nonprofit with Balls*, which used *The Hunger Games* metaphor to describe a persistent funding dynamic where funders are inclined to support institutions because they are sustainable and because they have scale. Vu Lee writes, “Instead of holistically looking at problems and systems, society just funds those organizations we think will be strongest and most likely to survive. And since we fund these more ‘sustainable’ organizations, then of course these organizations are likelier to survive, while the smaller, ‘weaker’ organizations (often led by marginalized communities) are left to struggle.” A number of those interviewed agree with Lee and believe it’s time to end the nonprofit hunger games.

Piper’s support of Demos, Wellstone Action, ReThink, and the Democracy Initiative are viewed by funding partners as promising examples of strengthening the money in politics and fair courts movement through intentional capacity building, leadership development, and intersectional work. Funding partners noted that, in the case of Wellstone Action and ReThink, these were not isolated grants but large investments over multiple years that have made a substantial impact on field capacity. Several funding partners indicated they want to see more projects like these in the pipeline.

The Democracy Initiative and State Voices were also highlighted as critical allies for moving the money in politics work forward and connecting to other structural reformers. Thought leaders and funding partners encourage Piper to consider engaging more leaders and organizations that could provide knowledge about the intersectionality of issues, to strategize and build the base for this work. Organizations such as Race Forward, Color of Change, the Advancement Project, Center for Media Justice, the National Coalition on Black Civic Participation, Presente.org, and Black Lives Matter were identified as examples of potential advisors

who would have particular insight for these conversations. Figuring out how to support the field that exists is key, said one thought leader. “Create incentives to work with partners [...] together create some clear ideas of what success looks like so that people are not just shooting in the dark and there’s less potential for people to be disappointed.”

Another thought leader noted the emergence of new, dedicated funding streams in the wake of the police shootings of Black men. “The feedback that we’re getting from Black-led grassroots groups on the ground is that this is the first time that they’ve ever felt that they’re actually a priority,” she said. “There’s such a disconnect between grassroots groups on the ground, particularly in communities of color and newer immigrant communities, and funders and donors.” Her organization has thus prioritized relationship-building and network development to introduce funders to more groups on the ground, but she said until funders “literally shift the dollars”, the degree of social movement inclusion that many people want to see is unlikely to occur.

Sharing a realization reached by his own institution recently, a funding partner noted that the progressive movement in general is increasingly hampered by a “disequilibrium” between grassroots, often people of color-led or people of color-participating organizations, and the large national groups that represent the standard, inside-the-Beltway power bases.

“We need to pay attention to equity issues inside the money and politics reform movement because this work will not succeed until it moves away from being a collection of elites working on various issues to a true, organized, grassroots-supported movement that expresses the needs and desires of the people who are most affected by the adverse policies that money in politics has led to.”

This sentiment was widely shared by thought leaders and leads back to the question of who holds the power. If the corollary implication is that the white-led organizations will need to share or give up power, what is the role of funders in general and the Piper Fund in particular in effecting this shift?

The Moral Mondays Fusion Coalition in North Carolina was cited as a leading example of a successful state-level coalition. Fusion has worked across multiple issues and organizations for a decade to develop a larger narrative about what’s at stake. The Moral Mondays movement is deeply rooted in the state’s civil rights activism dating back to the early 1960s in Greensboro. One recent example of its impact was seen in civil rights leader Reverend Barber taking a stance against the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which would not have happened, according to one thought leader, but for the comprehensive narrative that was formed and embraced by that community. Organizers and advocates have worked tirelessly and intentionally to respond to a series of draconian measures including voter-suppression law, detrimental redistricting, and the elimination of judicial public financing. Reverend Barber shared his vision for an inclusive moral-based cross sector movement at the Piper Fund Grants Committee Meeting in January 2014.

The Accountability Conundrum of an Unaccountable Sector

If there's a group that is unaccountable, it is philanthropy. It's going to take a lot more than a training or an accountability scorecard.

—Piper funding partner

The question of funder accountability around issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion drew sharp reactions from funding partners and thought leaders, as they each reflected on philanthropy's inability to hold itself accountable as a field. We found a split between data "defenders" and "skeptics". The defenders make a compelling case for "putting a stake in the ground", needing to establish a baseline, knowing where you've been, where you are, and setting benchmarks for where you want to go. They say that transparency and a willingness to share data are essential to addressing the "power imbalance" that drives so many of our social ills.

Skeptics worry that the data may not be telling us what we want to know. Or they believe that performance metrics or "boxes to check" can create a false sense of security and the challenge becomes about "getting the performance numbers" rather than understanding where you are winning or losing and why. Add to that the complexity of coming up with a number to provide assurance of equity in the first place.

Still others eschew the idea of trying to establish or enforce accountability standards as being impractical across different organizations, with a myriad of constraints. Instead, they suggest that Piper should provide tools, awareness, and incentivizing mechanisms to encourage shifts and adoption of best practices among peers.

So what does Piper want to know? What is it that Piper wants to change or achieve by applying a diversity/inclusion/equity frame to the money in politics and fair courts work? Can it facilitate conversations to figure out what should be tracked and monitored and why, and find that middle ground between the defenders and the skeptics?

One thought leader advised funders to be more humble in their approach to addressing big problems and less concerned with "good outcomes", success, and their own brand reputation. "I think we've got to take more risks and recognize that if we want change it's not always about funding something that we think we can predict the outcome on. If we could get that stuff out of the way, I think in general foundations would be less siloed and more collaborative."

Funding partners and thought leaders emphasized the importance of clear goals, vision for success, and metrics to successful collaboration. "This general articulation of what we're for and what we're against is hardly ever sticky enough to be the glue and the connective tissue for a functioning, sustainable collaboration," said one.

Although thought leaders and Piper funding partners alike are quick to acknowledge that philanthropy fares poorly when it comes to accountability, and that it would be hard work to design and implement, many agree that adopting a framework with goals and measurements is worthwhile because of the potential to deepen the authenticity of commitment to shared values of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Several of the thought leaders we spoke to are in a position to help Piper put some building blocks in place to adopt an intentional focus on race and equity. Others are eager to be engaged as peers in thinking about what winning looks like—in the idea formation stages of thinking through building the base, authentic engagement with communities and organizations led by women, people of color, and young people. “We’ve got to start with a more diverse table before we pretend that the diversity and equity agenda is outside the room, when the diversity and equity challenge is within the room,” an oft repeated refrain was voiced by one thought leader.

“Success is a great lesson,” said one thought leader. “I am much more supportive of a coalition of the willing’s success than a haranguing of the unwilling pre-success.” He was not alone in acknowledging that change is hard and some funding partners suggested it may make sense to focus on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion with a smaller group who are already committed to making change in their own practices. Try some things on an experimental or “proof of concept” basis before trying to bring the whole group along.

Lamenting the lack of accountability in the field of philanthropy, one thought leader said, “It would be wonderful if there were markers of success in philanthropy that weren’t just for ‘attaboys’ and back-slapping but really designed to improve it, and where there was no real improvement, then to make necessary adjustments. That would be ideal and that would be more akin to what happens in the real world, and so I love the idea of bringing some kind of norms and accountability to what is, often times, the driver or the engine for social change which is philanthropy. It would make for a much better money in politics movement, it would make for better grants, it would make for better strategies. Not an easy thing to do.”

Citing the euphoria around recent Supreme Court decisions on marriage, housing and health care, one thought leader reminded us that each was the culmination of decades

You have to intentionally focus on race in order to address racial equity, and when we say intentionally focus we have to have data that helps us understand how we’re doing on this issue. The data, again, that we have access to nationally says, that there has been no change, no substantive change in the amount of grant dollars going to organizations that are focused on communities of color. Until that changes, then we’re not going to see more inclusive movements.

— Thought leader

of battle. “Here’s what’s uncomfortable about philanthropy... how linear this can be, how messy it all is. Philanthropy wants it to be fixable by data and easiness.”

Several thought leaders commented on the importance of board and executive leadership, and buy-in to creating change within institutions. One thought leader said diversity and inclusion start at home and that foundations need to recruit “a set of leaders who reflect the competence diversity can bring.” He believes the field of philanthropy’s best opportunity to change its practices is to include a broader representation of viewpoints at the stage where the ideas and strategy are formulated that inform decisions and policy.

Piper funding partners agree and some pointed to a disconnect between their own level of understanding around the need for a greater diversity, equity, and inclusion lens in their work and that of their boards. All acknowledge that change is hard and slow. Some shared stories of trying to make a case for change to peers and executive leadership by demonstrating the outcomes and lessons learned as a result of slight shifts in how resources are allocated. But the sense is that funding partners would welcome having more open conversations—both within their own institutions and among their Piper funder partner peers—particularly around racial, gender, and generational equity and the implications for their own grantmaking.

Participatory Democracy: Correcting the Power Imbalance Is a Tall Order

This is about power [...] the messiness of deep engagement.
—Thought leader

This country’s founding documents didn’t fully acknowledge the democracy and rights of all citizens, thus the idea of a power imbalance that has limited the ability of everyone to feel included, should be seen as an almost inevitable outcome. Over the last half century, laws were added primarily to mitigate the negative outcomes, but we still see our democracy fall short and the power imbalance remain intact.

In recent years, following international and domestic events and uprisings, our nation has witnessed renewed energy around issues that challenge and impact the concept of “democracy for all”—issues that have always been on the front burner for civil rights activists. “The current political conditions, uptick in social unrest and mass movement building, and developments in the grassroots organizing sector, call for a coordinated and sustained effort to occupy philanthropy.” One might assume this was written in the wake of protests and nation-wide mobilizations in response to the police’s lethal use of force—and the Black Lives Matters movement that subsequently emerged—but it was actually written in 2011 in the wake of Occupy. It was making the case for 21st

century grassroots organizing and presciently highlighted that it would increasingly be recognized as a priority approach for how impactful transformation could be created and sustained.¹

Interestingly, the idea of shifting shared and more inclusive power was discussed many times at the April meeting, thus it logically surfaced during the course of funder interviews. What may be a bit of a surprise is how forcefully it came up in the thought leaders' interviews, none of whom attended the meeting or had shared ideas with attendees. As on-the-ground doers and thinkers, these leaders came to their own important conclusions, many of which aligned with Saru Jayaraman, co-founder and co-director of the Restaurant Opportunities Center United (ROC-United), and the ideas she presented on the topic of participatory democracy at the Piper Fund April Grants Committee Meeting.² Given their daily work on multiple issues and with a variety of stakeholders and constituents, we learned how they witness first-hand how power is assumed, held, and rarely shared. "Now is an opportunity to act critically by funding small grassroots organizations and collaboratives that bring people together to strategize around the best course of action," said a thought leader.

A point of caution is that we don't abandon the important ongoing work for the new shiny work. Excited about Black Lives Matter and the frame of how people are organizing around the country, but it shouldn't be seen as disconnected from work that has been going on for two or three decades. Sometimes the way philanthropy approaches things can erode the base.

— Thought leader

What might sharing of power look like? What might it look like to support substantial grassroots organizing to move reforms forward and increase participation? Many Piper funding partners are excited about moving toward larger conversations. A funding partner wondered if moving toward a consensus agenda would allow more time for bigger and more challenging conversations than during the biannual Grants Committee meetings. How can Piper sustain this discussion about diversity, equity, and inclusion beyond the April meeting was a main concern. Attendees don't want to lose the momentum and are counting on the Piper team to help them be accountable to their expressed commitment. There was a shared understanding and concern that part of the challenge will be how to balance the Piper work as currently defined, with a review of possible new frames, while also considering how to respond to important quick sector shifts. There will always be new issues arising that are important for a group like the Piper Fund to take on, but seasoned thought leaders and funding partners alike supported careful consideration of rapid response to movement moments.

¹ Jee Kim, *Occupy Philanthropy: The case for 21st century grassroots organizing*, 2011.

² Saru Jayaraman, "Redefining 'democracy' in communities of color: a new effort", presented at the Piper Fund Grants Committee & Funder Briefings, Thursday, April 30, 2015.

Funding partners and thought leaders understand the intricacies of supporting movement building. The philanthropic sector saw important examples of individual and institutional donors who jumped in to provide resources to the Black Lives Matter movement as it began emerging. Funders for Justice, a loose collaboration under the auspices of Neighborhood Funders Group, is working with individual donors, funding collaboratives and foundations to track financial and other types of support being given to grassroots organizations that are working with, and on behalf of, the Black Lives Matter movement.

One thought leader was adamant that philanthropy has not only the opportunity to respond but an *obligation* to respond to such moments in order to prepare for the next one and avoid the “Groundhog Day” effect. Plus, thought leaders and funding partners alike noted the amplifying potential of these moments; that they can transform the conversation by illuminating the issue or challenge that is the focus of Piper’s work, and thus advance toward meaningful solutions.

Piper’s strength is its ability “to go deep” and many funding partners see it and use it as tool for learning. It is difficult to predict where future movements might happen and Piper “knows better than most that you can’t just drop into a community.” Some suggested that the best way to support movement building may be through the expanded deployment of current resources. For example, Piper communications collaborative led by ReThink Media could support the work of Funders for Justice and the grassroots organizations. Similarly, a funding partner voiced the idea of ReThink engaging with funders to analyze the incidents in Ferguson and Baltimore through a democracy lens and develop messaging for funders—in anticipation of future such incidents? She noted that there’s a benefit to funders and advocates responding in unison and reinforcing messages about unacceptable behavior like that seen in the unlawful acts of police brutality over the past year.

There was wide agreement that the Piper Fund should continue to support both electoral and participatory democracy in the myriad ways it has done so to date, but also reminders to keep a careful eye out for how the work is evolving and growing. Some suggested that if Piper wanted to think about rapid response grantmaking specific to movement moments, it should look to other philanthropic entities such as the Global Fund for Women, Neighborhood Funders Group, North Star Fund, Resource Generation, or Third Wave Fund for lessons learned. These institutions are perceived to have done an excellent job at providing immediate operating support. It may be that Piper simply needs to collaborate to develop new work rather than moving away from its core mission, which also includes general operating and rapid response to specific money in politics and fair courts issues. Funding Partners don’t have an expectation that Piper has to be everything and do everything.

“There is a recognition that solving questions of money in politics is one of the keys to having a participatory democracy for everyone.” The request to the money in politics movement is to open the space to include other issues under the larger democracy umbrella; to reach beyond electoral democracy to also include participatory democracy as a promising and actionable strategy.

Recommendations for Future Piper Fund Action and Exploration

There's no such thing as failure, it's just a lesson. The story about why it didn't work is really the nugget, the investment.

—Thought leader

These recommendations emerged from the interviews and synthesis of viewpoints and are intended for the Piper Fund's exploration and consideration with all funding partners and allies. In other words, they are a starting point for further discussion of action items that may flow from the discussion that began at the April 2015 Piper Fund Grants Committee Meeting and Funder Briefings. Suggestions include areas where Piper has already begun work, for example, a mapping project as well as intentional efforts to incorporate a racial, gender and generational lens to its work.

Recommendation: Conduct a comprehensive field analysis and create mapping that focuses on strategy approaches for each of the priorities; providing insight into who are the grantees; how much they are receiving in funding; from which funders; and identifying strategic opportunities and gaps in collaboration and funding.

Recommendation: Further discussion on the need to expand the frame.

- There is a desire to reflect on the idea of what it takes to “win” in the money in politics/fair courts space. Resolve questions related to framing the issue:
 - » how might Piper strike a balance that both achieves some near-term goals while building “a healthy field” of democracy advocates for the long term—both traditional reform groups as well as people of color-led organizations—to be part of a broader community working on political reform that encompasses but extends beyond money in politics?
 - » what aligned metrics for “success” are appropriate to the communities where there is a need and desire to build power, as well as for the institutions funding them? Ensure that the expectations and metrics are reasonable and useful for both grantor and grantee.
- Some funding partners would like to move beyond the singular (“narrow”, “limiting”) frame of money in politics.

- Revisit frame of money and politics and fair courts as one movement; and ensure that funding partners are all in agreement with Piper Fund as to how these two issues:
 - » are interwoven as “one movement”; and
 - » relate to broader democracy reforms, including redistricting and voting rights.
- Consider the implications of any revisions to the frame on metrics, success, and winning.

Recommendation: Develop a theory of change around diversity, equity, and inclusion that would explain why it matters and how it aligns with Piper’s mission.

- Look at the work through multiple lenses:
 - » communities of color/racial justice lens;
 - » gender lens; and
 - » youth lens/millennial involvement not fully integrated, particularly from communities of color.
- Do some listening. Look outside the philanthropic sector to see who is doing both funded and unfunded work.
- Pay attention to growing regions with increasing people of color population, youth/millennial populations (e.g., southern and western regions of the country).
- Create a shared lexicon to ensure aligned conversations, particularly as allies expand.

Recommendation: Develop a three-tiered engagement strategy to infuse the movement with new ideas.

- Engage at field level with new (non-traditional) allies and organizers, including offering site visit opportunities to deepen learning for funding partners and their trustees.
- Invite leaders from other sectors and from other areas in philanthropy to engage with Piper.
- Offer opportunities for current funding partners to network with prospective allies from different sectors to break down silos and increase collaboration:
 - » increase general operating support, which would allow for leadership development, capacity building, and building power and support at the local level; and

- » engage people and organizations that have won for lesson learning.

Recommendation: Create opportunities to educate and cultivate relationships among leadership peers.

- Host periodic convenings of funding partner board members and Proteus board members, and include other leaders from philanthropy and other sectors

Recommendation: Consider the value of local research for grounding purposes.

- Explore potential for collaborations with local researchers.
- Host focus groups with grassroots advocates, civic leaders and funders in cities and states Piper has targeted to work in, to spur collaboration, test messaging and language, identify new organizational allies, opportunities, and champions, well in advance of launching campaigns.

Conclusion

Timing is right and there is enough greater will [...] People are sick of having money have an undue influence on them
—Thought leader

The Piper Fund is both in an enviable and challenging position. It is privileged to have a broad range of funding partners who are willing to invest in the success of these large issues facing our democracy, and who trust the team to do the best job possible to make this happen. From this research it is abundantly clear that Piper is recognized for its outstanding, cutting-edge work by leaders from around the country who would welcome the opportunity to assist if asked. The Piper Fund has helped bring some successes to the money in politics and fair courts fight and has the willingness of funding partners to continue to investigate new approaches. Most importantly, what is enviable about the Piper Fund and its funding partners is the shared commitment to declaring its intent to move toward a deeper conversation and action on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Ludovic Blain in his opening remarks at the April 2015 meeting challenged the funding partners by asking, “Why are we still having to figure out how to have multiracial movements?” His words weren’t for judgment or disdain, but rather a call to action that asked if people were really able to transcend their assumptions and identities in the interest of the greater good.

Complexity is at the heart of most matters and for the Piper Fund some of what presents as enviable also lies at the center of its challenges. It is about trying to find the right mix of key elements of the current issue framing, while considering the possible reorienting/

broadening of it; balancing the needs and interests of current funding partners with those that may differ from the new perspectives, invited in as part of the effort to expand and be more inclusive; and trying to keep the business model relevant and always at the ready for new learning and new opportunities. These are big next steps for the Piper Fund.

Going into this research and analysis the Piper Fund team sought to find information, lessons, understanding, and suggestions of new approaches. This project easily could have morphed into a larger project over a longer time period to allow for interviews of many more thought leaders, a closer examination and vetting of movement building approaches and strategies, and writing of a major paper/analysis for the sector. In the end all projects, regardless of the issues/themes in which they are focused, are limited by scope and time.

“Being aware of the issues and problems is great, but definitely apparent from the room [at the April Grants Committee meeting] is that we are at a time when we can’t *not* talk about these issues.”

The Piper team did not expect conversations to be easy. They expected to be challenged, they expected to learn, and they expected to hear fresh ideas. They expected to have a ready list of new potential allies and they expected to have a set of recommendations that provided further exploration. We hope this paper provides the wealth of shared learning the Piper team aspired to capture and that it may serve as its research and development (R&D) roadmap. Partners and thought leaders alike have confirmed strengths in Piper’s mission and the collaborative model, while also pointing favorably to the potential for significant opportunities for reframing, collaboration and growth.

Appendix A: Piper Fund Interviewee List

Sarah Abelow, Overbrook Foundation
Cristobal Alex, Latino Victory Fund
Adam Ambrogi, Democracy Fund
Susan Batten Taylor, Association of Black Foundation Executives
Jay Beckner, Mertz Gilmore Foundation
Ludovic Blain, Color of Democracy
Allison Brown, Open Society Foundations
Kelly Brown, D5 Coalition
LaTosha Brown, Grantmakers for Southern Progress
George Cheung, Joyce Foundation
Nat Chioke Williams, Hill-Snowdon Foundation
Cynthia Choi, Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy
Alan Davis, Why Not Initiative
Keesha Gaskins, Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Angela Glover Blackwell, PolicyLink
Stephen Foster, Overbrook Foundation
Samantha Franklin, Johnson Family Foundation
Saru Jayaraman, Restaurant Opportunities Center United
Hildy Karp
Sarah Knight, Open Society Foundations
Julie Kohler, Democracy Alliance
Carmen Lopez, Thornburg Foundation
Nancy Meyer
Eddy Morales, Latino Engagement Fund at the Democracy Alliance
Jodeen Olguin-Taylor, Demos
Allan Oliver, Thornburg Foundation
Kathy Partridge, Voqal Fund
Dan Petegorsky, National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy
Ilona Prucha
Guillermo Quinteros, Solidago Foundation
Dennis Quirin, Neighborhood Funders Group
Rashad Robinson, Color of Change
Charles Rodgers, New Community Fund
Robert Ross, California Endowment
Alex Russell, FCCP Money in Politics Working Group

Rachel Sagan, Fine Fund
Ralph Smith, Annie E. Casey Foundation
Jennifer Sokolove, Compton Foundation
Katherine Storch, Democracy Alliance
Austin Thompson, Youth Engagement Fund, Democracy Alliance

Appendix B: Resources for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion; Leadership; and Movement Building

The organizational and published resources listed below surfaced in interviews and through our landscape scan. This list is not intended to be exhaustive or an endorsement of any kind, but simply a list of organizations with resources and expertise that can potentially add value to the work of the Piper Fund and its funding partners. The list is in alphabetical order. Links are embedded in the text for easy online reference.

ORGANIZATIONS

America Healing

These organizations range from grassroots to academic institutions to national advocacy organizations, and are working within the field of racial equity and on a variety of issues and topics. This link is to a racial equity in movement building resource guide. <http://www.racialequityresourceguide.org>

American Friends Service Committee

Shan Cretin, General Secretary

The American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) is a Quaker organization that promotes lasting peace with justice, as a practical expression of faith in action. Drawing on continuing spiritual insights and working with people of many backgrounds, it nurtures the seeds of change and respect for human life that transform social relations and systems.

<http://afsc.org>

Auburn Theological Seminary

Rev. Katherine Rhodes Henderson, President

Auburn Theological Seminary is an institute for religious leadership that faces the challenges of our fragmented, complex, and violent time. Auburn envisions religion as a catalyst and resource for a new world—one in which difference is celebrated, abundance is shared, and people are hopeful, working for a future that is better than today. It works to equip bold and resilient leaders—religious and secular, women and men, adults and teens—with the tools and resources they need for our complex, multifaith world. It provides them with education, research, support, and media savvy, so that they can bridge religious divides, build community, pursue justice, and heal the world.

<http://www.auburnseminary.org>

Access Strategies

Alexie Torres-Fleming, Executive Director

Access Strategies is a progressive funder of small nonprofits and network-building organizations in Massachusetts. Its mission is to support the collective power of underserved

communities to engage the democratic process to improve the lives of individuals and society.
<http://www.accessstrategies.org>

Bay Area Justice Funders Network

Dana Kawaoka-Chen, Network Director

The Bay Area Justice Funders Network (BAJFN) is an alliance of funders working to advance a justice agenda and strengthen grantmaking for social justice movements in the Bay Area and beyond. The Network seeks to build relationships among foundations and facilitate authentic partnerships with community based justice organizations in order to help coordinate transformational strategies and solutions. BAJFN is hosting a field-wide conversation through its [What is a Justice Funder?](http://www.justicefunders.org) blog.
<http://www.justicefunders.org>

Black Youth Project 100

Charlene A. Carruthers, National Director

Black Youth Project 100 (BYP 100) is an activist member-based organization of Black 18-35 year olds, dedicated to creating justice and freedom for all Black people. It does this through building a collective focused on transformative leadership development, direct action organizing, advocacy and education.
<http://byp100.org>

Center for Community Change

Deepak Bhargava, Executive Director

The Center's mission is to build the power and capacity of low-income people, especially low-income people of color, to change their communities and public policies for the better. Its objective is to empower the people most affected by injustice to lead movements to improve the policies that affect their lives. Center for Community Change's focus areas include: jobs and wages, immigration, retirement security, affordable housing, racial justice and barriers to employment for formerly incarcerated individuals.
<http://www.communitychange.org>

Center for Effective Philanthropy

Phil Buchanan, Executive Director

The Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) is focused on the development of data and insight to enable higher-performing funders. CEP's mission is to provide data and create insight so philanthropic funders can better define, assess, and improve their effectiveness—and, as a result, their intended impact. This mission is based on a vision of a world in which pressing social needs are more effectively addressed. It stems from a belief that improved effectiveness of philanthropic funders can have a profoundly positive impact on nonprofit organizations and the people and communities they serve. CEP's resources for funders include a [blog](http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org) and [research reports](http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org).
<http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org>

Center for Evaluation Innovation

Julia Coffman, Director

The Center for Evaluation Innovation's (CEI) mission is to push philanthropic and nonprofit evaluation practice in new directions and into new arenas by focusing on areas that are especially challenging to assess. CEI's current focus is on advocacy and policy, systems change and strategic learning—all relevant to tackling deeply rooted and complex social problems. CEI offers an extensive online, searchable [resource database](http://www.evaluationinnovation.org).
<http://www.evaluationinnovation.org>

Center for Social Inclusion

Glenn Harris, President

Established in 2002, the Center for Social Inclusion works to identify and support policy strategies to transform structural inequity and exclusion into structural fairness and inclusion. It works with community groups and national organizations to develop policy ideas, foster effective leadership, and develop communications tools for an opportunity-rich world in which we all will thrive no matter our race or ethnicity.
<http://www.centerforsocialinclusion.org>

ChangeLab

Soya Jung, Senior Partner; Scot Nakagawa, Senior Partner

ChangeLab is a grassroots political lab that explores how U.S. demographic change is affecting racial justice politics, with a strategic focus on Asian American identity. Through research and cross-sector convening, ChangeLab seeks to revitalize a contemporary Asian American politics grounded in multiracial solidarity. ChangeLab also provides communications platforms to highlight the damage that racial ideas about Asian Americans have done to the broader racial justice movement—by reinforcing anti-Black racism, justifying U.S. empire, and marginalizing Asian American struggles. ChangeLab's blog is [RaceFiles](http://www.changelabinfo.com).
<http://www.changelabinfo.com>

Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard Law School

Charles J. Ogletree, Jr., Founding & Executive Director

CHHIRJ serves as a bridge between scholarship, law, policy and practice to devise and implement research-based solutions and remedies to promote equal access to the opportunities, responsibilities and privileges of a multi-racial society.
<http://www.charleshamiltonhouston.org>

D5 Coalition

Kelly Brown, Executive Director

D5 is a five-year coalition to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in philanthropy. It offers an online library of tools and resources specific to advancing DEI in philanthropy.
<http://www.d5coalition.org>

Georgia STAND-UP

Deborah Scott, Executive Director

Georgia STAND-UP, a Think & Act Tank for Working Communities, is an alliance of leaders representing community, faith, academic, and labor organizations that organizes and educates communities about issues related to economic development.

<http://www.georgiastandup.org>

GrantCraft

GrantCraft has published [two publications](#) for grantmaking for racial equity, developed in partnership with the Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity.

<http://www.grantcraft.org>

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations

Kathleen Enright, President and CEO

GEO is a diverse community of 500 grantmakers working to reshape the way philanthropy operates. Understanding that grantmakers are successful only to the extent that their grantees achieve meaningful results, GEO promotes strategies and practices that contribute to grantee success. GEO offers an extensive online [resource library](#) on a wide range of issues including stakeholder engagement, capacity building, and philanthropy's role in movement building.

<http://www.geofunders.org>

The Greenlining Institute

Orson Aguilar, President

Founded in 1993, The Greenlining Institute is a policy, research, organizing, and leadership institute working for racial and economic justice. It works on a variety of major policy issues, from the economy to environmental policy, civic engagement and many others, because it recognizes that economic opportunity doesn't operate in a vacuum. It doesn't see these issues as being in separate silos, but as interconnected threads in a web of opportunity. The Greenlining Institute has an extensive online resource library, including a series of publications on [Democratizing Philanthropy](#) that feature data on different dimensions of diversity and a *Racial Equity Toolkit*.

<http://greenlining.org>

Industrial Areas Foundation

Ernesto Cortés, Jr., National Director

The Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) is a network established in 1940 by Saul Alinsky, Roman Catholic Bishop Bernard James Sheil and businessman and *Chicago Sun-Times* founder, Marshall Field III. IAF's work flows directly from a commitment to Judeo Christian and democratic values. IAF develops organizational relationships that grow the voices of families and communities that have little power over decisions that impact their own lives. The measure of success is the extent to which IAF organizations contribute to human flourishing in communities where human development is often devalued and human dignity trampled. These successes, when they occur, take the form of imaginative responses to seemingly intractable

problems, new relationships overcoming racial, religious and socio-economic divisions and immediate, concrete victories that change communities for the better and inspire hope in the future. IAF invests heavily in the identification, training and connecting of leaders whose capacities and skills may be further developed with careful mentoring and challenge. <http://www.industrialareasfoundation.org>

The National Coalition on Black Civic Participation-Black Women's Roundtable

Melanie L. Campbell, Convener, Black Women's Roundtable

Black Women's Roundtable (BWR) seeks to bring together women representing diverse views and interests within the Black community around the theme of women's advancement with a particular focus on motivating Black women to engage in all levels of civil society. Through public policy forums, leadership training, and civic engagement and issue education campaigns, BWR provides women with a voice and the skills training to use the political process to improve the quality of life for themselves and their communities. <http://ncbcp.org>

The Peoples' Institute for Survival and Beyond

The People's Institute for Survival and Beyond focuses on understanding what racism is, where it comes from, how it functions, why it persists, and how it can be undone. Their workshops utilize a systemic approach that emphasizes learning from history, developing leadership, maintaining accountability to communities, creating networks, undoing internalized racial oppression and understanding the role of organizational gate keeping as a mechanism for perpetuating racism.

<http://www.pisab.org>

Perception Institute

Alexis McGill Johnson, Executive Director

Perception Institute is a consortium of researchers, advocates, and strategists that uses cutting-edge mind science research to reduce discrimination and other harms linked to race, gender, and other identity differences. Working in areas where bias has the most profound impact—education, health care, law enforcement and civil justice, and the workplace—they design interventions, evaluations, communications strategies, and trainings. Turning research into remedies, Perception Institute crafts real-world solutions for everyday relationships. Its blog, [Perception 20/20](#), offers a curated conversation about the ways in which we view each other and ourselves, and how we perceive and experience difference across groups, with a particular focus on the way we see Black men and boys. <http://perception.org>

Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity

Lori Villarosa, Executive Director

The goal of the Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity (PRE) is to increase the amount and effectiveness of resources aimed at combating institutional and structural racism in communities

through capacity building, education, and convening of grantmakers and grantseekers.
<http://www.racialequity.org>

PICO National Network

Scott Reed, Executive Director

PICO is a national faith-based community organizing network. PICO's path to building a more just world involves teaching people of faith how to build and exercise their own power to address the root causes of the problems they face. In PICO, this struggle for justice is rooted in faith. At the center of PICO's model of faith-based community organizing is a belief in the potential for transformation—of people, institutions, and our larger culture. This belief stems directly from PICO's rootedness in faith communities, and radiates throughout the organization, influencing the way PICO relates to public officials, to community members, and to one another.
<http://www.piconetwork.org>

Poverty and Race Research Action Council

Philip Tegeler, President/Executive Director

The Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC) is a civil rights policy organization convened by major civil rights, civil liberties, and anti-poverty groups founded in 1989-90. PRRAC's primary mission is to help connect advocates with social scientists working on race and poverty issues, and to promote a research-based advocacy strategy on structural inequality issues. PRRAC sponsors social science research, provides technical assistance, and convenes advocates and researchers around particular race and poverty issues. PRRAC also supports public education efforts, including the bimonthly publication *Poverty & Race*, and the award-winning civil rights history curriculum guide [Putting the Movement Back into Civil Rights Teaching](#), co-published with Teaching for Change.
<http://www.prrac.org>

Race Forward

Rinku Sen, Executive Director and Publisher of *ColorLines*

Race Forward advances racial justice through research, media and practice. Founded in 1981, Race Forward brings systemic analysis and an innovative approach to complex race issues to help people take effective action toward racial equity. Race Forward publishes the daily news site [Colorlines](#) and presents Facing Race, the country's largest multiracial conference on racial justice.

<https://www.raceforward.org>

Resource Generation

Jessie Spector, Executive Director

Resource Generation organizes young people with wealth and class privilege in the U.S. to become transformative leaders working towards the equitable distribution of wealth, land and power.

<http://resourcegeneration.org>

South Carolina Association for Community Economic Development

Bernie Mazyck, President and CEO

SCACED is a state-wide trade association of nonprofits, community development corporations, community development financial institutions, local governments, financial institutions, corporations and other entities working within the state's economically distressed communities. SCACED places particular emphasis on promoting development in communities that have been left out of the economic mainstream, especially minority communities.

<http://www.communitydevelopmentsc.org>

Social Transformation Project

Jodie Tonita & Robert Gass, Co-founders (also co-founder of Rockwood Leadership Institute)

The Social Transformation Project supports and strategizes with prominent senior leaders, consultants, and intermediaries to increase the power and impact of the progressive movement.

<http://stproject.org>

Women's Equality Center

Margarida Jorge, National Director

The Women's Equality Center is a campaign hub that partners with local, state and national organizations on issue advocacy and civic engagement campaigns that promote freedom, fairness and opportunity for women.

<http://www.womensequalitycenter.org>

PUBLICATIONS

As noted above, many of the organizations listed feature a vast array of online publications and resources. We do not list them again here, but instead highlight a few articles, papers and blogs that we believe are key and exemplary of new developments or seminal pieces from the last decade on the state of diversity, equity and inclusion as relates to philanthropy.

Articles, Papers, and Conversations

Austin, Algernon, and Lawrence T. McGill. "Proceedings from the First Annual Researcher/Practitioner Forum: 'The State of Research on Diversity in Philanthropy'." Council on Foundations, ARNOVA, and Foundation Center. 2008. <http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/diversity.pdf>

Bryan, Brielle, comp. "Diversity in Philanthropy. A Comprehensive Bibliography of Resources Related to Diversity Within the Philanthropic and Nonprofit Sectors." Foundation Center. 2008. http://foundationcenter.org/getstarted/topical/diversity_in_phil.pdf

Chioke Williams, Nat. "A Decade after Katrina, Can Philanthropy Make Black Lives Matter?" *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. August 27, 2015. <https://philanthropy.com/article/Opinion-A-Decade-After/232659>

D5 Coalition. "Analysis of Policies, Practices, and Programs for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion." Fall 2013. <http://www.d5coalition.org/work/policies-practices-and-programs-for-advancing-diversity-equity-and-inclusion/>

Daniels, Alex. "Foundations Take Broad Approach to Reducing Racial Inequalities." *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. May 7, 2015. <https://philanthropy.com/article/Foundations-Take-Broad/229979>

Dean-Coffey, Jara, Nicole Farkouh, and Amy Reisch. "Dimensions of change: A Model for Community Change Efforts." *Foundation Review* 4 (2012): 42. <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1021&context=tfr>

Democracy Alliance. "Field Notes from the Progressive Future: A Listening Project of the Youth Engagement Fund." 2015. (Available upon request.)

Dugan, Máire A. "Power Inequities." *Beyond Intractability*. The Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado. February 2004. <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/power-inequities>

GrantCraft. "Grantmaking with a Racial Equity Lens." A guide developed in partnership with the Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity. 2007. <http://www.grantcraft.org/guides/grantmaking-with-a-racial-equity-lens>

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations. "Learning Together: Actionable Approaches for Grantmakers." June 17, 2015. <http://www.geofunders.org/resource-library/all/record/a066000000JxeRoAAJ>

Hawk, Crystal Echo. "Implicit Bias and its Role in Philanthropy and Grantmaking". *Responsive Philanthropy*. Spring 2015. http://ncrp.org/files/rp-articles/RP_Spring15-powell.pdf

Hill-Snowdon Foundation. "Making Black Lives Matter Initiative". 2015. <http://hillsnowdon.org/grantmaking/making-black-lives-matter-initiative/>

McClain, Dani. "How the Moral Monday's 'Fusion Coalition' is Taking Back North Carolina". *The Nation*. July 2, 2014. <http://www.thenation.com/article/how-moral-mondays-fusion-coalition-taking-north-carolina-back/>

National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. “Cultivating Nonprofit Leadership: A (Missed?) Philanthropic Opportunity.” March 2015. <http://ncrp.org/paib/smashing-silos-in-philanthropy/cultivating-nonprofit-leadership>

National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. “Smashing Silos in Philanthropy: Multi-Issue Advocacy and Organizing for Real Results.” 2013. <http://ncrp.org/paib/smashing-silos-in-philanthropy/multi-issue-advocacy-organizing>

Osborn, Maggie. “The Music of Philanthropy.” The Center for Effective Philanthropy. September 22, 2015. <http://www.effectivephilanthropy.org/the-music-of-philanthropy/>

Pastor, Manuel, Gihan Perera, and Madeline Wander. “Moments, Movements and Momentum: Engaging Voters, Scaling Power, Making Change.” Program for Environmental and Regional Equity, USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts & Sciences. April 2013. http://dornsife.usc.edu/assets/sites/242/docs/M3_web.pdf

Program for Environmental and Regional Equity and PolicyLink. *National Equity Atlas*. 2014. (A comprehensive data resource to track, measure, and make the case for inclusive growth.) <http://nationalequityatlas.org/>

White Jr, Thurman V., in cooperation with ABFE. “Who Manages the Money? How Foundations Should Help ‘Democratize Capital’. A Case Study of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.” Progress Investment Management Company and ABFE. September 2014. <http://www.abfe.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/White+Paper+-+Who+Manages+the+Money+14.pdf>

Wilchins, Riki. “Gender Norms: The Missing Part of Gender Equity Philanthropy.” *Responsive Philanthropy*. Spring 2015. http://ncrp.org/files/RP_Spring15-Wilchins.pdf

Woodwell, Jr., William. “Bolder Together. Ten diverse foundations are collaborating in new ways to increase civic participation in California.” California Civic Participation Funders. 2012. <http://www.haasjr.org/sites/default/files/BolderTogether.pdf>

Blogs

ColorLines

A news service published by RaceForward. It advances racial justice through research, media and practice. Founded in 1981, Race Forward brings systemic analysis and an innovative approach to complex race issues to help people take effective action toward racial equity. <http://www.colorlines.com>

NCRP's blog

Published by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy (NCRP). This wide-ranging blog explores issues related to best practices in philanthropy, from leadership to capacity building to equity and beyond.
<http://blog.ncrp.org>

Nonprofit with Balls

Produced by Vu Lee, a writer, speaker, vegan, Pisces, and the Executive Director of Rainier Valley Corps, a nonprofit in Seattle with the mission of developing and supporting leaders of color to strengthen the capacity of communities-of-color-led nonprofits and foster collaboration between diverse communities to effect systemic change.
<http://nonprofitwithballs.com>

Race Files

A project of ChangeLab. As cited on their website: “We live in an age of colorblind racism. We claim we don’t see color, yet American society continues to be organized and divided by race. Race Files exists to lift the veil of colorblindness—to make race and racism visible. We use analogy, pop culture, and personal narratives to tell the story of race and create a language that will help us defeat racism. We use analogy, pop culture, and personal narratives.”
<http://www.racefiles.com>