

***WOMEN AND PHILANTHROPY:  
OLD STEREOTYPES,  
NEW CHALLENGES***

**A Monograph Series**

**Written by Mary Ellen S. Capek**

**for Global Fund for Women  
Michigan Women's Foundation  
Resourceful Women  
Women & Philanthropy and  
Women's Funding Network**

**FINAL MANUSCRIPT DRAFT**

Contact Mary Ellen Capek at 505/890-6446 *phone*,  
505/890-6556 *fax*, or [mecapek@unm.edu](mailto:mecapek@unm.edu) *email*

To order printed editions, contact  
Women's Funding Network  
332 Minnesota Street, Suite E840, St. Paul MN 55101-1320  
612/227-2213 *fax* [wfn@wfnet.org](mailto:wfn@wfnet.org) *email*

***FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR  
WOMEN AND GIRLS:  
"SPECIAL INTEREST" FUNDING OR  
EFFECTIVE PHILANTHROPY?***

***Includes a Special Section  
on Women's Funds***

**Volume Two of the Monograph Series**

***WOMEN AND PHILANTHROPY:  
OLD STEREOTYPES,  
NEW CHALLENGES***

**Written by Mary Ellen S. Capek**

**for Global Fund for Women  
Michigan Women's Foundation  
Resourceful Women  
Women & Philanthropy and  
Women's Funding Network**

**SERIES PREFACE**

We are pleased to present the series *Women and Philanthropy: Old Stereotypes, New Challenges*. As organizations, active in the field of philanthropy that provide both funding and other kinds of support to groups serving the needs of women and girls, we offer these monographs on key issues affecting women and the practice of organized philanthropy.

Our five organizations--the Global Fund for Women, the Michigan Women's Foundation, Resourceful Women, Women and Philanthropy, and Women's Funding Network--have known and worked with each other for many years. We were fortunate, however, to have strengthened our working relationships over the past two years during which we were participants in the W.K. Kellogg Foundation supported the Women's Philanthropy Cluster. The Cluster provided a forum for our organizations to come together on a regular basis. It offered a unique opportunity for us to address many of the critical questions that affect our own organizations and the broader field of women's philanthropy. We are grateful to the Kellogg Foundation for its support of our work and of this project.

One of the first unanimous decisions was to commission targeted research and documentation on some of the key challenges facing the field. This series by Mary Ellen Capek is designed to give readers food for thought, provoke active discussion and debate, and offer an analysis of some of the emerging trends in the field. Other papers on related topics will follow. The perspectives presented in the series are those of the author, but the issues are of concern to all of us who care about and are active in the field of social change and philanthropy.

We hope that these papers will simulate animated conversations and thoughtful reflection among those of us engaged in the foundation world as well as serve as a resource to grassroots practitioners serving women and girls in this country and around the globe. We welcome your responses and look forward to the ideas generated from such discussions.

Kavita N. Ramdas, President, Global Fund for Women  
Peg Talburtt, Executive Director, Michigan Women's Foundation  
Judy Bloom, Executive Director, Resourceful Women  
Felicia Lynch, Executive Director, Women and Philanthropy  
Carol Mollner, Executive Director, Women's Funding Network

## **INTRODUCTION**

This series began as an internal report written in the summer of 1997 for the five grantees that constitute the Women's Philanthropy Cluster funded by W.K. Kellogg Foundation: Global Fund for Women, Michigan Women's Foundation, Resourceful Women, Women & Philanthropy, and Women's Funding Network. I would like to thank cluster participants for their support, encouragement, and feedback as we reshaped the original report for broader audiences in the nonprofit and philanthropic communities: Carol Barton, Judy Bloom, Stephanie Clohesy, Karen Judd, Alissa Hauser, Felicia Lynch, Carol Mollner, Misti Mukhopadhyay, Kavita Ramdas, Sharon Ramirez, Laura Sperazi, Laurisa Sellers, Peg Talburtt, and Holly Wolhart.

I would also like to thank researchers Lee Badgett, John Havens, Barry Johnson, Ann Kaplan, Judith Kroll, Susan Ostrander, and Paul Schervish for reviewing parts of the manuscript. Gerald Auten, Robert Avery, Rebecca Blank, Tara Blue, Lynn Burbridge, Diana Campoamor, Chris Cardona, Mariam K. Chamberlain, Tim Consedine, Sally Covington, Donald Cox, Judith Eargle, Catherine Eckel, Nancy Folbre, Marjorie Fujiki, Tracy Gary, Sherman Hanna, Heidi Hartmann, John Havens, Virginia Hodgkinson, Fran Huehls, Janet Huettner, Ann Kaplan, Andrea Kaminski, Lynn Karoly, Judith Kroll, Barry Johnson, Patricia Lewis, Donna Manning, Susan Ostrander, Ellen Remmer, Loren Renz, Kathryn Shaw, Paul Schervish, Margaret Smith, Pam Sparr, Frank Stafford, Martha Starr-McCluer, Richard Steinberg, Cynthia Teague, Walteen Grady Truely, Abbie von Schlegell, Denny Vaughan, John Weicher, and Ed Wolff--all provided data, articles, referrals, critical comments, and/or other helpful resource material, often in a hurry, and I am grateful for their prompt, thoughtful responses.

Finally, I would like to thank Susan Hallgarth, who listened patiently as I talked my way through many of the manuscript revisions and skillfully edited final versions of the series. I am also grateful to the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, and the Anderson Schools of Management at the University of New Mexico for providing valuable institutional resources and affiliation that made this research possible. Laird Klingler, librarian at the Woodrow Wilson School, and Jacqueline N. Hood, Chair of the Anderson Schools' Department of Management, were especially helpful in arranging for both database and other research resources.

### ***SCOPE***

As noted occasionally in the text of all three monographs, the topic "Women and Philanthropy" encompasses much of the work of the women's movement as well as the women's funding movement since the early 1970s. My original charge from the Women's Philanthropy Cluster was to produce an overview of existing research, interview a sample of philanthropic leaders and others active in the women's funding movement, and provide a think piece for the Cluster.

As the report was read and discussed, Cluster participants recommended producing several briefer publications, each of which could stand on its own, but together would form a broad overview of "Women and Philanthropy":

***Volume One.*** Women as Donors: Stereotypes, Common Sense, and Challenges

***Volume Two.*** Foundation Support for Women and Girls: "Special Interest" Funding or Effective Philanthropy? (Includes a Special Section on Women's Funds)

***Volume Three.*** The Women's Funding Movement: Accomplishments and Challenges

These monographs all focus on the status of philanthropy in the United States. Future publications in this series will look at women's philanthropy in other countries, and it is important to note here that these three monographs are premised on the assumption that we in the United States have much to learn from philanthropy in other countries. For example, women and girls in other countries are seldom labeled a "special interest" group. The United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women held in Beijing, China in 1995, the accompanying Nongovernmental Organization (NGO) Forum in Huairou, and international women's organizing efforts leading to those events taught most of the world that funding women and girls changes families and changes communities. United States philanthropy has yet to take that lesson to heart, as all three publications in this series will document.

### ***SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS***

Reliable research on women and philanthropy is slim. To fill in gaps and analyze issues that range beyond the limits of existing documentation, 81 women and men were interviewed for this project: they included researchers; CEOs, senior executives, and program officers in "traditional" foundations; heads of nonprofit organizations, including Council on Foundations' affinity groups; current and former heads of women's funds; heads of women's organizations; women donors across the age spectrum; trustees; consultants and professional fundraisers and development directors. Twenty-eight percent of those interviewed were women and men of color. It is important to note that this sample was not drawn randomly. Because of the dearth of reliable research, the list of respondents necessarily included researchers whose opinions helped to shape my own interpretations about existing data, social climate issues, and the philanthropic and nonprofit sector in general. The list of respondents also was weighted to include people active in the women's funding movement and to include women and men in leadership positions in philanthropy, especially women and men of color. As with any anecdotal research, their observations should be read as food for thought. In most cases, respondents' perspectives are *opinions*, not facts, and some respondents may or may not have been acquainted with complete or up-to-date information.

### ***OVERVIEW***

The three monographs in this series were originally written as one report, sharing many of the same respondents. Read together, they provide an overview of the status and perceptions of philanthropy as it affects women and girls. Although data and analyses in each publication also inform the other monographs, they are designed to be read separately. Each has a summary

section and provides recommendations for further research and implementation strategies for different types of organizations--women's organizations and others that raise money from women or for women and girls, women's funds, community foundations, corporate and private national funders, and government agencies that fund women and girls.

### **Volume One. Women as Donors: Stereotypes, Common Sense, and Challenges**

This monograph begins with an overview of existing research on women as donors and raises questions about common stereotypes: Do women give away less money than men? Less often? It draws the conclusion that much existing research is based on stereotypes about gender that generate the wrong questions and hence the wrong answers. In fact, once other variables such as age, level of income, number of dependents, and health are taken into account, few discernible differences between men and women donors remain.

The data reveal, however, that some differences do exist. Women have less wealth than men, earn less, and have to spend more on day-to-day expenses. Yet women do give and give generously. To fill in background for conclusions about women as donors, this monograph provides up-to-date facts on women's assets, with some new data on wealth only recently available. Given the resources available for research on women's philanthropy, the important questions are *not* about gender differences in giving behavior but about what people give *to*. The evidence suggests that women and men give for many of the same reasons. Yet so many women and men still do *not* give--or do not give generously--to women's funds and other activist women's organizations. One important question is why *don't* they?

To consider several possible answers to that question, this monograph looks first at stumbling blocks for women donors; second at fundraising skills and constraints within women's organizations; and third at cultural phenomena that have subtle but powerful impact on giving to women and girls: 1) a barrage of image distortions about the people many women's organizations fund and serve, including immigrant women, poor women, lesbians, women students, and abused women and children; and 2) the internalized norms that condition how women see themselves in relation to other women and women's causes.

### **Volume Two. Foundation Support for Women and Girls: "Special Interest" Funding or Effective Philanthropy? (Includes a Special Section on Women's Funds)**

This monograph looks at the available data on organized philanthropy as it affects women and girls. When women's organizations publicized previous years' numbers--both dollar values and numbers of grants awarded to women's and girls' organizations and programs--they stirred up controversies about the reliability of the data and what the data tell us. This review begins with a

summary of available data on foundation funding for women and girls and defines in some detail what we can and cannot read from the data.

The monograph also looks at data on foundation leadership and staff--especially boards, CEOs, and program officers--and discusses what the numbers mean, especially for women and men of color. The analysis attempts to account for paradoxes in mainstream foundation culture: how some respondents within that culture feel thwarted and challenge the assumption that foundations are interested in pursuing diversity that is more than skin-deep. What does it mean, for example, that while philanthropy itself is becoming a "feminized" profession, relatively few philanthropic resources reach women and girls and their organizations and programs in this country, especially organizations serving women and girls of color?

Finally, this monograph looks at the history of women's funds, diversity, success, growing pains, and--perhaps most important--the innovations and funding strategies women's funds bring to organized philanthropy. This monograph and the third monograph on the women's funding movement itself rely heavily on assessments and questions shared by respondents interviewed. Its focus is on strategic funding for women's and girls' organizations; how women's funds' influence other foundations; how they have worked to democratize donors and achieve greater racial/ethnic diversity; and what does and does not work as women's funds reach toward wider communities and higher dollars.

### **Volume Three. The Women's Funding Movement: Accomplishments and Challenges**

This monograph is shaped by responses to the question, "Is there a women's funding movement?" It also looks at definitions of social movements; lists key players, allies, and potential allies in the women's funding movement; explores areas of success, tensions, and failures; and identifies some visions for the future.

The theme emerging most frequently from respondents interviewed for the original report--many of them sympathetic supporters of women's organizations themselves--is the need for new thinking, new language, and, as important, new collaborations, coalitions, and strategies to connect the concerns of women and girls to a wider public.

As in the other two monographs, this report ends with a series of recommendations for future research and suggested strategies for using the data and analyses for further work.

## **FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS: "SPECIAL INTEREST" FUNDING OR EFFECTIVE PHILANTHROPY? (Includes a Special Section on Women's Funds)**

### ***SUMMARY***

This monograph looks at the available data on organized philanthropy as it affects women and girls. When women's organizations have publicized data about foundation grants to women's and girls' organizations and programs--both dollar values and numbers of grants--they stirred up controversies about the reliability of the data and what the data tell us. This review begins with a summary of available data on foundation funding for women and girls and defines in some detail what can and cannot be read from the data.

The monograph also looks at data on foundation leadership and staff--especially boards, CEOs, and program officers--and discusses what the numbers mean, especially for women and men of color. The analysis attempts to account for paradoxes in mainstream foundation culture--how some respondents within that culture feel thwarted and challenge the assumption that foundations are interested in pursuing diversity that is more than skin-deep. What does it mean, for example, that while philanthropy itself is becoming a "feminized" profession, relatively few philanthropic resources reach women and girls and their organizations and programs in this country, especially organizations serving women and girls of color?

Finally, this monograph looks at women's funds' history, diversity, successes, growing pains, innovations, and funding strategies women's funds bring to organized philanthropy. This monograph and the third monograph on the women's funding movement itself rely heavily on assessments and questions shared by respondents interviewed. Its focus is on strategic funding for women's and girls' organizations; how women's funds' influence on other foundations; how they have worked to democratize donors and achieve greater racial/ethnic diversity; and what does and does not work as women's funds reach toward wider communities and higher dollars. The monograph concludes with a series of recommendations for future research and suggested strategies for using the data and analyses.

### ***DATA COLLECTION***

What is known about foundation funding for women and girls? There are no comprehensive aggregate figures. Because of the lack of national data and controversies raised by use of earlier data, it is especially important to clarify what conclusions can and cannot be drawn about grant dollars reaching women and girls. And given the constraints on how existing data are collected, it is important to recognize that there are no reliable ways to extrapolate additional information from the existing data. The most recent data available (1995) document that over 40,000 private, corporate, and community and operating foundations in the United States gave away almost \$12.3 billion dollars (Renz, Mandler, and Tran 1997, pp. viii). Of that amount, it can only be said "for sure" that a fraction, just over \$326 million in 1995, was officially designated for women and girls as a beneficiary group.

The Foundation Center is the best source of data, but they are constrained by data available. In fact, 67.6 percent (of dollar value) and almost 61 percent (of number) of grants from a set of 1,012 foundations reporting to the Foundation Center are *not* coded for beneficiary groups--or "special population groups," to use Foundation Center language (Renz, Mandler, and Tran 1997, pp. 63, 92-93)--either because grants are core support, aimed at a general population, or information is not available. Designation of "special population groups" is the predominant way of tabulating grants to women and girls, although staff capture some additional grants by including subject areas like adolescent pregnancy and reproductive health.

Furthermore, only 2.8 percent of the 1,012 foundations reporting actually fill out the Foundation Center's reporting form (Form 400), the use of which yields the most complete information on scope, duration, purpose, and location of grants funded. The rest of the information is extracted by Foundation Center staff from annual reports, newsletters, or grants lists (33%). The majority of data (63.9%) come from 990-PF forms that provide little information beyond amounts of grants and names of recipients.

There are two additional constraints on the data. Information on beneficiaries is tracked *only* for this set of 1,012 foundations, and only for grants of \$10,000 and higher. However, this sample of 1,012 foundations--2.6 percent of the total number of over 40,000 active, grantmaking foundations in the country--does account for over 50 percent of all grant dollars awarded in 1995. The sample includes 800 of the 1,000 largest foundations by total grants, along with small or mid-size foundations, including a substantial number of community foundations, that voluntarily report their grants of \$10,000 or more to the Foundation Center (Renz, Mandler, and Tran 1997, p. 113).

Similar samples have enabled the Foundation Center to track significant trends in philanthropy since 1980. But it is important to note the limits of this data--necessitated, as noted earlier, by constraints on data collecting--in describing the universe of all grants that benefit women and girls. Many grants to women and girls do not show up in the sample:

- grants under \$10,000;
- some of the 50 percent of foundation dollars *not* included in the Foundation Center sample of 1,012 foundations;
- some of the 44,924 grants in the 1,012 foundation sample that were not able to be coded for beneficiaries or program areas, which could have been grants for "welfare reform" or "youth" that directly or indirectly serve women's and girls' needs; and
- grants from most women's funds that, although grant-making entities, are publicly-funded charities themselves and not included in the Foundation Center's database as "independent foundations," "corporate foundations," or "community foundations."

Some more detailed tracking data are in the offing. The grants coding system developed and currently being pilot-tested by the Women's Funding Network (WFN) Women's Funds

Database Project will provide descriptions and the capacity to classify most grants and allocations made by women's funds (Women's Funding Network 1996, p.7). Compatible with the Foundation Center's Grants Classification System, WFN's new, expanded coding will offer grantmakers more refined, detailed indexing options: key terms, for example, that make it

possible to describe more accurately the actual substance of the grants. The system will also be a useful model for grantmakers outside the Women's Funding Network, helping them identify and track grants to women and girls in more depth and detail--and not incidentally offering some definitions and a checklist that may enable other funders to see the range of topics considered to be grants to women and girls.

### ***WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT GRANTS TO WOMEN AND GIRLS?***

So bearing in mind the caveats just described, what *is* known about grants to women and girls? The good news: 1995 Foundation Center data show a slight increase over 1994 figures for percentages of both dollar amounts and number of grants benefiting women and girls (Renz, Mandler, and Tran 1997, pp. 92). There is a 10.7 percent increase in total dollars awarded in 1995 compared to 1994. That increase even exceeded the overall increase for all foundation giving for the same period (8.6%).

The bad news, however, is that although the percentage of *number* of grants awarded has steadily inched up (from 5.7 percent in 1991, 5.9 percent in 1992, 6.1 percent in 1993 and 1994, to 6.4 percent in 1995), the percentage of total dollars awarded in 1995 (5.2%) to women and girls is actually less *as a percentage of all foundation dollars* than in 1992 (5.3%).

All told, 1995 Foundation Center data show women and girls receiving grants totaling \$325.7 million, 5.2 percent of the almost \$6.3 billion in grants of \$10,000 and above given out by the 1,012 foundations in the Foundation Center's sample set. Of the actual number of total grants awarded by these foundations (73,763), only 4,746 grants (6.4%) were designated as benefiting women and girls.

Women and girls fare better in larger foundations, receiving 8.1 percent of number of grants and 5.7 of dollar value of grants awarded by the 100 largest foundations. This compares to 5.7 percent of the of grants and only 4.3 percent of dollar value of grants awarded by the other 912 foundations tracked (Renz, Mandler, and Tran 1997, pp. 98). When data for the 1,012 foundations are broken out by *type of foundation*, women and girls fare slightly better among independent foundations (70.5 percent of the 1,012 foundation set), receiving 7.4 percent of number of grants awarded, 5.5 percent of dollar value of grants awarded.

From community foundations tracked (10.2 percent of the set), women and girls received 6.4 percent of the number of grants awarded, 5.0 percent of the dollar value of grants awarded. And from corporate foundations tracked (18.7 percent of the sample), women and girls received only 3.5 percent of the number of grants, 2.4 percent of the dollar value of grants awarded (Renz, Mandler, and Tran 1997, pp. 99, 104).

## Where does the money go?

A more detailed breakdown of much of the same data is available from the Foundation Center's *National Guide to Women and Girls*, Fourth Edition (Rich 1997). This guide lists details of 4,306 grants totaling nearly \$310 million and includes descriptions of 978 grantmaking entities, not all of which have grants listed but have noted an interest in funding women and/or girls: grantmaking foundations (794), direct corporate giving programs (66), and public charities (118, including 74 community foundations). Table 1 ranks program area funding described in *The National Guide to Women and Girls* (Rich 1997, p. xi).

**Table 1. 1995 Grants to Women and Girls**

<i>Program Area</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>\$</i>	<i>#</i>
Health-general and rehabilitative	27.4	\$84,842,325	904
Human services-multipurpose	12.2	37,791,257	721
Education	9.2	28,561,567	431
Youth development	8.9	27,620,933	522
Civil rights and social action	6.3	19,518,722	272
Social sciences	6.3	19,442,255	162
Community improvement & development	4.4	13,591,612	121
Public affairs & government	3.5	10,962,587	102
Crime, justice & public protection	3.2	9,976,641	195
Employment	3.1	9,576,114	123
International affairs, development & peace	3.2	9,863,810	113
Mental health	2.8	8,590,939	127
Science	2.4	7,333,107	84
Health-specific diseases	1.7	5,353,179	112
Arts & culture	1.0	2,968,964	62
Recreation & sports.	.9	2,882,190	29
Medical research.	.9	2,752,477	41
Housing & shelter.	.8	2,331,739	77
Religion	.7	2,234,423	46
Environmental protection	.6	1,982,000	23
Philanthropy & volunteerism	.4	1,349,280	24
Food, nutrition & agriculture.	.1	388,269	12
Membership benefit activities	.0	30,000	3
Totals	100%	\$309,944,390	4,306

Listings in the directory were drawn from actual grants of \$10,000 or more reported to the Foundation Center or from foundations' own stated fields of interest. The Foundation Center staff then evaluated entries "to ensure a sufficient interest in women or girls" (Rich 1997, p. vii). A difference between these data and the set of 1,012 foundations described above is the inclusion of more grantmaking public charities, including 28 members of the Women's Funding Network.

## What do the numbers mean?

Women & Philanthropy, the Ms. Foundation for Women, the National Council for Research on Women (NCRW), the Women's Funding Network, and other organizations began publicizing the less-than-five percent numbers as a "wake-up call" in the late '80s (see, for example, Women & Philanthropy's first *Far From Done* report (Bonovoglia 1989) and the 1989 NCRW flyer "Why Fund Women and Girls?").

While alerting some sympathetic funders to needs for both more dollars and better coding, the publicity triggered in other funders a range of reactions that extended from irritation and mild annoyance to downright anger. Because so many funders considered grants for reproductive health or welfare reform, even grants to youth, as benefiting women and girls, however, there ensued much debate about what constitutes a grant to women and girls and how funders were being seriously misunderstood, even insulted or maligned. Feedback from a number of respondents interviewed pointed out that continued use of the numbers in subsequent reports and publicity seemed only to exacerbate the annoyance or anger. In fact, relying on continued use of these numbers has probably been counterproductive as a strategy to increase awareness about the need for more funding for women and girls.

Because there are so many gaps in data collecting at the national level that might capture the bigger picture of funding for women's and girls' programs, some of these funders' frustrations were understandable. Yet whenever researchers were able to look more closely at smaller, discrete sets of grantmakers and grantees in cities, states, or regions--in Boston, Chicago, the Delaware Valley, Minnesota, and Michigan, for example--they concluded that the national estimates of the dollars reaching women and girls had actually been *higher* than the evidence emerging locally or state-wide (Women Working in Philanthropy 1990, Servatius 1992, Eberhart and Pratt 1993, Michigan Women's Foundation 1993, and Mead 1994). In Chicago, for example, researchers found that only \$4.1 million, 1.4 percent of the \$300 million given out by Chicago-area foundations and corporations, targeted programs serving women and girls in Illinois (Servatius 1992).

The debates continue. Many funders challenge any need for "special" funding for women and girls, arguing that "universal" or "generic" grants benefit both genders. According to Tufts researcher Molly Mead, many funders feel their "priorities with respect to gender are right on target" (Mead 1997, p. 13) and argue that gender is "an irrelevant category for targeting" and that gender-specific programs promote exclusivity and function "too far out of the mainstream of society" (Mead 1997, p. 14). Others point out that funding aimed specifically at men and boys is less than for women and girls--1.8 percent of number of 1995 grants, 1.3 percent of dollars--while still others claim that "universal" or "generic" grants represent *de facto* gender-based funding with men and boys the beneficiaries. Mead and others argue that funding criteria are too often based on "lack of understanding both of gender as a relevant category in grantmaking and of the role of programs for women and girls" (Mead 1997, p. 16).

Perhaps the most telling evidence Mead presents, however, is the widespread lack of any evaluation data about who non-gender funding actually reaches. Do universal funds reach women and girls similarly to men and boys? What little evidence exists says no (National Council for Research on Women 1994a, Capek and Hallgarth 1995). Mead, for example, documented gaps in funding reaching women and girls in Boston, concluding that "funders and nonprofits for women and girls live in separate worlds, operating out of conflicting basic assumptions about how to create and support programs that work effectively for women and girls" (Mead 1994, p. 6).

Before this analysis probes deeper into possible reasons for differences between funders' assumptions and grantees' claims, however, it is important to establish some additional facts about the foundation community itself.

**FOUNDATION LEADERSHIP AND STAFF**

Who decides where money goes? The data to answer this question, at least partially answer this question, come from the Council on Foundation's *Foundation Management Report, Eighth Edition*. This monograph draws from both the most recent edition, published in 1996, which covers 1994 data, and from data in the Council's *1997 Grantmakers Salary Report*.

There were 748 respondents to the survey for the Council's *Foundation Management Report, Eighth Edition*, representing foundations that held \$76.5 billion in assets, 40 percent of all US foundation assets, and gave away \$3.8 billion in grants, 33 percent of all grants made. The *1997 Grantmakers Salary Report* is based on fewer respondents (571), but these are staffed foundations (only an estimated one in five of all foundations), and they hold nearly half of all foundation assets. Because neither is a random sample, it cannot be said with certainty that the numbers are representative of all foundations in the United States. But because both represent such a sizable number of the largest, professionally-staffed foundations, the numbers are indicative of trends and profiles of these larger foundations, most of which are probably included in the Foundation Center sample set used to track grants for women and girls.

**Foundation boards**

According to the *Foundation Management Report, Eighth Edition*, 30.8 percent of foundation trustees in 1994 were women--2,378 women out of 7,710 trustees. Women had the highest representation on family foundation boards (43.6%), with the next strongest showing on boards of public foundations (39.3%). Women made up 29.5 percent of community foundation boards and 26.3 percent of independent and private operating foundations. They were least represented on corporate foundation boards (18.3%).

**Table 2. Women and Men on Boards 1994  
As Percentages of Trustees on Boards of Different Asset Sizes**

	<i>% Women</i>	<i>% Men</i>	<i># Women</i>	<i># Men</i>
\$100 Million and Over	25.7	74.3	301	868
\$50 to \$99.9 Million	27.2	72.8	200	536
\$10 to \$49.9 Million	30.4	69.6	664	1,517
Under \$10 Million	33.5	66.5	1,213	2,411
All	30.8%	69.2%	2,378	5,332

**Table 3. Women and Men on Boards 1994  
As Percentages of Trustees on Different Types of Boards**

<i>% Women</i>	<i>% Men</i>	<i># Women</i>	<i># Men</i>
----------------	--------------	----------------	--------------

Family	43.6	56.4	489	632
Public	39.3	60.7	217	335
Community	29.5	70.5	1,101	2,634
Independent & Private Operating	26.3	73.7	492	1,379
Corporate	18.3	81.7	79	352
All	30.8%	69.2%	2,378	5,332

Overall, women were most represented on boards of foundations with the least amount of assets. This is consistently the case for women on boards of public, independent, and family foundations. (This is also the case for women on many corporate and other nonprofit boards. See, for example, Capek 1988, Odendahl 1994, Abzug 1994, Catalyst 1996.)

Overall, women on foundation boards increased less than eight percent in ten years--from 23 percent in 1984 to 30.8 percent in 1994. Minorities on boards increased less than five percent in the same period--from five percent in 1984 to 9.8 percent in 1994. Black trustees increased from 3.6 percent in 1984 to 6.1 percent in 1994. Minorities were most represented on public foundation boards (17.8%), second most represented on corporate foundation boards (13.7%).

**Table 4. Women on Boards 1994**  
**As Percentages of Women on Different Types of Boards**

	<i>% Women</i>	<i># Women</i>
Community	46.3	1,101
Family	20.7	489
Independent & Private Operating	20.6	492
Public	9.1	217
Corporate	3.3	79
All	100%	2,378

Minorities constituted 10.7 percent of independent and private operating foundation boards, 10.1 percent of community foundation boards, and 2.3 percent of family foundation boards. Blacks constituted 6.1 percent of all foundation boards, Hispanics 1.7 percent, Asian/Pacific Islanders 1.3 percent, Native Americans .4 percent, and other .4 percent.

Women of color constituted 4.2 percent of all people on boards, just under 324. In all instances except for blacks and Native Americans, men of color outnumbered women of color within the same racial/ethnic groups. Black women were 2.9 percent of all people on boards, black men 3.3 percent. Hispanic women were .7 percent of all people on boards, Hispanic men one percent. Asian/Pacific Islander women were .4 percent of all people on boards, Asian/Pacific Islander men .9 percent. Native American women and men were .2 percent each of all people on boards, and "other" women were <.1 percent, "other" men .3 percent (Council on Foundations 1996, p. 73).

#### **Women CEOs**

In 1996, women chief executive officers (CEOs) broke the 50 percent barrier, holding 50.2 percent of all foundation leadership slots, and in 1997, that number rose to 51.3 percent (263 of 513), virtually doubling their percentage since 1982 when women CEOs numbered 26 percent (Council on Foundations 1997, p. 18).

Women headed 71 percent of corporate foundations and giving programs--74.4 percent corporate foundation heads, 91.7 percent heads of corporate giving program, and 50 percent heads of combination corporate foundations and giving programs. Women CEOs were also a majority in community foundations (56%) and public foundations (52.6%), half of CEOs in family foundations (49.5%), and least represented in independent foundations (36.4%).

Of 263 women chief executive officers and chief giving officers (CGO) listed among the Council's 1997 respondents, the largest percentage of women headed up community foundations (40.7%), with the second largest heading independent foundations (19.8%).

**Table 5. Women and Men CEOs/CGOs 1997  
As Percentages of CEOs/CGOs of Different Types of Foundations**

	<i>% Women</i>	<i>% Men</i>	<i># Women</i>	<i># Men</i>
Corporate	71.0	29.0	49	20
Community	56.0	44.0	107	84
Public	52.6	47.4	10	9
Family	49.5	50.5	45	46
Independent	36.4	63.6	52	91
All	51.3%	48.7%	263	250

**Table 6. Women CEOs/CGOs 1997  
As Percentages of Women Heading Different Types of Foundations**

	<i>% Women</i>	<i># Women</i>
Community	40.7	107
Independent	19.8	52
Corporate	18.6	49
Family	17.1	45
Public	3.8	10
All	100%	263

## What do the numbers mean?

Women are more likely to head smaller foundations. According to the *1997 Grantmakers Salary Report*, "about two-thirds (67%) of the grantmaking programs with assets under \$50 million are headed by women, while women head up only 33 percent of foundations with assets of \$100 million or more....Over 67 percent (176) of the 263 full-time female CEOs/CGOs manage grantmaking organizations that hold less than \$50 million in assets. Women are also more likely to head up smaller corporate contribution programs.

It is tempting to speculate on some of the apparent dynamics that show up when these facts and tables are compared to the Foundation Center data about grants to women and girls broken out by *type of foundation*. (See Table 2 of this publication.) It needs to be borne in mind that these data sets are not statistical samples of the universe of foundations, nor are they matched for staff/board and giving patterns in either the foundations included or the year the data were collected.

One curiosity in comparing the *type of foundation* giving with the board and CEO tables is the relatively low level of women's and girls' funding from corporate foundations given the relatively high percentages of women CEOs in corporate foundations. The Foundation Center does not track dollars from corporate giving programs, so actual corporate dollars targeted to women and girls may be somewhat higher. And the Council on Foundations cautions against drawing inferences from their numbers because they are so small. But in just a quick look at the numbers of women CEOs in corporate foundations (74.4 percent in 1997, 88.5 percent in 1996), the discrepancies are noticeable.

As shown in Table 4, women are the least represented on corporate boards (18.3 percent of all board members). Among the corporate foundations tracked in the Foundation Center data, women's and girls' programs and organizations received only 3.5 percent of the total number of grants awarded, 2.4 percent of total corporate dollars--almost *half* the averages for all grants. Because there are no ways of knowing the actual dollar amount of corporate giving programs for women and girls (as opposed to corporate foundation dollars that are tracked), what follows might be sheer speculation. But even acknowledging all the caveats, the data still raise the question of why so little funding for women and girls with so many women heading up corporate foundations?

Do these comparisons hint at where decisions are made and how much power actually resides in the corporate CEO or CGO? Do women heading up corporate foundations have fewer decision-making roles than their female colleagues heading up other types of foundations with similar assets? Are they younger than their counterparts, with less experience? Even though women tend to head up smaller corporate foundations, is the corporate culture such that they are even less likely to advocate for women's or girls' programs? Do women who have control of their funding make different charitable-giving decisions than men who control their giving programs? Answers to these questions simply cannot be determined with any degree of accuracy from the data available, although a 1994 empirical study of 420 small businesses in a southwestern city found no significant differences between amounts of charitable giving from female- and male-owned firms. The study, however, did confirm differences in *reasons* for giving that could form the basis for further research: female-owned firms may give a higher priority to stakeholders like employees or customers with whom they have a more direct connection, and who expressed gratitude for previous contributions (Hood and Thompson 1994).

Another observation: it was noted earlier that women's and girls' programs and organizations receive the highest level of support from independent foundations. Yet independent foundations have the second lowest representation of women on their boards (26.3 percent of all independent trustees) and the lowest percentage of women CEOs--almost the inverse of the board/CEO gender ratio in corporate foundations and giving programs. Yet they fund more. Why?

Independent foundations would include the largest, most professional foundations in the sample--largest in assets and largest in staff size. Perhaps these patterns reflect influence of women program officers and/or the foundations' improved access to research and other information about women's and girls' organizations. Professionally-staffed independent foundations may also represent the majority of foundations that women's and girls' organizations apply to for grants.

### **Program officers**

In 1997, women were 66.7 percent of all program officers listed in the Council on Foundations survey (340 of 510). Here too women were most represented in corporate foundations (88.9 percent of all corporate program officers), 79.5 percent of community foundation program officers, 72.7 percent of family foundation program officers, and 60 and 59.3 percent respectively of public and family foundations' program staff.

**Table 7. Full-time Paid Program Officers within Racial/Ethnic Groups  
As Percentages of all Full-time Paid Program Officers**

	<i>% Women</i>	<i>% Men</i>	<i># Women</i>	<i># Men</i>
Asian/Pacific Islanders	5.1	1.6	26	8
Black	9.2	6.1	47	31
Hispanic	4.5	4.1	23	21
Native American/Other	1.0	.4	5	2
White	46.9	21.2	239	108
All	<u>66.7%</u>	<u>33.3%</u>	<u>340</u>	<u>170</u>

Thirty-three percent of program officers in the 1997 Council of Foundations salary survey were people of color, more likely to be employed at independent and community foundations. (Keep in mind that these are data drawn from staffed foundations who are principally members of the Council. The total number of respondents to the survey account for approximately half of total foundation assets, albeit including many of the largest, staffed foundations. The sample includes data on paid full-time staff only.)

### **People of color**

The 1997 affinity group data, for example, document that there were 71 native people, current members of Native Americans in Philanthropy, on the staff, board of directors, or governing bodies of corporate, foundation, or native grantmaking organizations. Of that group, 52 were women, 19 were men; the group was evenly divided (39/38) between those who were staff

persons and those who were board members, with four serving as both board members and staff. Voting members of Hispanics in Philanthropy who were Latino number 192, 111 women and 81 men. Twenty-one were board members, 11 women and 10 men. An informal survey conducted by Asian American/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy yielded 74 Asian American trustees, approximately half of them women, and 10 CEOs, five of them women.

One recommendation of this publication is a simple, one-page common survey form that the affinity groups themselves can use to collect and pool data--filling out the picture for affinity group members who may not be captured in the Council on Foundations data, either because their foundations are not eligible for membership (they give away less than \$60,000 a year) or have not joined for other reasons.

The most comprehensive survey of affinity group data is Lynn Burbridge's 1995 study for the Association of Black Foundation Executives (ABFE). Burbridge's report is based on in-depth analyses of the Council on Foundations *1992 Management Survey* and a separate survey sent to 206 ABFE members. While the study focuses primarily on blacks in philanthropy, Burbridge also provides some of the only available analysis of gender patterns by other racial/ethnic groups as well, again using the Council on Foundation's *1992 Management Survey* data.

In 1992, black women were approximately twelve percent of those in foundations with five or more employees. Black men, while numbering fewer than half the number of women employed, were much more likely to work in foundations with 40 or more employees. Burbridge accounts for this by noting that black women work in foundations as both professional and support staff, whereas black men tend to be mostly professionals (Burbridge 1995, p. 3).

Hispanic women were also more frequently found in larger foundations, although this was not true for men. Although Asian women were found more frequently in smaller foundations, Burbridge points out the sample sizes for Asian males, Native Americans, and other racial/ethnic groups were too small to use for analysis. The majority of people of color worked in foundations with 10 or more employees, and most worked in foundations with larger assets.

Burbridge notes that black women were more likely than black men to be CEOs and vice presidents, but "they have obtained these positions primarily in the smaller public and corporate foundations" (p. iii). White males were a majority of all foundation CEOs in 1992 (55.4%), white females 39 percent, black males 1.6 percent and black females 2.3 percent.

According to the Council on Foundations *1997 Grantmakers Salary Report*, white males constituted 46.2 percent of full-time paid CEOs/CGOs, black males 2.1 percent, and black females 2.3 percent. Black men have made some slight gains since 1992 but not black women. Given the size of the data samples, however--only 33 of the 515 CEOs/CGOs in 1997 (6.4%) were people of color--even a few people changing jobs can throw off the percentages.

**Table 8. Full-time Paid CEOs/CGOs within Racial/Ethnic Groups  
As Percentages of all Full-time Paid CEOs/CGOs**

	<i>% Women</i>	<i>% Men</i>	<i># Women</i>	<i># Men</i>
Asian/Pacific Islander	.58	0	3	0
Black	2.30	2.14	12	11
Hispanic	.77	.39	4	2

Native American	.19	0	1	0
Other	0	0	0	0
White	47.38	46.21	244	238
All	51.3%	48.7%	264	251

Burbridge notes, not surprisingly, that the median salary of white male professionals was significantly higher than any other group. Black women professionals earned 14 percent less than black male professionals in 1992 dollars (\$47,900 compared to \$55,600), although Burbridge found little difference in median salaries of black and white women (p. iii).

The ABFE survey replicated patterns in Burbridge's analysis of the Council on Foundations aggregate data, with black men generally earning more than black women. Interestingly, the survey also indicated that black men were more likely than black women to be involved in management and strategic planning activities, even when they were all program officers. Burbridge also found other sex differences when looking at program officers' grantmaking activities: "Women reported giving more in grants even when controlling for months in foundation, foundation type and foundation assets," which she attributes to male program officers having a wider breadth of activities, being more likely to be involved in management and strategic planning, for example (p. iv).

Twice as many men as women in the survey came from higher education, and twice as many women as men came from the private sector. On the whole, women generally appeared to be more optimistic than men and were more likely to want to pursue a career in philanthropy, while black men were more likely "to feel that racial discrimination is a barrier for them and are more pessimistic about pursuing a career in philanthropy" (p. 69). Most black men and black women felt that the foundation CEO and board of trustees were critical for encouraging diversity, although some also noted the role of senior staff and community leaders (p. v).

In her Executive Summary, Burbridge notes that "more detail is needed on some of the difficulties black professionals indicate that they encounter. For example, what is the nature of the 'foundation culture' that has been difficult for many blacks or the differences in priorities blacks sometime feel they have" (p. vi)? The next section probes issues of institutional culture as one way trying to understand differences between funders' assumptions and grantees' questions about who is getting funded.

### ***INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE***

If there is one common theme that runs throughout many of the interviews conducted as background for this publication, it is precisely this question of foundation culture and what it means. Especially for people of color, women and men, culture is a key concept. One foundation trustee, a woman of color, asked "are we having an impact on the culture? That's the most important criteria." Later in the same interview, she noted that "the only way you can transform a culture is to be there, where the policies are made, the practices shaped." What does "being there" mean, especially for people of color?

At one level, obviously, it means gaining and using power, learning how to help shape priorities and determine how foundation dollars will be spent. And that means being subtle, learning how to translate agendas, bringing along foundation leadership in the language they are used to hearing. (One program officer, for example, a woman of color, was finally able to make the case

for funding several women's programs because she "had the numbers that convinced them, that's what it finally took, the numbers, oh, and pity, the numbers and the pity for the babies--those two together made the case." But she saw this as a one-time victory; she didn't feel that anything she said enabled her board to grasp the systemic causes of the problems she was trying to address with her grant.

### **Insular lives**

Her foundation board--virtually all wealthy, married white males as she described them--were leading insular lives, traveling by limousine in and out of the city where the foundation was housed in its parent corporation, never meeting women like those they were being asked to support. Nor did the foundation trustees connect to the women in the foundation's office, white women or women of color. Typical of other women of color program officers interviewed, this program officer never felt "seen" for the whole time she worked in the office--even though she had what she described as "good" close working relationships with these wealthy white male colleagues.

### **Hired to be black or female?**

So "being there" is complicated. One researcher, a woman of color, hypothesized that blacks are hired to be "black" in foundations, whereas women, especially white women, are hired as "people." Many blacks, especially black men, are segregated in program areas like urban poverty but have more freedom to fund blacks than women do to fund women. These connections may have more to do with race linked to class than with race linked to gender: in a study of black and white families, for example, another researcher found middle class blacks under greater pressure to be of service to their communities than are middle class whites and thus more likely to fund their communities (Willie 1985).

The researcher interviewed, however, sees women having greater mobility in their foundations but not able to fund women's organizations as readily. There is a complicated dialectic going on here: who is in the worst position? Blacks, men and women, come into their work in foundations as representatives of their communities and their achievements are community achievements, but blacks, especially black men, are apparently more vulnerable: if urban poverty is no longer a priority area, they will lose their jobs.

Another woman of color, an organizational head, notes just the opposite to be the case for Hispanics, with men "easier to mainstream" than women. This is borne out by the Council on Foundations data that show almost twice as many Hispanic men as women are trustees. According to the executive interviewed, Hispanic trustees are more likely to be chosen for their credentials than are Hispanic program staff, men and women. Like black men, Hispanic women and men are more likely to be hired for a program area related to their ethnicity and rarely hired because they're generalists.

### **Multiracial but monocultural**

Another women of color executive sees many mainstream foundations as "multiracial but monocultural." She does not see inclusiveness as much as she sees uncomfortable tolerance that,

as one white foundation executive noted, was based on fear and need for personal psychological safety: "We're afraid we're racists and will be caught out by our own prejudices."

Another way to talk about some of these concerns, however, is to go back to the term "institutional culture" itself. Much of the available research on institutional culture comes from the organizational management literature (see, for example, Cox 1993, US Department of Labor 1995, Fernandez 1991, Morrison 1992, Kanter 1977). Rosabeth Moss Kanter defines the term when she talks about "both a formal and an informal company culture, reflected in language, rituals, and styles of communication" (1977, p. 40).

### **Customs and rituals**

What many respondents refer to when they talk about culture is the informal--the implicit, often unnamed assumptions, manners, and conventions--the subtext that permeates organizations just as it does families. In a more complex way, however, this notion of culture also subsumes the concept of "norm": the assumptions, often unstated, that determine who "looks like" a leader, who "fits" on the board, or who gets slotted in a program because of his or her race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

Many respondents shared frustrations about foundation culture that are probably little different from critiques leveled against other elite institutions. For those not "native" to the culture, many conventions seem so opaque as to be inconsequential. Yet stumble over them and you're dead--or at least on your way to ineffectualness and marginalization.

At a personal level, most of the conventions boil down to what to say or not to say to whom about what. Or they are subtler details, like the office equivalent of which fork to use with the salad: what to wear to the board meeting? Who asks whom to lunch? Whom to include on which committee? Which vice president to cc: on which memo? What types of jokes are permissible in whose company? The list goes on. The good news is that most of these protocols can be learned, especially with the help of an experienced mentor. These are components of informal culture, the dialects, so to speak, that "nonnative" speakers can drill and master, enabling them to "fit in" with the "language, rituals, and styles of communication" that Kanter defined.

### **Silent norms**

The trickier parts of the culture, however, are the implicit norms that nobody can learn to speak because these are the norms that judge, usually silently (and they are often internalized, even among those not "born to Norm.") Many of these implicit norms are also gendered. Women often talk about being in a double bind--branded "aggressive" if they push too hard, "weak" if they don't. As we've seen in the CEO data, there are now some obvious exceptions reached with women in philanthropic leadership, but in too many foundations, especially in more established, elite foundations with large assets, women are too often not "seen" as leaders: one experienced foundation executive observed that women can "do the work, carry the load, even get praised for the work, but we don't get to be at the helm."

What does it mean, for example, that Burbridge found black male program officers more likely than black female program officers to be involved in setting policy? On the other hand, what

does it mean that an articulate black male foundation executive tells of the time he spends "holding myself in. Just speaking too strongly will do you in. You're then an 'angry black male' and threatening, totally unacceptable." He notes with some exasperation that "this gets to be a real obstacle, making it hard to do your best work." When others in the foundation asked tough questions, they were praised for their solid professionalism, but he made people uncomfortable by "showing his intellect": a black male asking tough questions is labeled "attacking," another pernicious gender/racial stereotype that's seldom discussed but difficult to shake.

### **We DON'T discriminate**

Extensive analyses of these complex dimensions of institutional life are beyond the scope of this publication and best not undertaken without more in-depth original research, especially as it applies to foundations. But in order to understand why women and men in foundations have such a hard time funding women's and girls' organizations and programs, it is crucial at least to name the phenomena because foundation funding for women and girls cannot be talked about without understanding the complex roles gender, race, and class all play within a foundation's own culture. And the phenomenon is complex because it is both hidden and often fraught with good intentions: one senior foundation male executive noted that "we *don't* discriminate against women; that's why we make 'generic' grants. This is 1997. Women are equally considered in every way. We *don't* need a special program to make sure women get their fair share."

### **Norm sometimes wears skirts**

Other respondents disagree. While quick to acknowledge significant changes in philanthropy, especially the inclusion of women, many respondents interviewed--male and female senior program staff, foundation executives and trustees, and heads of organizations they fund--were often candidly critical. This is not just criticism of men in philanthropy; it's as often leveled against women: "Sometimes Norm wears a skirt," one woman of color executive quipped, "and often she's white." White women collude by not raising issues faced by women of color in the foundation *and* in the grantee community. Another foundation executive, a man of color, noted that if racial or ethnic groups had succeeded at anywhere near the rate of women succeeding in philanthropic leadership, "we'd do things differently." Which is to say, both diversity agendas and funding for their constituent groups would be significantly increased or their constituent communities would "hold their feet to the fire."

### **Don't rock the boat**

Without more complex analysis, perhaps, it is best to let respondents speak for themselves. Many critiques point to foundation culture muting women or women muting themselves. One respondent noted that "women still have problems taking the risk of being advocates. Some of the concern is not wanting to make a fuss, not generating conflict, not rocking the boat." Another pointed out that "if you do raise issues not on the agenda, especially as regards women and girls, you're seen as a feminist, and that's a 'bad thing.'" Another quipped sarcastically, "We *did* women in the eighties; let's move on."

### **We don't fund "nasty"**

While some of these complaints are obviously specific to women and play out the "norm" phenomena, others are a function of other institutional habits, not necessarily linked to gender per se. "Most foundation executives don't want to take on the nasty stuff," one program officer pointed out. "It's endemic. We're rewarded for being safe, rewarded for funding a program that looks good, not one that tackles a nasty problem."

### **Accountable to whom?**

Another foundation executive pointed out that, while any organization has a hard time changing itself, foundations are too often intractable, especially when it comes to "discomfort" issues like race, ethnicity, and gender. The private sector may be forced to change because of changing markets. Government may be slow to get started but is eventually responsive to political constituencies. Yet there are few real spurs for change in foundation culture. Most foundations are small institutions, with little turnover in personnel or board positions, and because of the power dynamics built into the giving away of money, foundation executives seldom get honest feedback from outside constituencies. In the opinion of most people of color interviewed for this publication, few foundations, even those best intentioned, have really grappled with what it means to root out racism or sexism within foundation cultures, even as more women have moved into positions of foundation leadership.

### **"Been there, done that"**

Another foundation executive blames the culture at large and general lack of will within foundation leadership: "diversity is just not a priority for us anymore." There is a sense that the efforts to make a difference, the drive to push for a more diverse workforce, more diverse leadership and board composition, has significantly slipped in the last few years. "Leadership for these issues comes from the top, it has to come from the top," as one foundation executive noted, but with few exceptions, many of those interviewed see "the top" as unwilling to buck anti-equity trends in the culture at large. Even people who might want to do something take a "bigger political hit" for their efforts because "there's not a lot of support for affirmative action efforts out there." So the prevailing sense of leadership becomes "if we can find women or people of color, that's wonderful, great, but we're not going out of our way to find them. That's not our responsibility," is how one foundation executive of color paraphrased his peers: "It's all been done now."

### **There's never enough time**

Another foundation executive noted "there's never time to have sustained conversations, so you can't easily bring along a board or show them new evidence they really need but they might be resistant to at first." Still another program officer echoed this time pressure: "Everything has to be relevant *tomorrow*. We need to see results too quickly. We need to see results we can measure easily. There's too much pressure to fund what's safe, to look good." Or as another program officer scoffed, "Today it's [fill in the blank]; tomorrow it's the progressive 'program du jour.'"

Several foundation executives interviewed also noted the irony of the current economy. They point out that foundations all have more money than they had three years ago, so much more that some foundations are actually having a "payout problem"--needing to give away more money in

a hurry to satisfy federal tax laws. Instead of giving funders more confidence in their ability to take on longer term, more complex problems, however, this additional money, one respondent noted, means that there's even more of a tendency to ask, "What are the issues I can fix quick?"

### **Women's "problems"**

Women's "problems," especially the problems of poor women of color, are more subtle, much harder to solve in the short term, to show a beginning, a middle, and an end. This same respondent noted that a funder like George Soros, apparently seen as a maverick by many in the funding community, is one of the few major funders taking on hard issues like drugs, prisons, civil and human rights that don't get resolved quickly--and not afraid to name problems as "women's issues." Another funder notes that gender is "so all-encompassing" that many just do not see its functioning: "Ethnicity and race are external 'categories of cognizance,'" she notes. "Gender is invisible, but the good news is that some men of color, at least, are starting to 'get' gender as an oppression as insidious as race." Another woman of color board member notes that its "when gender and race are glued with poverty that it really gets stuck. Coming up with solutions that work take time, lots of time and lots of innovation."

### **Conservatives are effective funders**

The irony this executive also points out is that, for the most part, conservative foundations are the funders with the long view, the foundations most committed to funding massive social change by funding change in both national attitudes and public policy. The only problem is that conservatives are building an image of philanthropy that's charity for the neediest--with a strong emphasis on the poor "pulling themselves up by their sandal straps," as one respondent noted, without doing anything about root causes of poverty or discrimination: efficient, even radical, but all about keeping Norm firmly in the executive seat.

### **Importance of boards**

A number of respondents interviewed for this publication pointed out the importance of diverse voices on boards. As one board member of a major foundation noted, "Unless you've got a critical mass [of people who understand diversity] on a board, you can mouth all the great things you want to do, but you'll have a disconnect on how you're implementing. You won't see the contradictions, and [as a board member] you're certainly not going to be confronted in any way that will alienate you." More board education is needed, more inservice work that helps boards "get" the issues at deeper than skin level.

This same respondent asked, "What makes the 'click' happen; what makes folks get it?" There is consensus among those interviewed that many board members are people who "believe the words" about the importance of a diverse institutional culture and program areas that tackle systemic social problems, but they need to be shown ways to connect their values to action: "Yes, we're going to do this. Now we're 'walking our talk' and seeing the values of the organization come alive." One board member suggests a strategy of more involvement, with board members working in major program areas, being involved in committees and feeling like being a part of "making it happen."

### **Importance of leadership**

There may be a vested interest on the part of some executive officers and program officers in keeping the board out of day-to-day business. ("Boards are expected to keep hands off, rubber-stamp executive decisions," one board member noted. "The last thing a CEO wants is a meddling board.") But there is also a sense among interviewed board members that a board member who knows "where the rubber hits the road in the organization, not just the rubber on the stamp," will be a more creative, productive board member. And leaders need to be strong enough, imaginative enough to bring boards along on the "sticky stuff." Another board member asks, "Who's monitoring the overall institutional progress? Who's minding the big picture? How can we get out in front of the curve so that foundation work coincides with policy work: long-term foundation work should be reflected in policy changes."

"It's hard work," another respondent notes who's a board member of one of the largest foundations in the country. "We're talking societal transformation, but it's easier to tinker around the edges. It's hard to ask the tough questions." Intractable problems that stem from racism, systemic economic discrimination, and a culture that, as one board member noted, seems to "thrive on violence," are not going to be solved easily nor solved alone. "We need to be talking coalitions across sectors, major national coalitions that draw strength in numbers." Maybe no one foundation can tackle these problems alone with any assurance of impact, but "we surely can work together better with nonprofits and government agencies and other groups that all share expertise on different dimensions of these issues. These underlying cultural issues--racism, class, gender bias--are at the root of so many intractable problems in this country. How do we get back on the national agenda?"

"We're all struggling, struggling for frameworks to talk better, talk different about these issues," another respondent noted. "These are issues that silence most people. We need to partner with other organizations to find new language and get out in front, to start leading the conversation instead of just joining in when it hits Rivera or Oprah."

### **But there are innovations**

Besides this perceived need echoed by a number of respondents for more assertive philanthropic leadership and coalition building, other insights and strategies have evolved in the last decade. Two of the largest established foundations in the country, for example, now stress active use of a "gender lens" in reviewing grant initiatives. At least one foundation is experimenting with being a venture capitalist, taking on the role of social entrepreneur by picking three or four organizations and investing in them over a long period of time, partnering with them and learning through the process. The Council on Foundations itself has taken a proactive role in strengthening affinity groups, in encouraging evaluation, in helping family foundations and community foundations grow while avoiding the traps of institutional rigor mortis. And other nonprofits like The Philanthropic Initiative in Boston work with family and corporate foundations as well as with individuals to help them think through new strategies for innovative philanthropy that include an intentional focus on women and girls (Remmer 1997).

Among innovative foundations addressing the needs of women and girls since the 1970s, however, are the women's funds themselves--a growing phenomenon that has helped to make the case in communities around the country for the importance of funding women and girls and for

the importance of diversifying both foundations themselves and the ways they give away their money.

***WOMEN'S FUNDS:  
CHANGING THE FACE OF PHILANTHROPY***

**Growth of assets**

As of 1997, more than 100 women's funds have formed, including three in Canada and one United States-based fund whose grants are international. Women's funds steadily increase in numbers, with more forming in some years than others, and as one enthusiast noted, "They are a gathering force." They have been a gathering force since the early 1970s, when eight funds led the way, among them the Ms. Foundation for Women (1972), the Women's Sports Foundation (1974), Women's Way (formerly Women's Way of Philadelphia 1975), and the Astraea National Lesbian Action Foundation (1977).

These eight joined three existing funds, the oldest of which, the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, formed in 1888 and the second oldest, the Business and Professional Women's Foundation, in 1956. In the 1980s, 50 new foundations joined the original eleven and in the 1990s another 40 brought the total to 101. Even more impressive, according to estimates by the Women's Funding Network (WFN), over 70 percent have survived, with six of the original eleven still going strong (Women's Funding Network 1997a, 1998).

The Women's Funding Network, with an initial group of 20 member funds, first convened in 1985 as the National Network for Women's Funds. Their charge was to "develop communications and mutual assistance among funds, to plan a second conference, to establish a clearinghouse of information, and to provide leadership and attention to diversity and 'isms'" (Women's Funding Network 1997b, p. 1), and Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy (renamed Women and Philanthropy in 1995) served as fiscal sponsor. In 1990, the Network made the decision to incorporate separately as a 501(c)(3), and in 1991, the Network became an affinity group of the Council on Foundations.

The Network conducted its initial survey of funds in 1986. Fifteen funds reported raising \$4.8 million in 1985. By 1991, six years later, the number of funds had more than doubled, and the 38 funds surveyed reported raising \$12.9 million. By 1994, the amount of dollars raised had doubled, with 33 funds reporting nearly \$25 million and with estimated net assets topping \$40 million in 1994 (Women's Funding Network 1997b).

The amount of dollars distributed by women's funds also showed dramatic growth. In 1985, 10 funds reported grants and allocations of \$1.2 million. By 1991, those amounts had increased five-fold, with 38 funds reporting grants and allocations of \$6.2 million. By 1994, grants and allocations had jumped to over \$9 million.

According to WFN, the actual totals raised and distributed by the funds is probably even higher. Again the problem is data collection. Not all WFN members report funds raised and grants allocated. But the biggest gap in accessible data comes from women's funds that are part of community foundations and unable to provide IRS 990 forms or financial reports with data

comparable to that collected by the other funds. WFN's Women's Funds Database Project is developing methodologies to capture these reports and verify data via 990 or 990 PF forms and some reporting mechanism for funds in community foundations. Once the database project is producing reports, the Network expects more funds to complete the forms.

Despite the difficulties in data collection, WFN was able to use comparable sets of 28 funds to arrive at some basic comparisons between 1993 and 1994 fiscal years. Net assets for those 28 funds increased 31.3 percent in one year: from \$30.7 million in net assets in 1993 to \$40.3 million in 1994. Amounts raised in the same period increased almost 50 percent, from \$16.4 million in 1993 to \$24.6 million in 1994. Amounts granted or allocated increased 16.7 percent in the same period, from \$7.8 million in 1993 to \$9.1 million in 1994.

The Women's Funding Network also tracked increases in net assets for a set of eight funds from 1992 through 1996 and reports a jump of 79.8 percent in the eight funds combined net assets for that five-year period, from almost \$14 million in 1992 to over \$25 million in 1996. Of that set of eight, the three newest funds--one nine years old and two oldest eleven years old--had the largest increase in net assets, ranging from an almost eight-fold increase for the nine-year old fund to over 650 percent and 231 percent respectively for the eleven-year-old funds.

Looking at the distribution of contributions received is interesting. Of the \$16 million that 22 funds reporting raising in 1994, for example, over 67 percent came from corporations and foundations, although individuals accounted for over 90 percent of those making contributions. Over 68 percent of the 22 funds reported raising over \$300,000 in 1994, and 18 percent of funds reporting raised over \$1 million. Corporations tended to contribute at higher levels: 32 percent of their giving was in the \$25,000-50,000 range. Foundations tended to give smaller contributions: 59 percent gave at \$5,000 or less. Less than one percent of contributions came from bequests, although the majority of those gifts were in the \$10,000-25,000 range and expected to be small, given the relatively young age of the funds. The majority (64%) of the 22 funds reporting awarded over \$100,000 in grants and allocations in 1994, with three making grants totaling over \$1 million (The Women's Fund Survey Report 1997, p. 8, 16).

Once WFN has more of this kind of information available from its database project, it will be able to trace more complex patterns and trends among the funds. Such information will provide a useful tool for assessing what components combine for success, e.g. variables like age, size and composition of boards, fundraising strategies used, and so forth.

### **Diversity on Fund Boards and Staff**

From its inception, the Women's Funding Network has been committed to modeling diversity within the Network itself and its member funds and also considers fundraising and disbursement key strategies for empowering women from all classes and racial/ethnic groups. For example, 1996 WFN data on 27 member fund boards show 66 percent European American, 16 percent African American, six percent Latina, four percent Asian/Pacific, two percent indigenous, one percent multiracial, one percent "other," and four percent not reporting. Although 30 percent of board members were not identified by sexual orientation, 64 percent were reported as heterosexual, five percent lesbian or gay, and one percent other--bisexual, transgender, or celibate (Women's Funding Network 1998, p. 21).

Compare WFN member board composition (34 percent nonwhite in 1996) with the Council on Foundation member board composition (9.8 percent nonwhite in 1994), and it quickly becomes apparent why women's funds are a crucible for understanding the concept of more equal access to decision-making. What the data do not yet show are patterns of class access--levels of income and wealth among board members and staff.

### **A Wealth of Possibilities**

Much more data needs to be gathered. A primary scope of this publication, however, is looking at what *is* known about funding for women and girls.

Is gender transformative? But before doing so, implications in one last area of research need to be explored, that of women's funds as crucibles, models for doing philanthropy differently. Marsha Shapiro Rose, in a 1994 article "Philanthropy in a Different Voice: The Women's Funds," argues that, as "gendered organizations," women's funds "represent a unique opportunity to study the transformative power that gender exerts on organizational structure and direction" (p. 233). It is beyond the scope of this publication to do a detailed critique of this analysis. Suffice it to say that some of the same stereotypes recycled in the literature about women as donors surface again in analysis of organizations as "gendered."

It is important to understand more about women's funds and how they work. But detailed analyses need data, data that the WFN Women's Funds Database Project will provide: on the one hand, what and who gets funded for how much and, on the other hand, information about the age of the funds, size and composition of boards, volunteer structures, staff organization, fundraising strategies--and even the institutional culture of funds, however that can be measured.

We need better questions. And it *is* important to understand how the constraints, complexities, innovations, and institutional cultures of women's funds affect the ways in which organizations attract and disperse money. But it is also important to free these analyses from stereotypes that, among other dangers, encourage asking the wrong questions. Studying women's funds alone, as Marsha Shapiro Rose did in her 1994 article, risks exactly those dangers. Although her analysis provides thoughtful insights into the culture of this set of women-led organizations, how gender affects institutional structures can never be understood until matched sets of differently-gendered organizations are analyzed. The more appropriate questions to ask in analyzing available data are how innovations in organizational structure occur in the first place, change over time, and, perhaps most important, enable women's funds to "walk their talk" and deliver the goods: more money for women and girls.

And women's funds do reflect innovations in organizational structures and do deliver their goods. Virtually unanimously, women's funds are committed to democratizing both fundraising and decision-making about fund disbursements. Aiming to break through class barriers both "up" and "down"--for fundraising *and* decision-making--women's funds, like many other women's organizations, are doing things differently. Based on interview responses, the focus for the rest of this section is on how they have done their work.

Strategic funding. A "traditional" foundation executive who sees the breadth of women's funds' successes points out that "women's funds are strengthening the very fabric of the community organizations they fund. They take on the whole enchilada," including "nasty" grants that

traditional funders tend to avoid. This breadth of funding has its obvious downsides. One program officer in a traditional foundation was reminded of an unsettling conversation with a woman who insisted that "every woman's organization deserves money...and we've got to fund 'em!" And another foundation executive noted that many of the women's funds are not seen as professional grantmakers in the larger philanthropic community. "They don't have programs sliced the same way as other foundations. Their funding areas are more disaggregated."

Other respondents counter this impression of indiscriminate funding by pointing out that many of the funds *have* in fact developed sophisticated capacities to identify strategic program areas, to niche their giving, though their "enchilada" may be larger and differently defined than the ingredients of traditional funding. "The problem may be more of a case of not communicating how well they do," one executive noted. And there are also debates about whether "niche" funding *is* strategic (Shuman 1998).

Influencing other foundations. Yet respondents, especially those not affiliated with women's funds, also commented on funds' influence on other foundations. "They put issues on the map...in their communities, [and] they've helped larger foundations to think more strategically about women." Women's funds like the Ms. Foundation have also learned to build partnerships and collaboratives as they grow, leveraging funding from other foundations on behalf of their grantees and key program areas like economic development and girls.

On the other hand, some women's funds have also annoyed "mainstream" funders with what is dismissively labeled "p.c. smugness." "Sure, we've all got to do a better job empowering women and minorities," one foundation executive contended, "but this is a business where image is important, and the way *not* to have influence is to claim you're 'doing it right' and everyone else is 'doing it wrong.'" While respondents saw a cross-section of the funds as vigorous, entrepreneurial, principle-based, and learning from their experience, they also noted that at least a few others tend to be "stuck in jargon, negative attitudes toward wealth, and politically-correct behavior," with the emphasis on "stuck."

Still, many positive influences are apparent, especially where women's funds' staff and boards move into "mainstream" foundations or consultancies. Women's funds' boards, especially, are seen as training grounds for both diversity and empowerment. "Board members get excellent grantmaking experience--experience making good grants and experience working with diverse people to do that. Then they transition off the board and go on to have real impact elsewhere."

One observation many respondents made had to do with the importance of women's funds being more active and having a more visible presence in the larger philanthropic coalitions; the Regional Associations of Grantmakers (RAGs), for example, and affinity groups, conferences, and committees of the Council on Foundations and the National Network of Grantmakers. Some RAGs don't let women's funds be members, one respondent pointed out, "but surely this is something the Council on Foundations can help to change."

While the Women's Funding Network itself was praised for its participation among the affinity groups, National Network of Grantmakers, and the Council on Foundations, many respondents also noted the importance of more of the funds themselves getting active. "That's a strategic way of moving agendas at both national and regional levels: serve on RAG and Council committees."

Democratizing donors. Clearly an area in which respondents considered women's funds to excel is their outreach to different kinds of donors. Different, that is, from traditional philanthropy in both method of outreach and type of donor. Researchers Susan Ostrander and Joan Fisher note that in so far as women's funds have learned to build two-way mutually-beneficial relationships between organizations and donors, they are in many respects the wave of the future (Ostrander and Fisher 1995).

Researcher Kathleen Kelly tests four models of fundraising that have evolved since the turn of the century: press agentry, public information, two-way asymmetrical, and two-way symmetrical. The first three still dominate much of traditional charitable fundraising, but Kelly makes a strong case for the last becoming standard. Clear communication, exchanges between asker and giver are essential, according to Kelly, and partnering with both donors and grantees is something that women's organizations have learned to do well (Kelly 1995).

The styles of women's funds--both asking and giving--appeal to a wide range of donors. One Hispanic female organizational executive noted that many wealthy Latinas who are normally skeptical of organized philanthropy contribute to women's funds. What appeals to them is the diversity of grantees, especially the funds' support of grassroots' organizations. But they also feel welcomed as donors because they are taken seriously and "don't feel as managed." One respondent was critical of at least one fund she saw losing touch with their donor bases, for raising money from donors of color, for example, then not getting that money out to the community fast enough. But most respondents had nothing but praise for the strategies many women's funds used to reach a diverse group of new donors.

Democratizing donors includes class diversity. There are debates in the philanthropic community about the impact of class diversity on boards as well as among donors. Many feel the funds have done an excellent job of empowering women with more limited means as donors: "Women's funds have broken the rules, aiming to treat all donors equally. It's the same stretch, after all, for some women to give \$100 as it is for others to give \$10,000." But there is also criticism that some of the funds avoid women of wealth, even when they know they need them to build stable endowments. "They do a better job diversifying 'down' than 'up,'" one respondent said. "Would you believe that some are *proud* not to have an endowment? They're still looking at money as 'good' and 'bad': Really."

From another angle, another respondent notes that women's funds understandably demonstrate little patience with "'affluenza,' the sickness of being rich," the baggage some women's fund leaders say that some women of wealth bring to the table. But another respondent observes that even some "normal" women of wealth are made to feel unwelcome: "You've got to cut holes in your jeans [to be accepted], and it helps if you don't like your parents."

These are not easy issues. Acknowledging the existence of privilege flies in the face of the American myth of a classless society. Yet like much of society, traditional philanthropic culture caters to wealth. Many donors are used to being treated deferentially. One fund executive noted that "the women's funding movement as a movement has learned much from those hardy women of wealth who slugged it out and took their licks with the rest of us."

One of the key challenges facing the funds as they grow is how they can keep attracting women with both inherited and earned wealth--wealth that is crucial for the long-term viability of the

funds--without getting bogged down in painful class conflicts. As one respondent noted, the difficulties the funds experience are a function of their taking on these challenges that are so often taboo in the rest of the culture. These are not conflicts among women so much as they are reflections of ambiguities about wealth and the meaning of wealth in a wealth-driven society that still claims it doesn't have royalty.

Singing together and tooting one's horn. One concern that surfaces for many respondents has to do with communications, usually the lack of effective communications internally and externally. Funds need better internal communications to do transitions more effectively, to institutionalize gains, to do more donor education, and to bring new people along. In spite of what seemed often endless struggles for consensus, there was still a sense--especially among those outside the funds--that not everybody was "singing from the same hymnal." Some of these critiques had to do with rifts between donors and staff, especially where they concerned class-based tensions. Some respondents are critical of leaders who "take off without their staffs"; others note that this style may be attributable to the fact that so many leaders in the first generation of women's funds' are entrepreneurs. Many see a need for fewer entrepreneurs and more institution builders among the second generation of fund leaders.

Others leveled criticism against the funds for lack of a more visible public presence, especially in the media. Many understand this to be a function of relatively scarce resources, but they also suggested that funds could have a stronger voice and greater impact, especially if they worked collectively. A stronger public voice could help to build the case nationally for the importance of funding women and girls and promote the success of the funds themselves. This is a role many see the Women's Funding Network playing more visibly in the future. "We need star power," one leader noted, "a national superstar to be a spokesperson for the Network in the media." But the funds themselves also need to be on the local news more and become an active part of other national coalitions to make the issues they fund more visible.

Part of the problem may have to do with age and experience. "We aren't thinking big enough," one women's fund leader noted, "and we haven't stepped up to the roles we can play, the influence we can have." Another observed that "we're all relatively young organizations; we've tended to think locally, not nationally." But there is increasing pressure on this to change. "If women's funds could show they were all part of the same movement, working together, it would really encourage donors," another funder suggested.

Future dollars. The first monograph in this series points out constraints faced by women's organizations and women's funds. Adequate core support. Achieving economies of scale to reduce administrative costs. Availability of capacity-building resources. Support for infrastructure funding like media and public outreach. All are key to any movement's success. A number of respondents noted how crucial it is for the larger philanthropic community to understand more fully the importance of women's funds' accomplishments. "Not unlike Ginger Rogers dancing with Fred Astaire," quipped one respondent, "they're doing everything he does but doing it in high heels and doing it backwards." (She quickly noted she was speaking metaphorically, "Since many women don't wear high heels anymore and of course not all dance with men.... But you get what I mean.") The consensus is that women's funds have done a lot of "dirty work" for the sector and done it remarkably well, considering their limited resources and a public climate increasingly hostile to the constituents they serve.

What's needed? Lots more money. "Traditional philanthropy needs to invest in successful funds and invest big time," one donor noted. Several foundation CEOs pointed out that big foundations helped develop the community foundations and need to do the same for women's funds. They stressed that large foundations need to "invest in skill-building [for the women's funds]; they need what the funds have learned to create: a culture that's much more respectful of people." There's a "wealth of possibilities there," another donor urged. "Let's fund it."

## ***RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOWUP***

So what conclusions can be drawn from these analyses? To summarize, this monograph looks at the available data on "organized" philanthropy as it affects women and girls. In spite of more than two decades of work, advocates for women and girls claim resources supporting a broad range of important programs, services, policy, and research for women and girls have not significantly increased. Many claim that organized philanthropy shortchanges women and girls, and the available data, inadequate as it is, would seem to bear them out.

This monograph also looks at data on foundation leadership and staff--especially boards, CEOs, and program officers--and probes the paradoxes that both leaders and program staff in mainstream foundations feel thwarted. There is evidence to suggest that few foundations are interested in pursuing diversity that is more than skin-deep. And there is the growing paradox that philanthropy itself is becoming a "feminized" profession, yet relatively few philanthropic resources seem to be reaching women's and girls' organizations and programs, especially organizations serving women and girls of color.

Finally, this monograph looks at women's funds and concludes that they and other progressive foundations have helpful innovations and funding strategies to bring to organized philanthropy. Women's funds themselves have rich opportunities to "seize the historical moment" by tapping significant amounts of the upcoming intergenerational wealth transfer and setting their sights even higher for serving their constituencies.

### **Research**

- ***Develop new research initiatives to probe endemic racism and gender biases within organized philanthropy.*** Expand interviews with mainstream foundation leaders and staff and conduct peer-level focus groups (board members with board members, presidents with presidents, program staff with program staff) to get at the roots of these "what's-in-the-air conditioning" biases that apparently make it so difficult for both women and men of color to feel part of and succeed within mainstream philanthropy.

How can mainstream philanthropy take a harder look at itself when there is so little internal evaluation on these concerns? Do foundation executives seldom hear painful truths from those unwilling to "bite the hands that feed them"--or is this perception, not fact? Is limited board turnover a problem? What in fact are opportunities for promotion of people of color within foundations? How wide-spread are anti-affirmative action agendas in the culture-at-large and does foundation leadership reflect what seems to be wider discomfort with new equity initiatives?

These and similar questions go to the heart of much off-the-record criticism of foundations. Mechanisms need to be established that can fund and produce new research "safely." Because affinity groups, researchers, even researchers' affiliate institutions are all dependent on foundations' good will and largess, with few exceptions--work produced by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, for example--research that might be potentially critical of foundations is seldom undertaken by researchers or research organizations. One suggestion might be to have this proposed research funded by pooled grants from several

foundations and conducted, at least in part, by anonymous researchers working with corporate focus group specialists not tied to the philanthropic community.

- ***Develop collaborative research efforts that would enable a sample of foundations to evaluate the effectiveness of their grantmaking efforts.*** Who is benefiting from current grants initiatives? Who is actually receiving the funds? Are "universal" grants actually reaching women and men, girls and boys in comparable numbers as many foundations claim? Boston researcher Molly Mead is currently working on a project reviewing grants to youth projects and organizations in the greater Boston area and the extent to which the money actually reaches girls and girls' organizations (Mead 1997a). This type of query could be expanded to a program area aimed at adults and evaluated for the effectiveness of a handful of "universal" or "generic" grants from national funders: Did the grants succeed in their stated purpose? Who are the intended beneficiary groups? Does the money reach women and men equitably? If not, why not? If so, how did it reach them, how were the grants coded when submitted to the Foundation Center, and how can the field do a better job of tracking/coding those kinds of grants in future data collection. Did the money reaching girls replicate old, sexist assumptions or was it as effective as funding targeted with a "gender lens"?
- ***Highlight "best practices" of diversity initiatives.*** What works to diversify a foundation's board and staff? Select three or four women's funds and women's organizations that are thought to be the most effective at diversifying boards and staffs and describe in detail how they do it. This report could also draw on the expertise of the affinity groups, involving them as research advisers. And it could use the experiences of women's organizations to talk about organizational diversity in ways that would add to the existing research literature, much of which seems to focus on racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity, but talks little about gender or sexual orientation diversity in the same framework and seldom grapples with intersecting linkages among these identities.
- ***Highlight a "best practices" collaboration model.*** Select sites where women's funds, "mainstream" foundations, nonprofit agencies, grassroots groups, and research centers are some or all working together on one or more defined program initiatives. The Ms. Foundation, for example, has launched two collaborative funds: the Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development, which began grantmaking in 1991 with \$2.2 million in grants, and the Collaborative Fund for Healthy Girls/Healthy Women, which began grantmaking in 1997. Building on the Ms. Foundation's experience with these "peer learning models," for example, further research can look at the process of collaboration itself (who initiates, who funds, how is the balance of power played out, how are goals set and implemented, how do partners influence each other, and so forth), at the outcomes of the collaboration (e.g. leveraging additional funds, expanded donor awareness) and at the impacts on all the participating organizations. Evaluate the effectiveness of grants/joint initiatives funded by or influenced by the collaborations.

As background, document with brief descriptions all instances where Women's Funding Network members have collaborated with mainstream foundations to find funding partners and leverage grants. (This is crucial since one of the critiques of women's funds from "mainstream"

philanthropy is that some women's funds are not "professional," are not leveraging their dollars by targeting program areas and building coalitions with other mainstream funders.)

- **Analyze "cross-fertilization"** (roles and impact) of women who have worked as board or staff in women's funds after they've moved into mainstream philanthropy or other organizations in the region, and analyze instances of mainstream philanthropy executives and board members moving into women's organizations.
- **Analyze successful staff and board leadership transitions.** Many organizations, large and small, struggle with issues of transition and few formal guidelines are out there to help--at least few that seem to really grasp the complexities of leadership transitions in organizations that have been immersed in intentional experiments with hierarchies and collaborative leadership styles. A report that explored in depth several successful recent organizational transitions, especially if it looked at foundations and both grassroots and national nonprofits, could be a significant help to organizations struggling with staff and board turnover.
- **Do background research for a board initiative.** More data are needed about the roles of people of color and white women on boards of both women's funds and "mainstream" foundations. Building on work Women & Philanthropy and others have done on boards, one strategy for collecting more data might be to use an expanded "snowball" technique to select a short list of effective women on boards and interview them: What are the key issues they face as board members? What are differences for women on all-women, racially/culturally diverse boards vs. women on male-heavy or white boards? How are women appointed, trained or oriented to the culture of the foundation? What has most effectively made the case for funding women and girls on their boards? Look at board referral resources: How could these be expanded to make available experienced people of color and white women to serve on all kinds of foundation boards? What strategies would be the most helpful for raising the consciousness of other women on boards?
- **Do background research for a leadership initiative** that could look at similar issues for executive directors, especially issues facing women of color as they move into positions of leadership both within women's organizations and mainstream philanthropy. How are women recruited for leadership positions and what are the constraints they experience. More research is needed to update earlier work like Judy Remington's study of Twin Cities women's organizations (1991) and Women and Foundations/ Corporate Philanthropy's 1993 survey of women CEOs in philanthropy (Garafolo).
- **Develop a one-page survey form for all affinity** groups to use in collecting demographic information and positions held by their members.

### **Implementation Strategies**

- **Increase efforts to build coalitions** among women's funds, mainstream foundations, government funding agencies, and other groups on specific funding initiatives that can "translate" gender concerns into the language used in mainstream foundations' current program areas. As several respondents noted in interviews for this publication, working

together is often one of the best ways to learn from each other on issues that may be much harder to discuss in the abstract.

- ***Develop a trustees' board placement service.*** Implement a comprehensive trustees board placement service, working with or modeled on the Catalyst Corporate Board Placement service, that could diversify those appointed to women's funds boards but also make a more diverse list of trustees available, including those with experience on women's funds' boards, to mainstream foundations.
- ***Launch a peer-to-peer mentoring program*** for philanthropy professionals, introducing experienced board members, for example, with new board members who may not be as “up” on issues like those described in this monograph series.
- ***Develop new strategies and opportunities for peer-to-peer communication,*** especially among philanthropic leadership and board members, to help philanthropy “walk its talk.”
- ***Use the clout of foundations to build cross-sector coalitions*** of organizations that are working to transform the way society understands race/ethnicity, class, and gender: this could take the form of a series of regional conferences, a national teleconference, or issue-specific collaboration that linked researchers, policy specialists, funders, and activists all working on the issue.
- ***Build a major multi-foundation initiative to raise regrating funds*** for women's funds and other organizations working to promote diversity strategies.
- ***Encourage mainstream philanthropy to use its clout to move public policy agendas.***
- ***Develop a collaborative, national media campaign*** linked to regional and local media campaigns that can begin to counter the “bad rap” suffered in the media by those most women's organizations serve, that can translate sophisticated, theoretical, research-based understanding of race/ethnicity, class, and gender issues to the wider public. What will it take to make the case in the national media? In regional/local media? Begin locally: what are the issues, the new language, the sound bites, the convincing messages in local communities that dramatize the existence of persistent bias in most women's lives and appeal to donors? Link local initiatives to each other and to a multi-year national media strategy for a broad coalition of women's organizations.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Abzug, Rikki. 1996. "New Frontiers: Women and Girls Encounter the Nonprofit Sector." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 6 (Spring):311-15.
- Abzug, Rikki, and Christy L. Beaudin. 1994. *Women on Board: Parallel and Subordinate Power Structures/Cultures in Voluntarism and Trusteeship*. Project on Non-Profit Organizations Working Paper No. 211. New Haven: Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University.
- Bell, Ella L. 1990. "The Bicultural Life Experience of Career-Oriented Black Women." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 11:459-77.
- Bonavoglia, Angela. 1989. *Far from Done: The Status of Women and Girls in America*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- , 1991. *Making a Difference: The Impact of Women in Philanthropy*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- , 1992. *Getting It Done: From Commitment to Action on Funding for Women and Girls*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- , 1994. *The Trustee Connection: Making a Difference*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- Bradshaw, Pat, Vic Murray, and Jacob Wolpin. 1996. "Women on Boards of Nonprofits: What Difference Do They Make?" *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 6 (Spring):241-54.
- Bridging Worlds Apart: Questions and Actions for Grantmaking with a Gender Lens*. 1995: Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University.
- Brilliant, Eleanor. "Fund Raising as an Empowerment Strategy for Women." In *Citizens, Society, and State: Social Subjectivity and Development Processes*, ed. A. Cancedda, 61-76. Bari, Italy.
- Burbridge, Lynn C. 1995. *Status of African Americans in Grantmaking Institutions*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.
- Burke, Ronald J. 1994. "Benefits of Women on Corporate Boards of Directors as Reported by Male CEOs." *Psychological Reports* 75 (August):329-30.
- , 1996. "Why Aren't More Women on Corporate Boards?: Views of Women Directors." *Psychological Reports* 79 (December):840-42.
- Capek, Mary Ellen S. 1988. "Women as Trustees." In *Women in Academe: Progress and Prospects*, ed. Mariam K. Chamberlain. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Capek, Mary Ellen S., and Susan A. Hallgarth, eds. 1995. *Who Benefits, Who Decides? An Agenda for Improving Philanthropy: The Case for Women and Girls*. New York: National Council for Research on Women.
- Carson, Emmett D. 1987. "The Contemporary Charitable Giving and Voluntarism of Black Women." In *Women and Philanthropy: Past, Present, Future*. Working Paper. New York: Center for the Study of Philanthropy, City University of New York Graduate School and University Center.
- , 1994. *A Hand Up: Black Philanthropy and Self-Help in America*. Washington DC: University Press of America.

- Castle, Ann. 1997. *Women in Philanthropy: A Bibliography and Resource List*.  
HTTP://WWW.HAMILTON.EDU/HTML/PERSONAL/ACASTLE.
- Catalyst. 1996. *Women on Corporate Boards: The Challenge of Change*. New York: Catalyst.
- Chakravartty, S. 1991. *Far From Done: Women, Funding and Foundations in North Carolina and the Southeast*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- Chakravartty, S. 1992. *Far From Done: Women, Funding and Foundations in Wisconsin*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- Chamberlain, Mariam, and Alison Bernstein. 1992. "Philanthropy and the Emergence of Women's Studies." In *Teacher's College Record*. Montpelier VT: Capital City Press.
- Chambré, Susan M. 1993. "Parallel Power Structures, Invisible Careers, Benevolence, and Reform: Implications of Women's Philanthropy." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 4 (Winter):233-40.
- , 1997. "Jewish Women's Philanthropy." In *Jewish Women in America: An Historical Encyclopedia*, eds. Paula Hyman and Deborah Dash Moore. New York: Routledge.
- Chicago Women in Philanthropy. No date. *ClearSighted: A Grantmaker's Guide to Using a Gender Lens*. Chicago: Chicago Women in Philanthropy.
- Congressional Research Service. 1994. *A Brief Legislative History of United States Efforts to Promote Women in Development*. Washington DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Council on Foundations. 1996. *Foundation Management Report, Eighth Edition*. Washington DC: Council on Foundations.
- , 1997. *1997 Grantmakers Salary Report*. Unpublished Draft. Washington DC: Council on Foundations.
- Covington, Sally. 1997. *Moving a Public Policy Agenda: The Strategic Philanthropy of Conservative Foundations*. Washington DC: National Committee on Responsive Philanthropy.
- Cox, Jr., Taylor. 1993. *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Diaz, William A. 1996. "The Behavior of Foundations in an Organizational Frame: A Case Study." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 25:453-469.
- Eberhart, Catherine Velasquez, and Jon Pratt. 1993. *Minnesota Philanthropy: Grants and Beneficiaries*. St. Paul MN: Minnesota Council of Nonprofits.
- Feminist Majority Foundation. 1991. *Empowering Women in Philanthropy*. Arlington VA: Feminist Majority Foundation.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 1984. *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fernandez, John P. 1991. *Managing a Diverse Workforce: Regaining the Competitive Edge*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Patricia Yancy Martin, eds. 1994. *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Filer Commission. 1977. *Research Papers Sponsored by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs*. Washington DC: US Department of the Treasury.

- Fletcher, J. 1994. "Castrating the Female Advantage: Feminist Standpoint Research and Management Science." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 3(1):74-82.
- Ford Foundation. 1974. *That 51 Per Cent: Ford Foundation Activities Related to Opportunities for Women*. New York: The Ford Foundation.
- . 1979. *Financial Support of Women's Programs in the 1970's: A Review of Private and Government Funding in the United States and Abroad*. New York: The Ford Foundation.
- The Foundation Center. 1997. *Grant\$ for Women and Girls*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Furnari, Ellen, Carol Mollner, Teresa Odendahl, and Aileen Shaw. 1997. *Exemplary Grantmaking Practices Manual*. San Diego: National Network of Grantmakers.
- Gale Research. 1997. *Encyclopedia of Associations CD-ROM, Gale Global Access: Associations*. Chicago: Gale Research.
- Galvin, Katherine. 1990. *Far from Done: The Challenge of Diversifying Philanthropic Leadership*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- Garofalo, Gitana. 1993. *Women Taking Power: The Quest for Equality*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- Gelb, Joyce. 1990. *Feminism and Philanthropy in the United States and England*. Working paper. Center for the Study of Philanthropy at the City University of New York Graduate School and University Center.
- Gittell, Marilyn, Sally Covington, and Jill Gross. *The Difference Gender Makes: Women in Neighborhood Development Organizations*. New York: Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, City University of New York Graduate School and University Center.
- Gittell, Marilyn, Jill Gross, and Kathe Newman. 1994. *Race and Gender in Neighborhood Development Organizations*. New York: Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, City University of New York Graduate School and University Center.
- Glass Ceiling Commission. 1995. *Good for Business: Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital*. A Fact-Finding Report of the Glass Ceiling Commission. Washington DC: US Department of Labor.
- Green, Laura. 1985. *Shortchanged: Chicago Foundations' and Corporations' Funding of Women's Organizations*. Chicago: Donors Forum of Chicago.
- Guinier, Lani, Michelle Fine, and Jane Balin. 1994. "Becoming Gentlemen: Women's Experience at One Ivy League Law School." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 143 (November):1-110.
- Hallgarth, Susan A., ed. 1992. *A Directory of National Women's Organizations*. New York: National Council for Research on Women.
- Harquail, Celia V., and Taylor Cox, Jr. 1993. "Organizational Culture and Acculturation." In *Cultural Diversity in Organizations*, ed. Taylor Cox, Jr. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Hernandez, Aileen C. 1991. *National Women of Color Organizations: A Report to the Ford Foundation*. New York: The Ford Foundation.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia A., and Murray S. Weitzman. 1996. *Nonprofit Almanac 1996-1997, Dimensions of the Independent Sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Hood, Jacqueline N. and Judith Kenner Thompson. 1994. "Care and Connection: A Study of Gender Differences in Charitable Contributions of Small Businesses." *Journal of Business & Entrepreneurship* 6 (July):73-89.
- Ianello, Kathleen P. 1992. *Decisions Without Hierarchy: Feminist Interventions in Organization Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Independent Sector. 1995. *The Impact of Federal Budget Proposals Upon the Activities of Charitable Organizations and the People They Serve, 1996-2002: The 100 Nonprofit Organizations Study*. Washington DC: Independent Sector.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Kaplan, Ann, ed. 1997a. *Giving USA*. New York: National Society of Fund Raising Executives.
- Kelly, Kathleen S. 1994. *Building Fund-Raising Theory: An Empirical Test of Four Models of Practice*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.
- King, Karen Nudd. 1994. *Men and Women on Nonprofit Boards of Directors: A Study in the Distribution of Power Between the Sexes Using Structural, Behavioral, and Perceptual Indicators*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Louisville.
- Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe. 1989. *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy*. Middletown CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- McCarthy, Kathleen. No date. *The Ms. Foundation: A Case Study in Feminist Fundraising*. Working paper. New York: Center for the Study of Philanthropy at the City University of New York Graduate School and University Center.
- Magat, Richard. 1991. *Public and Scholarly Reporting on Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector*. 1991 Independent Sector Spring Research Forum.
- Mannion, Geri. 1997. Telephone interview (August 20).
- Mead, Molly. 1994. *Worlds Apart: Missed Opportunities to Help Women and Girls*. Boston: Women in Philanthropy/Boston Women's Fund.
- , 1997a. Telephone interview (August 1).
- , 1997b. *Why Such Low Funding for Programs for Women and Girls? Contrasting Views of Foundation Staff and Program Staff*. Unpublished paper.
- Michigan Women's Foundation, The. 1990. *Women and the Future of Michigan: Strengthening Partnerships for the 21st Century*. Lansing MI: The Michigan Women's Foundation.
- , 1993. *Investing in Michigan Women*. Lansing MI: The Michigan Women's Foundation.
- Morrison, Anne. 1992. *The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Murningham, Marcy. 1990. "Women and Philanthropy: New Voices, New Visions." *New England Journal of Public Policy* February.
- National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal. 1997. *Giving Better, Giving Smarter: Renewing Philanthropy in America*. Washington DC: National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal.

- National Council for Research on Women. 1989. *Why Fund Women and Girls?* Flyer. New York: National Council for Research on Women.
- , 1994a. "Philanthropy: Do 'Universal' Dollars Reach Women and Girls? A Special Report." *Issues Quarterly* 1(2).
- , 1997. *Guide to Federal Funding Opportunities*. New York: National Council for Research on Women.
- National Network of Grantmakers. 1993. *Evaluation Guide: What is Good Grantmaking for Social Justice?* San Diego: National Network of Grantmakers.
- National Network of Women's Funds. 1993. *Changing the Face of Philanthropy, 1985-1992*. St. Paul MI: National Network of Women's Funds.
- National Science Foundation. 1990. *NSF's Research Opportunities for Women Program: An Assessment of the First Three Years*. Washington DC: National Science Foundation.
- Odendahl, Teresa. 1990. *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest Among the Philanthropic Elite*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Odendahl, Teresa Jean, Elizabeth Troccoli Boris, and Arlene Kaplan Daniels. 1985. *Working in Foundations: Career Patterns of Women and Men*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Odendahl, Teresa, and Michael O'Neill, eds. 1994. *Women, Power, and the Nonprofit Sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Odendahl, Teresa, and Sabrina Youmans. 1994. "Women on Nonprofit Boards." In *Women & Power in the Nonprofit Sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ostrander, Susan A. 1995. *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket People's Fund*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- , 1997. Telephone interview (September 14).
- Ostrander, Susan A., and Joan M. Fisher. 1995. "Women Giving Money/Women Raising Money: What Difference for Philanthropy?" In *Taking Fundraising Seriously: Cultures of Giving*, ed. Dwight Burlingame. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pandolfi, Joyce. 1979. *That 51%...Plus: A Ford Foundation Report*. New York: The Ford Foundation.
- Pond, Elizabeth. 1996. "Women in Leadership: A Letter from Stockholm." *The Washington Quarterly* 19 (Autumn):59-69.
- Poole, William T. 1989. "How Big Business Bankrolls the Left." *National Review* 41 (10 March):34-37.
- Powell, G. 1990. "One More Time: Do Female and Male Managers Differ?" *Academy of Management Executive* 4(3):68-75.
- Powell, Walter W., and Paul J. DiMaggio, eds. 1991. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Preston, Anne E. 1990. "Women in the White-Collar Nonprofit Sector: The Best Option or the Only Option?" *Review of Economics and Statistics* 72(4):560-68.
- Remington, Judy. 1991. *The Need to Thrive: Women's Organizations in the Twin Cities*. St. Paul MN: Minnesota Women's Press.

- Renz, Loren, Crystal Mandler, and Trinh C. Tran. 1997. *Foundation Giving: Yearbook of Facts and Figures on Private, Corporate and Community Foundations*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Rich, Elizabeth H., ed. 1997. *National Guide to Funding for Women and Girls, Fourth Edition*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Rose, Marsha Shapiro. 1994. "Philanthropy in a Different Voice: The Women's Funds." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 23 (Fall):227-42.
- Rosener, J. 1990. "Ways Women Lead." *Harvard Business Review* (November-December):119-25.
- Rubin, Mary. 1985. *A Declining Federal Commitment to Research About Women and Girls*. New York: National Council for Research on Women.
- Sakai, Ann K., and Melissa J. Lane. 1996. "National Science Foundation Funding Patterns of Women and Minorities in Biology." *Bioscience* 46 (September):621-25.
- Salamon, Lester M., and Helmut K. Anheier. 1996. *The Emerging Nonprofit Sector: An Overview*. Johns Hopkins Non-Profit Sector Series, Volume 1. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.
- Servatius, Mary. 1992. *Short Sighted: How Chicago-Area Grantmakers Can Apply a Gender Lens to See the Connections Between Social Problems and Women's Needs*. Chicago: Chicago Women in Philanthropy.
- Simmons, Verna Cornelia. 1996. *Service-Learning as a Social Movement: Fact or Fallacy, Part I*. Unpublished report prepared for the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Shuman, Michael H. 1998. "Why Progressive Foundations Give Too Little to Too Many." *The Nation* 266 (January 12/19):11-16.
- Smith, James. 1993. *Philanthropy in the Age of the Virus*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Sweetman, Katherine J. 1996. "Women in Boardrooms: Increasing Numbers Qualify to Serve." Editorial. *Harvard Business Review* 74 (January-February):13.
- Union Institute Center for Public Policy. 1988. *Part of the Solution: Innovative Approaches to Nonprofit Funding*. Washington DC: The Union Institute.
- Valian, Virginia. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1998.
- van Til, Jon, and Associates, eds. 1990. *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- "A Wealth of Working Women (American Survey)." 1996. *The Economist* 339 (8 June):27-28.
- Whitt, J. Allen. 1993. *The Inner Circle of Local Nonprofit Trustees: A Comparison of Attitudes and Backgrounds of Women and Men Board Members*. Project on Non-Profit Organizations Working Paper No. 192. New Haven: Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University.
- Willie, Charles Vert. 1985. *Black and White Families: A Study in Complimentarity*. Bayside, N.Y.: General Hall.
- Women & Philanthropy. 1998. *Careers and Passions: 1997 Membership Survey Report*. Washington DC: Women & Philanthropy.
- Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy. 1978. *Survey of Six Foundations that Derive their Assets Primarily for the Sales of Cosmetics to Women*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.

- , 1980. *Funding of Programs for Women and Girls by a Selected Sample of Major Corporations*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- , 1987. *New Ways to Lead: A Discussion by Native American, African American, Latino, and Appalachian Grantees*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- , 1988. *Directory of Women's Funds*. New York: Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy.
- Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy, Los Angeles Women's Foundation, and Southern California Association for Philanthropy. 1990. *A Report on the Proceedings of The Challenge of Being Female: A Conference on Philanthropy and Women's Issues in Southern California*.
- Women Working in Philanthropy. 1990. *Doubled in a Decade, Yet Still Far from Done: A Report on Awards Targeted to Women and Girls by Grantmakers in the Delaware Valley*. Philadelphia: Women Working in Philanthropy.
- Women's Funding Network. 1996. *Strengthening Service, Fostering Growth*. St. Paul MN: Women's Funding Network. Annual Report.
- , 1997a. *Women Funds Start-up Dates*. Fax.
- , 1997b. *Women Funding Network Chronology of Events, Accomplishments, Activities*. Fax.
- , 1998. *The Women's Fund Survey Report for Fiscal Year Ending in 1994*. Draft.
- Working Group on Funding Lesbian and Gay Issues. 1993. *Funders of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Programs: A Directory for Grantseekers*. New York: Working Group on Funding Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- , 1994. *Reaching Out: A Grantmakers' Guide to Lesbian and Gay Issues*. New York: Working Group on Funding Lesbian and Gay Issues.
- Zukin, Sharon, and Paul Dimaggio. 1990. *Structures of Capital: The Social Organization of the Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.