

PRELIMINARY DRAFT – Please Do Not Cite or Circulate

Paper prepared for the USC Center for Philanthropy and Public Policy
Philanthropy and Social Impact Symposium, March 14-16, 2019

Native-focused Philanthropy: An Assessment of the Current State and Practice of Native Organizations Seeking Major Foundation Support

Cheryl Ellenwood
Doctoral Candidate
School of Government and Public Policy
University of Arizona
315 Social Science Building
Tucson, AZ 85719
cheryle@email.arizona.edu

ABSTRACT

Native American communities are often ignored in much of mainstream academic research. This void in research is often due to a low sample size or a general lack of data. Thus, Native populations are relegated to the asterisk and left for scholars within niche topics and single subject disciplines. However, if mainstream nonprofit scholars and practitioners seek to understand the unique needs of minority-serving organizations such as Native-led organizations, we first need a broad overview of the current landscape of specific communities. This paper examines select Native philanthropists and Native-led organizations who advocate for Native-focused philanthropy. Currently, their efforts have successfully garnered the support of major foundations such as The Bush Foundation, Northwest Area Foundation (NWAFF commits 40% of their annual grant dollars to support Native-led organizations), The Novo Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation among others. Through advocacy, education, and engagement Native-focused philanthropy is strategic and aims to create the most impact with guidance from the community.

In this paper, I also review the current practices of two foundations who engage in philanthropy that supports Native-led organizations. A brief review of current strategic practices may provide insight for other minority-led organizations who seek foundation support for their specific community. Additionally, with an assessment of community led and Native-focused

philanthropy, we can begin to ask questions of inquiry that better our understanding of how and why foundations invest and commit to improving specific communities. This community specific approach is essential to understanding the current state of philanthropic practice that seeks to advance the mission of Native-led organizations.

Author Positionality

Cheryl Ellenwood: I am an enrolled citizen of the Nez Perce Nation located in rural, northern Idaho and I am also Navajo (Diné). My Navajo mother and Nez Perce father met in San Jose, California due to federal Indian policy encouraging reservation Native Americans to move to urban areas and assimilate into mainstream American society. While, I am a product of Indian relocation efforts, my family history is a story of federal Indian policy resistance and survival, i.e. Indian removal, treaties, reservations, boarding schools, assimilation, and termination policy efforts. After an early urban childhood, we moved back home to the Nez Perce Reservation. I am currently an ex-reservation, urban Indian attempting to navigate through predominantly white academic institutions. Throughout my experience as a first-generation college student, I excel in areas that promote or utilize specific community approaches to learning, particularly American Indian law and policy. I earned a M.A. in American Indian Studies from UCLA. I have worked for various organizations including a woman/Native-owned consulting firm, a Native research organization, and a national Native nonprofit. I am also a former development officer who has worked with individuals, corporations, foundations, and tribes across the nation. Given my upbringing and experiences, I tend to view organizations in both broad and narrow terms depending on the context and research question. I am an Indigenous researcher trained in positivist and interpretivist research methodologies common within Public Administration. However, when appropriate I am also critical and question mainstream practices and assumptions, particularly when studying minority-led or minority-serving organizations. I find a critical approach is particularly useful with research that examines vulnerable populations, where specific communities have a history of mistrust with researchers and mainstream institutions. I am a life-long student and my positionality is continually evolving, yet the work of local community organizations continues to inspire my work.

Introduction

Philanthropic research on specific communities is limited. However, research on population-based approaches have generally improved our understanding of health disparities, education attainment, or other deficit areas. For American Indian communities, population-based approaches to data collection is an ever-increasing area for Indigenous scholars involved in the Indigenous data sovereignty movement – the right of a Native Nation to govern collection, ownership, and application of its own data¹. In philanthropy, a similar message is emerging from Indigenous philanthropists within the US. In *Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance*, Indigenous (Lumbee) author Villanueva (2018) draws on his experience as a foundation officer and the experience of other under-represented program officers in the field to bring attention to the inequity within philanthropy. *Decolonizing Wealth* is an honest commentary of American Indian history and colonization within the US. Villanueva urges mainstream philanthropy to engage in decolonization through giving practices such as participatory grantmaking, horizontal power structures, and more inclusive methods that deviate from typical and traditional top-down and agenda setting philanthropic giving. In a similar vein, this paper attempts to bridge the divide between Native-led nonprofits and academia. There is scarce research on Native American nonprofits or philanthropic efforts to support Native communities, thus I draw heavily on the reports of Native-led organizations and other mainstream sources to provide a brief assessment from which scholars and practitioners can build future research from.

This paper examines a community-based approach to philanthropy through an assessment of the current practices of Native-led organizations seeking major foundation support. I consider these practices and the foundations who engage in Native-focused philanthropy as an example of a strategic approach and strategy for social change. With this narrow assessment of Native-focused philanthropy and Indigenous philanthropists, scholars and practitioners will glean insight for other minority-led organizations who seek major foundation support for their specific community. With increased knowledge of community-led and Native-focused philanthropy, we can create future questions of inquiry to better understand how and why foundations invest and commit to improving specific communities. A community specific approach is essential to

¹ For more information see <http://usindigenousdata.arizona.edu/about-us-0> - this definition is not the mainstream definition where data are subject to the laws of the nation in which it is stored.

understanding the current state of philanthropic practice that is both strategic and advances the mission of organizations that serve underserved and underrepresented communities.

The first section of this paper broadly outlines the current state and practice of Native-focused philanthropy through a review of existing practical research. The second section discusses two foundations who engage in Native-focused philanthropy - where Native-led organizations direct their own funding priorities and initiatives in partnership with, as opposed to directed by, funders. Each case briefly examines the history of grantmaking and current initiatives. The paper closes with a discussion of how this assessment of current practices can help direct future research and enhance community and foundation partnerships, specifically through a strategy that values local knowledge and community specific approaches to development.

Native-focused Philanthropy

Philanthropy and Community-based or Population-based Approaches

It is difficult to conceptualize and implement an agreed upon “strategic” approach to philanthropy (Sandfort, 2008). There is great freedom for designating philanthropic dollars. However, one avenue for foundations is to financially support the work of local organizations and create avenues for social change through funding innovative ideas and approaches. One strategy for philanthropy is to take a community-based or population-based approach to giving, particularly for underserved populations with well-documented deficits. The philanthropy literature has witnessed the need for more information on specific funding areas of interests. For example, there has been an increase and interest in funding for women and girls to improve development and address poverty (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011; Chaaban & Cunningham, 2011; Friedberg & Webb, 2006). Additionally, data that details the utilization of services and approaches in specific populations by gender, race, ethnicity, and income can increase understanding of health disparities and access (Treadwell, 2008). Thus, there is immense value in such seemingly narrow approaches to data collection that can help inform scholars, practitioners, and policy makers. Although this paper is a rigid assessment of one specific philanthropic practice, it is clear that such approaches are current and necessary for increasing a wider understanding of foundation strategies.

Research that addresses the need for community-based or population-based approaches may help shed insight into foundation strategies, specifically Native-focused philanthropy. Inequality and the need to address a data gap tell us to explore these niche areas of funding interests to determine boundaries, define terms, and to assess their impact. Moreover, the recent discussion and ideas of decolonizing wealth present a critical lens to the current and past philanthropic practices of foundations. For example, the recent *Decolonizing Wealth* (Villanueva, 2018) is not only a provocative call for foundations to empower underserved communities, it values the expertise and ability for Native-led organizations to tap into local knowledge to offer local solutions to complex problems. Many foundations supporting Native-led organizations are ill-equipped to address challenges such as cultural competency, trust issues, and lack general knowledge of community history. A rare case study documents one foundation's struggle in "Building an Organizational Culture that Supports Philanthropy in Indian Country: A funder's story" (2018) documents the story of one foundation's attempt to overcome organizational challenges around their work in Indian Country and explains how they addressed the challenge with a project to educate the board and staff about several American Indian issues. Complex problems abound surround several nonprofits and foundations who work in Indian Country make the solution to these challenges multi-faceted. A community-based approach like Native-focused philanthropy can potentially guide foundations and increase their social impact through a different partnership with Native communities and Native organizations.

Data and Methods

Compounding the need for a strategic approach is the existing data gap among American Indian organizations, populations, and communities. It is not an over statement to say data concerning Native American populations are left out of much of mainstream academic research (*see* Ferguson 2016 for one explanation). Higher education scholars refer to the need for addressing this data gap as a move *Beyond the asterisk*. The use of an asterisk (Native American*) is widespread in much of academic research, it often indicates the sample does not include enough observations or too few to count. Although according to the 2010 decennial census, American Indian and Alaska Native population (alone and in combination with other races) account for just 1.7% of the total U.S. population, the continued use of the asterisk renders Native Americans (in the context of higher education but also widely applicable) as invisible. Furthermore, much of

research that centers upon Native Americans are generally and firmly thrust into niche areas and viewed as niche topics for niche scholars and those within single subject disciplines.

The boundaries and need for this assessment are broad for two reasons. First, there are limited academic publications within public policy, public administration, management, sociology, and the more interdisciplinary study of nonprofits and philanthropy. Most works that include any combination of American Indians or Native Americans and philanthropy are books or dissertations that mention the terms and provide little in-depth discussion of the role of Native Americans in philanthropy. Currently, academic research is unable to inform an understanding of Native-focused philanthropy. Much of this data gap relates to reasons mentioned above. Second, another possible reason for needing a broad assessment is the recent national attention of Native issues. Perhaps the timeliness in identifying this data gap is due to the current national attention of Native-led movements such as the Standing Rock Sioux's resistance against the Dakota Access Pipeline or the NODAPL movement (see more Op-Eds written by Tate Williams in *Inside Philanthropy*). The sudden national attention of this movement gained traction far into mainstream media, reaching both Indigenous and non-Indians across the world. All of these reasons contribute to the need to assess this initial movement towards Native-focused philanthropy. With limited academic publications, much of the data draws from op-eds, Native-led nonprofit reports, and other mainstream outlets such as books, annual reports, and websites. Given the abundance yet variation in sources, this initial assessment is a loose amalgamation of data sources and serves to provide insight for more rigorous future research.

In the area of Native-focused philanthropy, a small number of foundations and organizations rise above in search results and reports; the Bush Foundation, Northwest Area Foundation and the Native-led nonprofit, Native Americans in Philanthropy. The next section provides a brief introduction into the work of the aforementioned organizations.

Native Americans in Philanthropy

Native Americans in Philanthropy (NAP) is a national membership organization that serves as a bridge between Native and philanthropic communities. Located in Minneapolis and an office in DC, their work is focused on serving tribal communities and Native nonprofits to improve development and relations with their funders. NAP also aims to work with mainstream and tribal

philanthropy to be more strategic about grantmaking and investment in Indian Country. Their approach is to engage, educate, and empower Indigenous peoples and philanthropists to create healthier and sustainable communities. Goals for the organization include increasing philanthropic investment in Native communities to expand community-based solutions, strengthen support for Native, philanthropic and nonprofit leaders to diversify the sector, and to improve data on Indigenous-led research on philanthropic giving to Native communities. While Native Americans account for almost 2 percent (5.4 million) of the U.S. population, philanthropic funding for the population remains less than 0.5 percent of annual foundation grant dollars.

With such immense goals, it is not surprising NAP maintains a growing and diverse network to work towards their vision. NAP accomplishes this through a network of Native and non-Native nonprofits, tribal communities, foundations, and community leaders. NAP emphasizes the Native tradition of reciprocity to help guide relationships with their network that consists of people and organizations who share their commitment to the inclusion of Native people in creating deep and long-lasting impact, systemic and sustainable change in all communities. The organization sometimes does this work through the initiatives of non-Native led organizations and foundations. For example, the 2015 article that tells *A Funder's Story* and their struggle to overcome their challenges approached NAP to provide trainings to the board and staff. Overall, the organization and its community-based approach helps philanthropy address wealth and both knowledge and data gaps.

Native-led organizations vs. Native-serving organizations

Before moving into an assessment of foundations engaging in Native-focused philanthropy, it is necessary to draw a distinction between Native-led organizations and Native-serving organizations. Many Native-led nonprofits advocate for supporting Native American-led (or Native American-controlled) organizations. Drawing this line may be polarizing but those in the field contend that Native-led organizations support Native Nations and organizations whose mission is focused on serving Native communities and whose board is over 50 percent Native American. Native-serving organizations may not hold a mission that commits to serving Native communities or people and the board may be predominantly non-Indian, thus the question becomes who benefits from the support of Native-serving organizations?

This approach has also become common practice for Native-led organizations with non-Indians serving on their board. For example, the American Indian College Fund located in Denver is a Native-led organization serving American Indian students at both tribal colleges and mainstream academic institutions. The College Fund receives zero dollars from federal grants. In fact, 100 percent of their funding dollars stem from fundraising efforts with foundations, corporations, individuals, and Native Nations. Thus, several board members are non-Indian and serve as representatives of their mainstream philanthropic organization. The practice of maintaining at least a 51 percent threshold is to promote accountability to the organization mission of serving Native American students while maintaining lasting relationships with mainstream funders. For foundations engaging in Native-focused philanthropy it is essential for funders to understand this distinction and the reasons why many Native-led organizations advocate for the approach. For example, a 2018 study that examines annual giving from 2006-2014 by large foundations show that a majority of grant dollars awarded annually in support of Native American causes are awarded to non-Native-led nonprofits (Growing Inequity Report). The report also lists the top funders by total amount and grants awarded for 2006-2014.

Table 1. Top Funders by Total Amount

Funder Name	Total \$ Amount Awarded	Average Annual Amount Awarded
1. Ford Foundation	\$89,400,000	\$9,9333,333
2. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	\$82,500,000	\$9,166,667
3. W.K. Kellogg Foundation	\$81,900,000	\$9,100,000
4. Northwest Area Foundation	\$59,000,000	\$6,555,556
5. Lilly Endowment	\$32,500,000	\$3,611,111
6. Rasmuson Foundation	\$28,700,000	\$3,188,889
7. Bush Foundation	\$24,600,000	\$2,733,333
8. Bill & Melinda Gates	\$22,300,000	\$2,477,778

Data for Table 1 from Growing Inequity Report (2018). First Nations Development Institute.

Additionally, examples of Native-led organizations are helpful for understanding their role in strategic philanthropy such as the practice of Native-focused philanthropy. First Nations Development Institute (FNDI) is a Native-led and Native serving nonprofit organization located

in Longmont, Colorado. FNDI provides the much-needed data within several facets of Indian Country. Much of the data that exists on Native nonprofits and Native philanthropy is produced by FNDI. In 2018 alone, FNDI produced several extensive data reports including; *The Growing Inequity: Large Foundation Giving to Native American Organizations and Causes from 2006-2014*, *Community Foundation Giving to Native American Causes*, and *Native-Serving Nonprofits and Charity Watchdog Agencies*. These reports reveal interesting findings worthy of further research. For example, community foundation giving in ten states with a relatively high American Indian population reveals that most states give lower than would be expected, meaning foundation giving to Native causes does not match population size. For those ten states² with overall state AI/AN populations ranging from 3 % – 19%, data indicates that community foundations don't fund Native organization at the expected rate. Additionally, on average only .15% of community foundation giving goes to Native American organizations and causes annually. It is clear there is a need for more data on Native-led organizations, Native-serving organizations, and foundation giving to Native organizations across the U.S.

Major Foundations Engage in Native-focused Philanthropy

Foundation Approaches

Since this assessment seeks to describe a general understanding of Native-focused philanthropy, for brevity it is best to first focus on an exemplary case. Future research should assess foundations with varying levels of Native-focused philanthropy. Given the small sample and research gap, my initial assessment begins by reviewing two foundation's focus areas, engagement, and provides a brief summary of foundation activities related or committed to a Native-focused philanthropic approach. Table 2 includes an overview of the Bush Foundation and Northwest Area Foundation's specific community-based approach to Native-focused philanthropy.

² Alaska, Arizona, California, Michigan, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon and South Dakota

Table 2. Foundation approach to Native-focused Philanthropy

<i>Foundation</i>	Region	Strategic Initiatives	Native-Focused Programs
<i>Bush Foundation</i>	Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota and 23 Native Nations within the BF region	Community Creativity, Education, Nation Building, Social Business Ventures	Native Nation Building Rebuilders program, Native-focused education, Social Business Ventures, Native-focused community innovation grants
<i>Northwest Area Foundation</i>	Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and 75 Native Nations	Access to Capital, Work Opportunity, Enterprise Development, and Financial Inclusion	Investments in Indian Country, Native Leadership Development, Insights into Granting in Native Communities, and Tribal Ventures

Bush Foundation

The Bush Foundation’s statement on Native-focused philanthropy admits they have drafted behind Northwest Area Foundation’s commitment to Native-led organizations and investment in Native CDFIs. They publish a Native Nations Investments report (2018) that outlines their activities. Acknowledging their shortcomings, they ask, how the Bush Foundation can better support the 23 Native nations, Native people, and the organizations that serve them in the Bush Foundation region (Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota). Bush Foundation Native-focused investments are listed by program and highlights some of the organizations and people they support. For the Bush Foundation, it’s about taking a hard look at your history of funding and investment and committing to improvements and learning from the relationships built.

The Bush Foundation recognizes the region’s future depends on institutions and systems that work well for all people. Their Equity Statement even goes so far as to state, “too many do not.” In that vein the Bush Foundation takes an initial step towards increasing their accountability to their region and the people within it by stating,

“As a philanthropic institution, we continue to strive to improve and to do more good every year. That includes how we do our work in, and in support of, Native nations, people and the organizations that serve them. To that end, we plan to publish additional reports on a periodic basis regarding our Native-focused investments.”

The commitment to producing more data lends legitimacy and trust to the communities they invest in. This is particularly important for Native communities with a history of mistrust with outsiders.

History of grant making.

The Bush Foundation has invested in Native communities for decades through their support of fellowship programs and tribal colleges, as well as other Native-led nonprofits. However, the Bush Foundation directly invests in people through leadership programs. Fellowship and cohort programs are available to both the general and Native American population. Overall, the Bush Fellowship program has invested in \$11.9 million since 2013. \$17 million has been awarded to Native American recipients (e.g. through the Rebuilders Program). Additionally, the last 30 years of investment has grown from \$460,000 in 1987 to \$6.7 million paid in 2017. A summary of their Native-focused funding between 2013-2017 shows a broad yet consistent focus for investments in the total amount of \$29.9 million. The investment summary grows to \$89.9 million when looking at Bush Foundation grants supporting Native Nations and Native people since 1982.

Table 3. Bush Foundation Native Focused Funding

Native Focused Funding Payment Amount 2013 – 2017	
Native Nation Building	\$10.7 million
Community Innovation	\$9.4 million
Education	\$3.9 million
Leadership	\$2.7 million
Community Creativity	\$1.8 million
Social Business Ventures	\$0
Other	\$1.4 million
Total Native Focused Funding from 2013-2017	\$29.9 million

Data for Table 3 from Native Nations Investment Report (2018) Bush Foundation.

Practices and partnerships.

The Bush Foundation's legacy is to invest in great ideas and the people who power them. The foundation has grown to realize they should expand their focus to support the ideas and people *who are working in their communities to find solutions to their unique issues* (emphasis mine). Thus, their flagship program has been the Native Nation Rebuilders program. The Rebuilders program has been supporting Native leaders since 2009. The Rebuilders Program supports fellows from 23 Native Nations who seek to strengthen tribal governance. Throughout the two-year, cohort-based leadership experience Rebuilders expand their networks and gain valuable leadership skills and pursue other trainings. The Rebuilders Program is integral to their Native Nation Building strategic initiative. Although a successful in-house program, the Bush Foundation has recently invested in the creation of a new nonprofit, the Native Governance Center. This new nonprofit will house the Native Nation Building initiative, specifically starting with the Native Nation Rebuilders Program but also expanding into Youth Rebuilders, Tribal Assistance, and Tribal Resources Grants and Education.

Essentially, the Bush Foundation's first successful step towards Native-focused Philanthropy was creating a successful leadership cohort program with the Rebuilders Program. The logical second step was to support a Native-led nonprofit that provides local support and administers the program, thereby leaving their traditional role that entails program oversight and administration. This is a well-documented approach within much of American Indian law and policy. Research from the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development shows that strong tribal governance leads to thriving Native communities and economies.

Dedicated Staff

While the Bush Foundation has changed their relationship with the Rebuilders Program, they continue to need knowledgeable and experienced staff who have worked in nonprofits and tribal government. Bush Foundation Native American Program Officers continue to serve as subject and community expert liaisons to Native communities. The Bush Foundation staff includes a Native Nations Activities Manager and a Nation Building and Government Redesign Portfolio Director.

Northwest Area Foundation

The Northwest Area Foundation also takes a community-based approach to investment. According to their website, the foundation “supports organizations anchored in the culture of the people they serve and dedicated to expanding economic opportunity in under-resourced communities”. The NWAFF footprint includes Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and 75 Native Nations (located within their region). NWAFF committed 40 percent of all donations between 2012-2016 (four-year period) to investing in Native-led organizations. The funding is focused on poverty reduction and community wealth-building efforts on reservation and urban Native communities. NWAFF has four interlocked funding portfolios; Access to Capital, Work Opportunity, Enterprise Development, and Financial Inclusion.

History of Grantmaking

Established in 1934, the first 50 year of grantmaking for the Foundation was traditional, awarding a broad set of short-term grants that promote economic revitalization. By 1998, the Foundation shifted to focus on a single-poverty reduction mission by allocating a significant portion of funding resources directly to communities and often, newly created organizations. A decade of this approach resulted in devoting \$200 million to this mission however by 2008, the Foundation pivoted once again. Currently, the approach remains committed to supporting local organizations steeped within local communities and promoting conversations and relationships that promote innovation. One can see the focused yet variation within the Native-led organizations funded by NWAFF. The NWAFF has invested in Native lending and microfinance organizations or Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) for five years. This commitment evolves from their commitment to invest 40 percent of grantmaking dollars in Native-led organizations. From 2012 to 2016, NWAFF has invested \$33.4 million in grants to Native-led organizations.

Practices and Partnerships

Because NWAFF commits 40 percent of new grant dollars to Native-led organizations working to advance economic, social and cultural prosperity in the urban, suburban, and reservation communities within their footprint, they fund several Native-organizations each year instead of administering their own programs. Recently, NWAFF supports the broad efforts of several Native

Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs). CDFIs are community development banks, loan funds, credit unions, and venture capital funds. Native CDFIs are ideal investment partners because they are local community-based organizations seeking to alleviate poverty, provide access to capital, and promote economic revitalization. Since designating the 40 percent for Native-led organizations, the support of organizations varies. Most awards are at least \$100,000 and the average length of award is over two years.

Dedicated Staff

NWAF has one Program Officer dedicated to working with Native Nations.

Discussion and Recommendation for Future Research

Through a narrow and focused approach to strategic community led philanthropy, Native-focused philanthropy can be an effective and strategic approach for foundations. It is also clear that the level of engagement can vary for foundations taking on a Native-focused philanthropic approach. The Bush Foundation is ranked as 7th Foundation funding Native issues. In contrast, NWAF is listed as 4th on the list of funders. This brief assessment shows that great variation can occur when engaging in Native-focused philanthropy. Bush Foundation appears to be relinquishing control to community-based and community-led organizations where NWAF, although their approach has shifted, still operates a fairly traditional approach to grantmaking despite investing more dollars annually. When looking at funding dollars alone over each year one might reach a different conclusion, thus a more in-depth assessment is necessary to better understand how and why foundations invest and commit to specific communities of color. Yet what is clear is that community or population specific approaches are strategic and advance the mission of Native-led organizations.

Furthermore, although my assessment of the work of Native Americans in Philanthropy is narrow, understanding their organizational focus and effort is helpful to improve our understanding of specific communities. Philanthropy can turn to similar organizations that serve specific communities. Indeed, there are several population-specific organizations that aim to advance their specific community or population such as ABFE, Hispanics in Philanthropy (HIP), Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP), and Funders for LGBTQ to name a few. Table 4 offers a description of their work and the population they serve.

Table 4. Population Specific Organizations

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Mission</i>
<i>ABFE</i>	Established in 1971, ABFE is a membership organization that advocates for responsive and transformative investments in Black communities. ABFE is credited with many of philanthropy’s early gains in diversity. To better reflect its growing membership, it has dropped its original descriptor, Association of Black Foundation Executives.
<i>HIP</i>	Hispanics in Philanthropy (HIP) is an organization dedicated to strengthening Latino leadership, voice, and equity. HIP has an expansive track-record and transnational network of grantmakers, donors, and philanthropic leaders committed to Latino communities in the US and Latin American.
<i>AAPIP</i>	Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP) is a national membership and philanthropic advocacy organization dedicated to advancing philanthropy in Asian American/Pacific Islander communities. AAPIP expands and mobilizes resources for AAPI communities to build a more just and equitable society.
<i>FUNDERS FOR LGBTQ ISSUES</i>	Funders for LGBTQ Issues is the sole organization dedicated exclusively to increasing institutional giving to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LBTQ) communities. Funders for LGBTQ Issues engages in research by producing reports that track annual giving to LGBTQ funding, provides training and support for new funders, and actively convenes grantmakers committed to LGBTQ issues for networking and support.

Conclusion

It is clear that the work of organizations serving specific communities is important and necessary. Furthermore, although this paper examines one narrow approach to strategic philanthropy, this assessment demonstrates that specific communities have distinct needs that foundations should consider when engaging in philanthropic support. There are also several organizations like NAP that can serve as resources and assist foundations who engage in philanthropic efforts that support specific communities and populations.

References

- Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy. “Who we are”. Retrieved from <https://aapip.org/who-we-are>
- Villanueva, Edgar. (2018) Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance.
- Bush Foundation. Native Nations Investments. 2018 Report.
- Ferguson, Kennan R. (2016) “Why does Political Science Hate American Indians?.” *Perspectives on Politics* 14.4
- First Nations Development Institute. (2018). Community Foundation Giving to Native American Causes. Longmont, CO: First Nations Development Institute.
- First Nations Development Institute. (2018). Growing Inequity: Large Foundation Giving to Native American Organizations and Causes, 2006-2014. Longmont, CO.
- First Nations Development Institute. (2018). Native-Serving Nonprofits and Charity Watchdog Agencies. Longmont, CO: First Nations Development Institute.
- Funders for LGBTQ Issues. “About and Mission”. Retrieved from <https://lgbtfunders.org/about/about-mission/>
- Adam Kintopf, B.A., Nicole Toves Villaluz, B.A., Jaime Martínez, M.Ed., Barbara Schillo, Ph.D., ClearWay Minnesota; Y. Elaine Rasmussen, M.S., Native Americans in Philanthropy (2018). Building an Organizational Culture That Supports Philanthropy in Indian Country: A Funder’s Story. *The Foundation Review*. Vol. 7.2
- Native CDFI Investment Partners (2018) Northwest Area Foundation Website. <https://www.nwaf.org/native-cdfi-investment-partners/>
- Sandfort, Jodi. (2008). Using Lessons from Public Affairs to Inform Strategic Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 3, September 2008 537-552 DOI: 10.1177/0899764008320270
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2015). Beyond the Asterisk: Understanding Native Students in Higher Education ed. by Heather J. Shotton, Shelly C. Lowe, and Stephanie J. Waterman (review). *Journal of College Student Development* 56(5), 525-528. Johns Hopkins University Press. Retrieved February 25, 2019, from Project MUSE database.