THE STATE OF CHANGE:

An Analysis of Women and People of Color in the Philanthropic Sector
As the leading voice for philanthropy, the Council on Foundations is committed to promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) as a core policy and fundamental operating principle in the philanthropic sector. We firmly believe that a talent pool that is rich in diversity better reflects our nation and contributes to the cultural competence necessary to understand the needs of the communities we serve. Indeed, DEI is one of the most important cornerstones of our ability to contribute to the common good of our changing society.

Within the Council, we strive to ensure that diverse perspectives and experiences are recognized in every aspect of achieving the Council’s mission. This is born out in our recruitment and hiring processes, where we ensure that staffing at every level of the organization is inclusive and reflective of the diversity of U.S. society and demographic trends, in how we develop our public policy positions, in how we choose the vendors with whom we work, in which speakers and presenters we invite to participate in our events and trainings, and in the composition of our board of directors.

We also ask our members to make a similar commitment to diversity and inclusion. To that end, we provide them with the tools, educational programs, and opportunities required to fulfill their organizational promises and commitments to inclusion.

But are these commitments working? Where does the sector as a whole stand when it comes to not only embracing DEI as core principle, but actually practicing it as a standard operating procedure?

To begin to answer these questions and to help inform strategies that support DEI efforts going forward, we have prepared a first-of-its-kind report examining the changes in the representation of women and racial/ethnic minorities employed as full-time staff at both the leadership and overall staff levels over the past five and 10 years.
I invite you to discuss this report with your staff and your board. It raises important questions about why there hasn’t been more change in the diversity of our institutions in recent years, despite the steps taken to create a more diverse and inclusive philanthropic sector. Do you see your organization in this data? Are the trends presented here reflected at your institution? If yes, why is that the case? And what can and should be done?

I hope this report sparks a robust dialogue about what works and doesn’t work in efforts to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion. The retention and development of a diverse talent pool will become critically important as the demographics of our nation continue to change. I encourage you to examine your sourcing, recruitment, and selection processes as well as how you develop and groom your talented staff members to ensure that they are among the pool considered for more senior roles.

I hope this report inspires renewed attention and efforts to make our workplaces more inclusive.

Our collective effectiveness is enhanced and our missions are better served when the practice of diversity is reflected in all aspects of our organizations. We aren’t there yet. But we can get there.

Best regards,

Vikki Spruill
President and CEO
Council on Foundations

“We firmly believe that a talent pool that is rich in diversity better reflects our nation and contributes to the cultural competence necessary to understand the needs of the communities we serve.”
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Provide the opportunity, leadership, and tools needed by philanthropic organizations to expand, enhance, and sustain their ability to advance the common good.

Our Vision

The Council on Foundations is a strategic leader that raises issues of shared interest, expands the thinking about our field, builds collaborative efforts, and breaks down barriers that stand in the way of effective and dynamic philanthropy.
Our Policy on Diversity and Inclusion

The Council on Foundations promotes responsible and effective philanthropy. Our mission requires a commitment to inclusiveness as a fundamental operating principle. It also calls for affirmations of diversity in its many forms, encompassing but not limited to:

- ethnicity
- economic circumstance
- race
- class
- gender
- disability
- age
- geography
- sexual orientation and gender identity
- philosophy

Diversity ensures that a range of perspectives, opinions, and experiences are recognized and acted upon in achieving the Council’s mission. We ask our members to make a similar commitment to inclusiveness in order to be more effective and better enhance their abilities to contribute to our changing society.
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An active philanthropic network, the Council on Foundations, founded in 1949, is a nonprofit leadership association of grantmaking foundations and corporations. It provides the opportunity, leadership, and tools needed by philanthropic organizations to expand, enhance, and sustain their ability to advance the common good. The Council empowers professionals in philanthropy to meet today’s toughest challenges and advances a culture of charitable giving in the U.S. and globally.
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I. Introduction

The conversation about diversity in philanthropy is not a new one. Over the past two decades in particular, numerous actors, working both field-wide and at the level of individual organizations, have waded into the debate with various initiatives, studies, and questions. These efforts have included convenings throughout the country, special initiatives like the D5 Coalition (its predecessor the Diversity in Philanthropy Project), professional development programs like the Council on Foundations’ own Career Pathways program, and reports produced with the intention of increasing diversity in the philanthropic sector. The conversation has also evolved over the years, and, informed in part by the wider discourse on social justice, now includes the pursuit of “equity” and “inclusion” as distinct endeavors residing parallel to increasing “diversity” in philanthropy.

But where have these efforts led us? What does the diversity of the sector look like today, and has philanthropy become more diverse, equitable, and inclusive over the past five or 10 years? If so, are we doing so at a rate that reflects the demographic transformation of the United States in the 21st century? What are the organizational characteristics of the field that might slow or accelerate progress?
The Council has a unique data set that can help us begin to answer some of these questions and inform strategies that will support the sector in reaching its goals. In 1980, the Council published its first compensation report for the field. Since then, our flagship Grantmaker Salary and Benefits survey has grown into one of the largest studies of staff compensation, benefits, and hiring practices among foundations and grantmaking institutions.

Within the wealth of data pooled through this now annual study, the Council has consistently collected responses on the demographic makeup of full-time staff (specifically race, gender, age, and now disability status) within grantmaking organizations of all types for a number of years. These data provide unique insights into how the demographics of the employees of foundations have changed over time. This report is the first of its kind to examine changes in the proportion of women and racial/ethnic minorities employed as full-time staff by our survey respondents, at both the leadership and overall staff levels.

We begin by exploring how the demographic makeup of staff, along racial and gender lines, has changed, and if the extent of those changes differs depending on the size or location of the institution or on the organizational level of the staff members. The report then examines the presence of women and racial/ethnic minorities at the leadership level within foundations. The clear story on both of these fronts is one of little movement, and we offer further data on hiring practices and position tenure that can begin to tell us why this might be the case. The report concludes with a view to how the data are informing the Council’s activities and how it might drive more strategic action more broadly within the field.

"The conversation has also evolved over the years, and, informed in part by the wider discourse on social justice, now includes the pursuit of “equity” and “inclusions” as distinct endeavors residing parallel to increasing “diversity” in philanthropy."
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We recognize that this analysis has its limitations. The Council’s own definition of diversity, for example, goes beyond race and gender to include multiple dimensions of the differences that exist among individuals. Furthermore, creating more diversity within the sector will not alone ensure that organizations have more inclusive and equitable environments. We also know that full-time employees are only one category of people influencing where grant dollars flow, and how foundations carry out their missions. Board members, community volunteers, donors, consultants, and part-time employees also shape the work of foundations. Finally, as we discuss in the next section, great care has to be taken in drawing conclusions from the survey, given the nature of the studies we conduct.

However, despite these limitations, we do find merit in conducting a thoughtful examination of the data we have available—which, to our knowledge, is the most extensive of its kind—and offering our findings to the continuing dialogue and efforts to create a diverse, equitable, and inclusive sector. We invite a robust conversation about these findings and how they complement or deviate from data collected by our colleagues in the field, or with the experiences of the individuals and organizations in philanthropy.
II. Data and Methodology

The Council’s annual Grantmaker Salary and Benefits Report survey accepts responses from staffed foundations of all types. Because of the voluntary nature of the survey, it cannot be considered a random sample of all grantmakers. It is nonetheless, to our knowledge, the largest and most comprehensive sample available for understanding the demographics of the people working in the field of philanthropy.

We used two different data sets to paint a picture of the diversity within the field and how the demographics of foundation staffs have changed over time:

*Five-year Matched Set*

The first data set we used was a matched set of the 455 foundations that participated in every survey from 2011 to 2015. Although this data set is smaller in size than the average number of foundations that participated over this time period, looking at the same group of institutions over a five-year period puts more controls in place and allows for greater insight into year-over-year changes in demographic representation. In total, this set includes data on 2,562 full-time positions within those organizations over the five-year period.
Ten-year Observational View

The matched set was then supplemented by an examination of an observational set examining responses submitted to our surveys in both 2006 (the first year the Council recorded survey responses in its online system) and 2015.

The large size of this data set—in terms of the number of organizations and the number of positions included—allows us to make interesting and important observations about the diversity in the field over a 10-year period. This data set includes over 6,000 positions for 2006 and over 8,000 in 2011. Although we see good levels of repeat participation from year to year, differences do exist in the lists of foundations that responded to the survey in any two years. We are therefore cautious in interpreting this information to be fully representative of the changes that occurred in the field as a whole.

Both data sets show diversity at the organizational level as well as the executive, professional, and administrative levels. Examining the data in this dual way gives us better understanding of the trends. A breakdown of what positions are represented at each level can be found in Appendix A.

The demographic information that the Council has collected for the past several years includes the race, gender, and age of individual full-time staff members. This report focuses specifically on race and gender. The Council has also been working to gather additional data on individuals with disabilities and individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender,

---

1 For the purposes of this study, we used the same definitions of executive, professional, and administrative level staff as is used in the Council’s Grantmaker Salary and Benefits Report. See Appendix A for a full list of positions from the survey that are found in each of these categories.
or queer (LGBTQ). In 2015, the Council began asking survey respondents to submit more detailed information on staff with disabilities. We saw significant under-reporting that limited our ability to draw meaningful conclusions from the data. In order to improve this data set, we are working with experts on disabilities to refine that data collection. Similarly, requesting data on the sexual orientation and gender identity of staff has raised some privacy concerns. We will continue to look for new opportunities to build our understanding of these important demographics.
III. The Demographics of the Field – Race/Ethnicity and Gender

The Council began collecting information on the race/ethnicity and gender of CEOs in our first compensation study in 1980, and over time we expanded the survey to include data for other full-time employees as well. Although these data represent only two of the many dimensions of diversity, they do provide insight into who is working in the field and how the state of diversity in philanthropy has changed over time.

In that inaugural year, 267 respondents indicated that a full- or part-time CEO served the organization; of those, 77 percent were male, 21 percent were female (and gender was not indicated for five incumbents). There were four minority CEOs (one percent) in the sample. Thirty-five years later, among the respondents in the 2015 survey, racial and ethnic minorities comprised 8 percent of CEOs and 24 percent of full-time staff. Women represented 57 percent of CEOs and 77 percent of all full-time positions reported in 2015.

Clearly at some level, a shift has taken place over the past 35 years, and the data point to some progress being made in diversifying the field. The overall racial/ethnic makeup of the employees represented in the 2015 data set are more in line with the demographics of the overall U.S. labor force. And when compared to the overall population, college graduates, and the
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U.S. labor force, women are now over-represented, and, broadly speaking, seem to have found opportunities for employment within philanthropy.

However, upon deeper examination of our more recent data we see two important realities:

• Women and racial/ethnic minorities are not equally represented within different levels of participating organizations, or across organizations in the sector.

• The proportions of women and racial/ethnic minorities on staff have changed very little over the past five or 10 years.

These trends raise important questions about access and opportunity within the field and to what degree any inequities we see here affect the work of the field. Over the next several pages, we will lay out this picture in more detail, and then use additional data from our survey to begin to pinpoint some of the potential reasons as to why so little change has taken place in recent years.
### Share of All Full-Time Paid Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity¹, 2015²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>4,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander/ Hawaiian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/ AK Native</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or Multi-Racial</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Respondents were asked to classify individuals by the following eight racial or ethnic categories: American Indian/Alaskan Natives, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islander/Hawaiian, White, bi- or multi-racial, or other. Because the survey did not include a separate question for Hispanic ethnicity, respondents falling into any of the specified “racial” groups may have chosen to privilege that identity over Hispanic ethnicity. Therefore, figures on the share of staff identifying as Hispanic may under-represent the actual share. Totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

² All Respondents.
IV. Diversity of Foundation Leadership

Although women make up the majority of employees among survey respondents, as noted above, they are not equally represented at all levels within participating organizations. And significant differences exist among organizations of different sizes. In a similar vein, employees who are racial/ethnic minorities are also not equally represented within or across participating organizations.

The representation of women and racial/ethnic minorities decreases as you move from the administrative level, to the professional level, to the executive level staff. Indeed, this finding has been consistent throughout many years of Council observations of the survey data. And although this reality may also be consistent with what is found in other sectors and industries, it raises questions about the access that racial/ethnic minorities and women—who comprise such a large proportion of foundation professional staffs—have to executive level job opportunities and decision making in the field.

Additionally, among participants in our matched set, the ratios of women in executive positions has not changed significantly over the past five years, moving from 53.6 percent in 2011 to 55.1 percent in 2015. And the percentage of racial/ethnic minority executives moved a little over one percentage point, from 11.2 percent in 2011 to 12.4 percent in 2015.
There were notable variations in the gender makeup of executive leadership when examining foundations by asset size. Foundations in our matched set with between $250 million and $750 million in assets experienced a 6 to 8 percentage point increase in the number of women in executive positions over the five-year period from 2011 to 2015. Smaller foundations saw smaller but still consistent growth in the number of women in leadership positions. Indeed for the smallest foundations studied, those with fewer than $5 million in assets, 71 percent of executive leaders were women.

1 All respondents.
These proportions plummeted for women among large organizations with significant assets. Specifically, between 2011 and 2015, foundations in the matched set with over $750 million in assets actually experienced declines in the proportion of women in leadership. These declines ranged from -.5 to as high as -3.8 percentage points among foundations with over $2 billion in assets.

Figures in millions.

Matched set
V. What Is the State of Change?  
Race and Ethnicity

Looking back across all staff levels, we found only small, albeit positive changes in the share of racial/ethnic minority staff over time. From 2006 to 2015, there was a 1.68 percentage point increase in the total number of minority staff reported, moving from 22.65 percent to 24.33 percent of the total. An examination of the matched set of 455 foundations from 2011 through 2015 echoes this broader observation, and finds a .76 percentage point difference from 2011 to 2015. With few notable exceptions, this marginal change was consistent when examining year-over-year demographic data for foundations by asset levels and age.

Foundation Size - Asset Levels

From 2006 to 2015, changes in racial/ethnic minority representation did see notable differences among foundations with over $1 billion in assets (32 organizations fell into this category in 2006 and 50 did in 2015). Within this cohort, representation of racial/ethnic minority staff among all levels grew 4.1 percentage points over the 10-year period, moving from 31.5 percent to 35.6 percent of staff reported.
However, when we examine the matched set of foundations between 2011 and 2015, we see a slightly different result. Foundations with over $1 billion in assets were home to more diverse staff than smaller foundations within the matched set. But there was very little change in the proportions of racial/ethnic minority staff over that time period, increasing less than one percent.

**Under 40 vs. Over 40**

Full-time staff under 40 years old were more diverse than those over the age of forty. These numbers are broadly in alignment with the demographics of the United States as a whole. Thirty-two percent of full-time foundation staff under 40 were racial/ethnic minorities in the matched set of foundations in 2015, nearly 10 percentage points more than what was observed among foundation employees over the age of 40. However, the numbers barely budged between 2011 and 2015, changing less than one percentage point in both groups.
Native American and Other Populations

In 2015, individuals with American Indian or Alaskan Native heritage constituted .09 percent of administrative positions, .06 percent of executive positions, and .3 percent of professional positions. As in other instances these proportions did not change appreciably between 2011 and 2015.
VI. What Is the Rate of Change: Gender

As noted above, our data suggest that women now comprise the majority of employees in philanthropy. Among the organizations in our matched set, three quarters of full-time employees were women and one quarter were men. These overall numbers moved less than half of one percentage point from 2011 to 2015. We see almost identical figures when examining the 10-year observational data set: a 75 percent to 25 percent split among women and men, and a change of less than one percent over time.

Interesting patterns emerge when observing the data by asset size, age, and staff level, and when we layer race/ethnicity with gender.

Asset Levels

There was little movement in the representation of men and women when breaking the data down by the asset size of foundations. Among asset groupings with sufficient respondents to provide an adequate picture, the largest change observed was among foundations with between $10 million and $25 million in assets. Within this group there was an increase of 3.7 percent in the percentage of women on staff between 2011 and 2015. Other changes ranged between -2.8 percent and 2.4 percent over the five-year period.
The proportion of women as a share of full-time staff over 40 years old and those under 40 years old remained stable from 2011 to 2015. In all years women were a larger proportion of staff under 40 than of staff over 40. Over a five-year period one might hypothesize that stable numbers of women in the under 40 cohort of foundation staffs would begin to produce changes in the share of women staff over 40. However, the percentage of women as a share of staff over 40 also remained stable.

**Under 40 vs. Over 40**

Within our matched set, racial/ethnic minority women were 20 percent of full-time foundation staff members in 2015. This was an increase of one percentage point over 2011. As with broader patterns we have observed for gender across staff levels, these numbers varied considerably when moving from the administrative to professional to executive levels within participating organizations. While racial/ethnic minority women in the matched set comprised 27.6 percent of administrative staff and 21.5 percent of professional staff, their representation among executive level staff fell to 7.5 percent. These numbers changed only slightly over the five-year period, with the biggest
change being a 1.5 percentage point increase in racial/ethnic minority women among professional staff.

![Minority Representation Across Staff Levels; 2011–2015](chart)

The percentage of racial/ethnic minority men at all levels stayed below 10 percent for all staff levels and all years, ranging in 2015 from 8.1 percent, to 7.1 percent, to 4.9 percent for administrative, professional, and executive levels, respectively. These numbers changed less than one percentage point over the five-year period. The greatest difference between staff levels can be seen among the representation of white men, which ranged from 8.1 percent at the administrative level to 35.5 percent at the executive level. Interestingly, these numbers increased by 2.3 percent among administrative level staff and decreased by 2.5 percent for executive level staff.

**Professional and Administrative Staff**

Broadly speaking, across the entire sample of 455 organizations, the proportion of women in administrative positions declined by three percentage points between 2011 and 2015. Over this period the proportion of women in executive leadership rose by 2 percent and the proportion of women in professional roles rose by 1.5 percent.
Indeed the story for women in philanthropy is one of a lack of representation at the leadership level when juxtaposed with their overall participation within the work of foundations at the administrative and professional levels. Women are inarguably the backbone of the professional foundation workforce, representing 77 percent of professional positions in 2015. Despite this, there remain potential obstacles to leadership, with women comprising only 60 percent of executive leadership (a 17 percentage point difference).
VII. Organizational Factors Potentially Contributing to the Low Levels of Change

In addition to collecting data on the demographics and salaries and of full-time employees, the Council gathers information on staff size, tenure, turnover, and departure rates. This information can begin to shed light on some of the reasons we might have seen little to no change over the past five to 10 years, despite broader awareness and efforts in the field.

We have found that many employees, especially executive level staff, stay in their jobs for an extended period of time, which can limit the opportunities for entry into the field, or upward movement within organizations. In 2015, among all respondents, the median tenure for CEOs for all grantmaker types was eight years, and 43 percent of CEOs were reported as having held their position for 10 years or more. For program officers, the most frequently found position among respondents, the median tenure was three years.

Almost half of the respondents in 2015 reported no staff departures the year before. The overall staff departure rate for all respondents (including those with no departures) was about 6 percent. Both the departure and turnover rates were higher for administrative positions than for professional roles.
Many foundations also have small staff, which further limits the opportunities to bring in more diverse team members. In 2015, the average staff size (for both full- and part-time employees) was six and the median was 13. Seventeen percent of respondents reported two or fewer staff members.

These numbers cannot tell the full story of why there has been a slow rate of change over the past few years, but it is important to recognize the organizational realities of foundations and how they might affect and shape opportunity.
This review of diversity, equity, and inclusion within the field of philanthropy suggests that not much has changed in recent years, despite the steps taken to create a more diverse and inclusive philanthropic sector. The field today is comprised of foundations which vary widely in terms of size, areas of focus, headcount, geography, etc. While the field has become increasingly diverse along these lines, the diversity of the talent pool within the field has not kept up pace with the changing sector. For several years, women have represented the majority of the philanthropic workforce, and yet there remains a disproportionate representation of women in leadership positions when compared to other levels within participant organizations. The representation of racial/ethnic minorities within our data set over the last five years is essentially unchanged, both overall and among leadership positions.

This research raises several questions:

**How can we best change the picture of staff diversity within the sector if the opportunities to hire new employees into the field are limited?** The number of people entering the sector will have a direct impact upon our ability to change the demographics of the sector. Much work has been done to address hiring practices that will essentially broaden the pool
from which our organizations are recruiting talent. While this is laudable, the efforts will only influence more rapid change if new talent is entering the sector at relatively significant rates. But because our research has shown that the rate of attrition within the philanthropic sector is low relative to other industries (consider the fact that 50 percent of those participating in the 2015 Grantmaker Salary and Benefits Report indicated no staff departures in the prior year), those individuals onboarding new talent need to be more intentional in their efforts to attract and hire from a diverse talent pool.

Those already working within the sector need mentors and role models who can groom them for advancement opportunities. Access to the senior positions within foundations should be available to all, necessitating a practice to promote from within. As a sector, we need to develop and prepare our talented staff members to ensure that they are among the talent pool considered for more senior roles. Foundation leaders must see genius beyond those who remind them of themselves if we are to diversify the pool of future philanthropic leaders.

We need to ensure that we are taking comprehensive measures to cast a wide net when seeking talent for our organizations. We need to analyze our recruitment and selections processes to guarantee that they are free from bias. We need to examine our job descriptions to confirm that we are not excluding populations of potential candidates from the onset, and we must target talent from multiple communities—racial/ethnic minorities, women, the LGBTQ community, people with disabilities, etc. If we wish to change the demographics of the sector, we must change the manner in which we approach the acquisition of talent.

Are we looking at the right data to measure progress? The Council on Foundations approaches diversity broadly. We recognize multiple dimensions of diversity, including ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, and physical/intellectual ability. We also recognize that additional factors, including, but not limited to, parental/family status, work experience, educational background, geographic location, and
organizational affiliation contribute to the diversity of thought that adds value to our organizations.

Our Grantmaker Salary and Benefits Survey has examined diversity primarily through the lens of race/ethnicity and gender. More recently, the Council has attempted to collect data on the representation of LGBTQ individuals and individuals with disabilities. Only 20 percent of foundation respondents in 2015 responded to questions regarding the presence of individuals with a disability on staff. Of these, only 1 percent indicated the presence of such individuals. The resulting dataset did not allow for meaningful analysis and raises important questions about the reasons our participating organizations chose not to disclose this data. It is incumbent upon our sector to foster greater transparency with regard to the reporting of our talent demographics while maintaining the anonymity of the talent pool against which we are reporting. Increased transparency will not only provide a more thorough understanding of the diversity of the talent in the sector, it will also aid in reducing potential concerns related to data reporting.

As our data collection processes become more inclusive, so too, must our workplaces. The organizations within the philanthropic sector must examine our workplace cultures and ensure that they are welcoming to, and inclusive of, the diverse talent pool that we seek to engage. The retention and development of a diverse talent pool will become critically important as the demographics of our nation continue to change. Our sector needs to examine internal operations and confirm that the policies and procedures regarding the management of our talent pools are inclusive and

"We need to ensure that we are taking comprehensive measures to cast a wide net when seeking talent for our organizations. We need to analyze our recruitment and selections processes to guarantee that they are free from bias."
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equitable. The policies related to health benefits, workplace flexibility, training, and development, etc. must align with the workforce of the 21st century.

Our sector is grappling with the same issues being faced by many industries today. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that by 2050, there will be no racial or ethnic majority in our country. Further, between 2000 and 2050 new immigrants and their children will account for 83 percent of the growth in the working-age population.

We must collaborate with others in the field—individual foundations, innovative consultants, identity-based groups (Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy, the Association of Black Foundation Executives, Emerging Practitioners in Philanthropy, Funders for LGBTQ Issues, Hispanics in Philanthropy, Native Americans in Philanthropy, the Women’s Funding Network, and others), infrastructure groups like the Council, and collaborative efforts such as the D5 Coalition—to map our path forward. We must also look to the private and public sectors to leverage effective practices, which have contributed to increased diversity within the talent pool and more inclusive workplaces. A talent pool that is rich in diversity better reflects our nation and contributes to the cultural competence necessary to understand the needs of the communities which grantmakers seek to serve.

The diversity of our talent pool is but one measure of a field which is truly inclusive. Our sector will need to study multiple factors through the lens of diversity, equity, and inclusion. We will need
to assess the composition of our boards and the leaders of our organizations. We will need to examine our practices with regard to the acquisition and management of talent. We will need to review our policies to ensure that they are inclusive of the talent we seek to retain. We will need to survey our programs to make sure that they are serving the various populations equitably.

This is an arduous task, to be sure. It is also one that is incredibly important to the field. Among the Council’s values is the belief that philanthropy plays a critical role in strengthening civil society and building thriving communities. Our sector’s commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion will contribute to our collective ability to do so.
## APPENDIX A: FULL-TIME POSITION BREAKDOWN

### Executive Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer/</td>
<td>Vice President or Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Development/Advancement Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director/</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President (Program)</td>
<td>Chief Investment Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President (Administration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Program Officer</td>
<td>Grants Manager/Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Officer</td>
<td>Director of Gift Planning/ Gift Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Associate</td>
<td>Human Resources Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Communications</td>
<td>Director of Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Donor Services/</td>
<td>Director of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Services Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Director</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>Communications Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Clerk</td>
<td>Grants Management Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Donor Services/Development/ Advancement Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION GUIDE

This paper raises challenging, yet important questions for the field regarding the development of a talent pool which better reflects the demographics of our nation’s workforce. The following discussion guide is designed to help foundation leaders facilitate dialogues with their staff and board members about the practices in place to foster greater diversity in the sourcing and recruitment of staff as well as an organizational culture that is welcoming and inclusive. It provides sample language to use to frame the dialogue and questions to ask during discussion.

Welcome and Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to discuss this report. You have been asked to participate as your point of view is important.

This discussion guide is designed to assess your current thoughts on a diverse talent pool and its impact on the organization and the community it aims to serve.

Introductory Question

Diversity can be interpreted many ways. For some, the term refers solely to race or ethnicity and for others, it refers to anything that is not the organizational norm. Diversity exists along multiple dimensions – race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, age, physical and/or intellectual ability, etc.

• What does the term “diversity” mean in your organization? What dimensions of diversity are you aware of among your staff and how does this diversity “show up” in the workplace?

Guiding Questions

Developing and retaining a diverse workforce requires that foundations foster inclusive workplaces that allow their
staff members to be their authentic selves. Examining the organization’s practices and policies may help to identify barriers to inclusion that may limit the ability to recruit and hire a more diverse workforce.

- What strategies are in place to source and recruit a diverse workforce?

If the goal is to focus greater intentionality on the diversity of the talent pool, the organization will have to give greater thought to how that talent is engaged. Job descriptions should reflect the organization’s culture and values and appeal to a broad range of talent. Inclusive job descriptions should be posted in multiple sources that will reach a diverse talent pool.

- Who is involved in the hiring process?

The hiring process should be inclusive of multiple perspectives. Including multiple dimensions of diversity among the staff demonstrates to the candidate that the organization is inclusive. In addition, the diversity of thought contributing to the hiring decision better reflects a fit with the organization as a whole rather than with a small subset that can reinforce a more “traditional” organization culture.

- Are the organization’s practices and policies inclusive of a diverse talent pool?

The organizational culture will be measured, in large part, by its practices and policies. Diversity and inclusion training and other efforts to build cultural competence will help to develop staff that is better prepared to engage in a multicultural environment. Benefits that are intentionally inclusive will allow for greater authenticity and reduced turnover among the staff.
Concluding Questions

• What value will greater diversity among the staff bring to the organization?

• How will a more diverse and inclusive organization influence the manner in which the organization interacts with its grantees and the community which it serves?

• How does the organization begin its journey on the path to becoming a more diverse and inclusive workplace?

Conclusion

Thank you for participating in this important dialogue. Your opinions are valuable and will help to shape our actions.

We hope you have found the discussion helpful and that you look forward to continued dialogue.