



Giving Together

Inside giving circles & impact groups

Strengthening Community Foundations

Collaborative giving will:

- Bring in more members and more donations
- Lead to greater community engagement
- Increase community profile
- Enhanced local knowledge of community needs
- Provide high impact grant making capacity
- Increased local knowledge of philanthropy
- Provide an opportunity for whole of community response
- Stimulate a multiplier effect

Common Attributes

- Five or more participants
- An agreed minimum individual dollar and time contribution
- A group donation of gathered money (or other forms of support) given to agreed charities/projects
- Money in and money out
- Groups form before the specific cause is selected – i.e. donor driven not fundraiser driven
- Encourage wide donor participation and education
- Formality varies depending on size
- Social element

Case Study:

Washington Women's Foundation

- To change the course of women's philanthropy through the power of collective giving.
- 'Capturing the capacity of women' in Washington State
- 500 women giving \$2,000 = \$1,000,000
- Donation increased to \$2,500 to form an independent entity (13th year)
- Keys to success were donor education, learning opportunities, democratic grant making process and leadership
- Five cause areas: Arts & Culture; Education; Environment; Health; & Human Services
- Five charities shortlisted for each area, site visits, research, voting & close mentoring if valued
- Most grants more than \$100,000 and \$15million+ distributed since 1996
- Founder believes they are 'building new major donors', civil society and local empowerment

Case Study: Portland Giving Circle

- 12 women, retired
- Individually contribute \$500 each and pool the funds
- Money given through the Portland Community Foundation, so tax deductible
- Make a \$6000 grant each year
- In the form of a scholarship to 'a woman rising out of poverty'
- After 11 years, 11 women in alumni that mentor others
- \$66,000 raised and many women's lives changed

Collective Giving Demographics

Men vs Women

- 81% women and 19% men
- 53% entirely women
- 61% overwhelmingly women
- 15% has a majority of men

Age

- 59% between 40 and 65 years old
- 28% between 25 and 40 years old
- 2% between 18 and 25 years old
- 1% under 18 years old

Number of Members

- 34% small group - fewer than 25 members
- 42% large groups – more than 25 members

US sample of 145 giving circles

Member Contributions

Donation Level

- Ranged from \$150pa to over \$100,000pa each member
- Average of \$2,809pa each member
- Most common donation level was \$1,000pa each member

Levels of Giving

- 64% one level of giving
- 15% tiered amounts
- 7% varying amounts

“A single, consistent giving level is essential to a safe environment in which every voice has equal weight.”

US sample of 145 giving circles

Democratic funding decisions

Deciding

- 38% make decisions on consensus
- Of these, 34% cast a vote and majority ruled
- 5% used a subset of members to make decisions
- 4% voted in proportion to their financial contribution

Information & sub-committees

- 46% had sub-committees responsible for information gathering
- 34% had a flat structure
- 50% made a site visit to the organisation
- 35% held meetings with nonprofit staff to learn more

US Sample of 145 Giving Circles

Specific cause area

Location

- 78% made at least some grants, if not all, in their own city, town or community
- 6% made national grants

Causes

- 49% Women & girls
- 43% Education
- 33% Youth development
- 30% Health & nutrition
- 26% Community improvement and capacity building
- 25% Arts, culture and humanities
- 9% Individuals

Grant recipients

- 30% remain very flexible
- 67% identified organisation by word-of-mouth
- 45% used a formal request for proposals

Where should money be held

- 68% had a host organisation
 - >52% of these kept money at their local community foundation
- 12% had their own incorporated structure and members received a tax-deduction for donations
 - >most of these had staff support and annual contributions exceeding \$1,000pa per member
- 20% un-hosted
 - >generally small giving circles of 25 members or less
 - >pooled bank account or wrote individual cheques
 - >donors received individual tax receipts

US sample of 145 giving circles



Impact100
fremantle

Impact100 Movement

- Founded by Wendy Steel in Cincinnati in 2002
- Collectively making significant grants to charitable initiatives in greater Cincinnati
- 100 people give \$1000 each towards a pooled amount of \$100,000
- Makes high impact grants into the local community
- High donor engagement and learning
- A 99% satisfaction rate of membership
- Now 18 groups in North America and five in Australia
- The movement has contributed more than \$25million
- The largest group, Impact100 Pensacola has 1060 members (April 2015) and distributes over \$1million annually

Impact100 Attributes

- Money in, money out
 - 100% distribution for maximum impact and sustainability
- Low, affordable minimum donation level
 - To be inclusive and engaging
- Agreed mission and shared decision making process
 - To grow local knowledge, awareness and community profile
- Large, high impact grants to lesser known local charities
 - To have an exciting and significant impact

Impact100 Four Principles

To use the ***Impact100*** name, the following principles must be committed to:

- Big grants rather than many smaller grants
- A equal vote whatever the donation
- No necessity for members to volunteer or participate
- Shared decision making process following stimulating dialog and educational opportunities about community needs

Forming Impact100 Fremantle

1. Key people agreed to do it
2. Discussed and understand the concept – what, why, how, where
3. Agreed our broad proposition – *the sell*
4. Formed a committee of mixed skills
5. Agreed our goals and targets – size, impact, time commitment, etc.
6. Set our minimum financial contribution at \$1000
7. Agreed form a sub fund “Impact100 Fremantle”
8. Found consensus on our cause area – disadvantaged children and young people in 1st year
9. Designed activities within an annual timeline
10. Recruited donors throughout the year up until Nov Awards Night
11. Formed working groups (grant making and events) - could also include donor/member engagement, donor recruitment.
12. Design the application process and assessment system
13. Called for applications and put them through the assessment process
14. Held the inaugural Grants Dinner on November 2013
15. Annual review

Structural decisions to make

- Board or sub committee skills?
- Geographical focus? – Inner Fremantle or Greater Fremantle?
- Cause areas? – committee or donor lead?
- Size? – initial and long term targets
- Short and long-term objectives? – Build a culture of giving.
- Donation level, fundraising and recruitment strategy?
- Communication strategy?
- Giving process?
- Application process?
- Assessment process?
- Reporting process?
- Commitment to education & social engagement ?
- Administrative costs?
- Workload?
- Sustainability?

Process decisions to make

- Eligibility for a grant? Both responsive and distinct from CF's
- Does tax deductibility matter?
- Public call or invitation only?
- Annual grant or multi-year grants?
- Capacity for smaller grants?
- Where's the money held?
- Communication with applicants and donors?
- Engaging donors in the assessment process?
- Evaluation criteria and decision making tools?
- Time restraints and deadlines?
- Speed the grant should be spent?

Keys to Success

1. Determined leadership
2. Visible impact
3. Member equality – one vote whatever the donation
4. Compelling cause at donor recruitment
5. Money in, money out - 100% distribution
6. Donor education and learning
7. Donor influence over decision making
8. Professionally run on a tight annual timeline
9. Excellent communication to donors and applicants
10. Enjoyable and social

Short term benefits seen by Impact100 Fremantle

- Drastic increase in social impact (\$10K-\$20K pa to \$130K pa in grants)
- Spike in public awareness
- Spike in intensive donor engagement
- Fast tracked the organisation's learning
- The wow factor - it's exciting – it get's people inspired!

Long-term Benefits

35% members contribute additional money

43% sit on non-profit boards

35% support charities fundraising efforts

32% offer pro-bono support

65% volunteer

Member Learning

65% of groups provide workshops and speakers about community issues

56% offer speakers about philanthropy and giving

27% offer how-to workshops on proposal evaluation & reading budgets

Advocacy and Lobbying

More Giving Together. J Bearman. May 2009.

Challenges

- Administration workload / system upgrade
- Allocation of funds during growth stages
- Donor recruitment
- Donor engagement
- Efficient donor management
- Committee recruitment and management

Power of Collective Giving

- Powerful
- Rewarding
- Social
- Inclusive
- Informed
- Effective
- Multiplier effect



For more information contact:

Dylan Smith

Fremantle Community Foundation

0410 202 610

dylan@fremantlefoundation.com

James Boyd

Impact100 WA and Impact100 Convenor (Australia)

0417 977 022

james.boyd@creativepartnershipsaustralia.org.au

