



CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS TO FUNDING: COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES©

Michael Muhammad, M.A., Ph.D.

Copyright© November 2023. Cite as: “Michael Muhammad, *Challenges and Barriers to Funding: Community Perspectives*, November 2023.”

COMMUNITY REPORT

Executive Summary

Private and public philanthropy (including government and quasi government) are viewed as powerful change agents that invest vast sums in top-down approaches to fund equity work that promote dominant group values, which are not necessarily aligned with community needs and priorities. Specifically, focus group participants noted that funders have vaguely defined concepts of equity, are biased towards short-term investments, adopt funding models that promote dependency on charitable institutions, and conflate diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) with authentic transformation of oppressed and marginalized communities. These practices frequently lead to the disproportionate funding of initiatives targeting crises that are currently being publicized in the media rather than long-term investment in creating lasting structural equity. As a result, much of the funded work often fails to address racism and eliminate health inequities.

Additionally, funders lack community-centered approaches, which is a prominent example of institutional practices that are counter to genuine equitable engagement with communities. Community defined needs for building equity are often co-opted by private and public philanthropy (including government and quasi government). Participants also believe that institutional practices are biased against funding smaller under-resourced CBOs and CBOs led by people of color. This practice results in the same community-based organizations repeatedly receiving the bulk of grant funded dollars.

Furthermore, funders often structure requests for applications that emphasize a deficit narrative requiring community organizations to justify need by focusing on what the community lacks, instead of highlighting community strengths and assets. Employing a community deficit model to support funding initiatives maintains unequal power relations, perpetuates community dependency on public and private philanthropy, and undermines the building of strong, resilient and self-sufficient communities.

To address these previously mentioned issues, funders need to partner with communities to create grant calls. In addition, focus group participants suggested that in collaboration with community, private and public philanthropy co-create metrics for success with community partners. Mutually agreed upon outcomes and definitions for what determines a successful project helps to create accountability measures for all partners.

Focus Groups

Using the focus group format, input from individuals and communities impacted by health inequities was gathered, including the challenges nonprofits and community organizations experience seeking funding from philanthropic institutions. Focus group participants were also asked for recommendations to ensure that funding would address racism, eliminate health inequities, and result in substantive community benefit. Information was collected during two focus group sessions.

Participants

Individuals were recruited from several different geographic regions, sectors, and expertise areas to participate in two focus group sessions. The participants' areas of expertise include community engagement, immigration, public health, social and community health activism, and race and social justice.

Forty-one individuals were initially invited, with twenty-five individuals participating in the focus groups. In addition, eight additional individuals, who had participated in other parts of this grant project, were invited to participate, and five of those individuals participated in the focus group. In total, thirty individuals participated in the focus group, with twenty individuals attending both sessions and ten individuals attending only the first focus group session. The list of focus group participants is in [Appendix A](#).

Process

All focus group sessions were conducted through video conferencing, which were recorded and transcribed for analysis. Participants provided consent to be recorded during the focus group sessions and received a stipend for their participation. Qualitative coding of the transcripts utilized a modified grounded theory approach with constant comparison between participant responses to identify similar and contrasting perspectives. Thematic analysis was used to organize and categorize key themes and subthemes emerging from a close reading of the transcripts.

Results

This section summarizes the key themes identified from an analysis of the focus group data for each question. There were three questions asked each session. Some of the responses go beyond the question asked; these themes are also included in key themes for each question. A fuller description of the findings is reported in the [Appendix B](#).

First Session

Question 1: What is your general assessment of the field of philanthropy in promoting equity? From your perspective, what is working and what is not?

- Philanthropy Lacks Community Centered Approaches
- Philanthropy Lacks Knowledge of Roots of Structural Inequity
- Equity Needs to Be Defined by Those Suffering from Inequity
- Diversity Narrative is Counterproductive to Equity Work
- Philanthropy Needs to Incorporate an Intersectional Lens in Funding Initiatives

- Smaller Community Based Organizations (CBOs) Need Support to Build Increased Capacity for Funding
- Philanthropy Needs to Develop and Adopt Alternative or Independent Funding Models
- Philanthropy Institutional Practices do not Promote Equity

Question 2: What has been your experience (good and bad) with the process of funding your organization or the projects you are involved with? For example, identifying funding opportunities, developing the grant application, grant submission requirements, post-award grant administration, implementation, evaluation, and/or reporting of outcomes.

- Negative Community Experiences with the Process of Funding Organizations and Projects
- CBOs Need Additional Support to Be Able to Compete for Funding
- Community Recommendations for Enhancing Philanthropic Funding

Question 3: How should philanthropists understand the role of race in advancing social change?

- Establish Mutually Agreed Upon Definitions of Race, Racism, and Anti-Racism
- Community Knowledge and Perspectives Should Drive Equity Work
- Use Community-Driven Funding Priorities and Outcomes
- Philanthropy Needs to Adopt New & Innovative Approaches to Funding Equity Work to Advance Social Change

Second Session

Question 1: How can philanthropic institutions be held more accountable (e.g., to community organizations, nonprofits, and the communities they support)? Please provide specific recommendations.

- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Assess Organizational Structures and Practices that Promote Community Accountability
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Incorporate a Narrative that is Intersectional and Utilizes Community Knowledge
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Co-Create Metrics with Community for Determining Accountability and Success
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Involve the Community in Developing and Adopting Grant

Application and Review Processes

- Philanthropic Institutions Must Develop Alternative Funding Models That Promote Equity

Question 2: How can philanthropic institutions actively adopt an “anti-racist” praxis? Share concrete recommendations on how they can ensure their organizational culture, norms, and policies do not perpetuate systemic, structural, or other forms of racism.

- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Assess Organizational Structures and Practices that Reproduce Systemic Racism and Other Forms of Racism
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Ensure Equitable Board Representation
- Community Recommendations for Institutional Practices that Facilitate Anti-Racism

Question 3: What are some specific alternative funding models, mechanisms, or strategies that community organizations and nonprofits can implement to reduce their reliance on traditional cycles of philanthropic funding?

- Community Recommendations for Alternative Funding Models
- Community Perspectives on Alternative Approaches to Funding Equity Work
- Valuing and Cultivating Community Power

Conclusion

Community focus group participants shared a consensus that the field of philanthropy (i.e., funders) seems to be somewhat disconnected from the legacies of colonization, African slavery, legalized racial discrimination, and the enfranchisement of systemic white advantage that is at the root of structural inequity and systemic racism in the US. Focus group members strongly believed philanthropic institutions should look inward at the organizational structures, policies and practices that may inadvertently contribute to systemic racism.

For example, wealth and power are unequally distributed along a socially constructed, racialized hierarchy of systemic white advantage. Furthermore, philanthropic boards, executive leadership, and staff are predominately white and therefore, philanthropic institutions must be intentional about the prevalence of white privilege and the ways it can shape organizational culture, norms and policies without careful observation.

Unraveling the interconnectedness of power and privilege that accrues from racism is challenging but necessary to deconstruct systems of oppression. The first step is to critically analyze one’s own position within society and practice solidarity with marginalized groups as a means of confronting racial inequity. Secondly, leaders

must assess institutional and community power to map how racism contributes to structural inequity. Third, philanthropies should establish regular dialogue with communities of interest to garner community level perspectives on funder practices and policies that may perpetuate systemic racism. Finally, leaders should conduct periodic assessments of institutional practices and policies by engaging external evaluators of color with expertise in intersectional and critical race analysis.

The focus group discussions revealed the ways in which institutional power, wealth, racism, and structural inequity are deeply intertwined with the founding of this great nation. It will take bold leadership and comprehensive vision that incorporate diverse perspectives and lived experiences to create a more just and equitable society. The community members participating in our focus groups stand ready to accept that challenge and are seeking the same commitment from philanthropic institutions.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the participants of the community focus groups, which provided insights about the field of philanthropy and some examples used in this report. I would also like to thank Debbie Chase and Ruqaiyah Yearby for their support with the focus groups and this report.

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Support for this policy brief was provided by the Robert Wood Johns Foundation. The views expressed here do not reflect the views of the Foundation.

The Institute for Healing Justice & Equity

The Institute for Healing Justice & Equity (the Institute or IHJE) aims to eliminate disparities caused by systemic oppression through systems change and deep community partnership. IHJE has a long-standing commitment to equity and is dedicated to community-driven systems change. IHJE received a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, through its Transforming Health and Health Care Systems team, to assist RWJF in planning two grant projects, including mapping a new system for grantmaking that was more inclusive and community focused.

In 2021, the Institute for Healing Justice & Equity (IHJE or Institute) received a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF), through its Transforming Health and Health Care Systems team, to assist RWJF in planning two grant projects. IHJE was also asked to imagine, build, and map a new system for grantmaking that was more inclusive and community focused. To accomplish the grant objectives, IHJE created the Anti-Racism Consortium – a panel of content experts, community advocates, and organizations from different geographic regions, sectors, and expertise areas.

As the grant work began to focus on providing recommendations for anti-racism funding practices, it became clear that additional community input was needed. Thus, the Institute asked Dr. Michael Muhammad to facilitate community focus group sessions and conduct an analysis of data collected during each session. Debbie Chase, a consultant and long-time collaborator with IHJE, supported Dr. Muhammad. This report summarizes the focus group process and discusses the results from those focus groups.

Author

Michael Muhammad, M.A., Ph.D., is an independent consultant specializing in CBPR, CEnR, and health inequities research. Dr. Muhammad was supported with a RWJF Doctoral Fellowship from the RWJF Center for Health Policy at UNM. His work has been published in *Ethnicity & Disease*, *Health Education & Behavior*, *Progress in Community Health Partnerships*, and the *International Journal for Equity in Health*.

Appendix A

Community Member Attendee List for the First and Second Session. Individuals who only attended the first session of the focus group have an asterisk by their name.

First Session Attendees: July 20, 2023 (N=11) & July 24, 2023 (N=17)

Name	Organization
Enrique Lopez-Escalera	Gemas de Vida, LLC, Las Cruces NM
Magdalena Avila, PhD	Transdisciplinary Research Center for Equity and Engagement, Abq, University of New Mexico
Cassandra Brooks	University of Michigan, Flint MI
Zachary Rowe*	Friends of Parkside, Detroit MI
Maryland Grier-Union	MMG Consulting Partners, Houston TX
Rebecca Rae*	Associate Director of Indigenous Research, Evaluation, and Strategic Planning with the Center for Participatory Research, University of New Mexico, Abq, NM
Patrick Barrett	New Mexico Center of Black Excellence!!, Abq NM
Earnest Hopkins*	Pamoja Circle, Inc., Augusta GA
Kasey Dudley	SPAN Advocacy, Newark NJ
Carmela Roybal, PhD	Native American Budget and Policy Institute, University of New Mexico Abq, NM
Michelle Barbeau	Community Governance Member of the STL Racial Healing + Justice Fund, St. Louis MO
Suzette Chaumette*	Food Indy, Oakland, CA
Thomas Cotton III	Redemption & Advancement Alliance, Atlanta, GA
Al Richmond	Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Raleigh NC
Cathryn McGill	New Mexico Black Leadership Council, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Lorenda Belone, PhD*	University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
Carolyn McKenzie*	Healthy Black Families, Berkeley, CA.
Starla Gay	Oakland, CA
Katherine Donald	Coalition for a Tobacco Free Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas

Name	Organization
Nancy López, PhD	Director & Co-founder, Institute for the Study of “Race” & Social Justice, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
Aaliyah Muhammad	North Carolina Justice Center Raleigh NC
Kenneth Perdue	Rollinbuckeyez Foundation, Cleveland Ohio
Azziz Muhammad	Verizon Learning Center, Cleveland Ohio
Kimberlee Parker	Faith Based Organization Higher Education, Atlanta GA
Scott Muhammad	SEED Inc., Tuskegee, Al
Ben D’Avanzo*	National Immigration Law Center, Los Angeles, Ca.
Jaime Gloshey*	Native Women Lead, Albuquerque, NM
LaShawn Hoffman	Hoffman & Assoc., Atlanta GA

Second Session Attendees: August 2, 2023 (N = 7) & August 9, 2023 (N = 15)

Name	Organization
Alan Richmond	Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Raleigh NC
Carmela Roybal, PhD	Native American Budget and Policy Institute, University of New Mexico Abq, NM
Starla Gay	Community Partner CBPR, Stanford University
Nancy Lopez	Director & Co-founder, Institute for the Study of “Race” & Social Justice, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
Kimberlee Parker	Faith Based Organization Clark-Atlanta University, Atlanta GA
Kenneth Perdue	Rollinbuckeyez Foundation, Cleveland Ohio
Scott Muhammad	SEED Inc., Tuskegee, Al
Cassandra Brooks	University of Michigan, Flint MI
Thomas Cotton III	Redemption & Advancement Alliance, Atlanta, GA
Patrick Barrett	New Mexico Center of Black Excellence!!, Abq NM
Aaliyah Muhammad	North Carolina Justice Center Raleigh NC
Enrique Lopez-Escalera	Gemas de Vida, LLC, Las Cruces NM

Name	Organization
Maryland Grier-Union	MMG Consulting Partners, Houston TX
Magdalena Avila, PhD	Transdisciplinary Research Center for Equity and Engagement, Abq, University of New Mexico
Azziz Muhammad	Verizon Learning Center, Cleveland Ohio
Dr. Rev. Neely Williams	Community Partners' Linked Network of Services, Nashville TN
Sheldon Jordan, PhD	New Mexico Black Leadership Council, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Michelle Barbeau	Community Governance Member of the STL Racial Healing + Justice Fund
Kasey Dudley	SPAN Advocacy, Newark NJ
Cathryn McGill	New Mexico Black Leadership Council, Albuquerque, New Mexico
LaShawn Hoffman	Hoffman & Assoc., Atlanta GA
Katherine Donald	Coalition for a Tobacco Free Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas

Appendix B

Key Findings from Qualitative Analysis of Community Focus Group Data. Many of the key themes appear under more than one question. Some of the responses go beyond the question asked; these themes are also included in key themes for each question.

First Session – July 20, 2023 (N=11) & July 24, 2023 (N=17)

Question 1: What is your general assessment of the field of philanthropy in promoting equity? from your perspective, what is working and what is not?

Philanthropy Lacks Community Centered Approaches

- Philanthropic Institutions Need Authentic Community Representatives to Fight for Community Interests
- True Equity Work Requires Long-Time Investment in Communities
- Community Based Organizations (CBOs) Should Not Have to Water Down Their Work to Get Funding from a More Conservative Donor Base

Philanthropy Lacks Knowledge of Roots of Structural Inequity

- Philanthropy Exhibits a General Lack of Understanding of the Legacies Producing Structural Inequity

- Philanthropic Funding Biased Against Organizations Led by People of Color

Equity Needs to Be Defined by Those Suffering from Inequity

- Equity Needs to be Defined from the Perspective of Those Suffering from Inequity
- Funders and CBOs May Have Different Definitions of Equity
- Large Philanthropic Institutions Influence Trends in Funding Initiatives

Diversity Narrative is Counterproductive to Equity Work

- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) does not Promote Equity
- DEI Efforts Results in More CBOs Competing for the Same Funding

Philanthropy Needs to Incorporate an Intersectional Lens in Funding Initiatives

- Incorporate an Intersectional Lens When Viewing Social Problems and Inequities
- An Intersectional Approach Can Add Flexibility to Problem Definition and Solution for Funders and CBOs

Smaller CBOs Need Support to Build Increased Capacity for Funding

- Funders Overlooking Small Organizations is a Missed Opportunity for Equity
- CBOs Need Technical Assistance and Infrastructure Building to Attract Funding
- CBOs Need to Build Relationship with Funders Through Small Grants Overtime Mechanisms Are Needed to Connect Philanthropists with Grassroots Organizations in Need of Funding
- Consistent Funding Comes from Understanding the System of Grant Based Funding
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Provide Capacity for CBOs and Grassroots Organizations to Equitably Partner with Tier 1 Research Universities
- Volunteer Work of Community Partners Needs to be Considered Part of CBOs Operating Budget
- Smaller Organizations Need Technical Assistance to Increase Equitable Access to Funding Through a Greater Technical Competency About Funding Initiatives

Philanthropy Needs to Develop and Adopt Alternative or Independent Funding Models

- Independent Funding Models Developed in Partnership with CBOS and Communities are Needed for True Systemic Change

- Black, Indigenous, and Other People of Color Organizations and CBOs Need to Create Alternative Funding Models to Reduce Dependency on Philanthropy
- When CBOs Stop Working in Community Due to Funding Termination, They Are in Effect Simply Extensions of Philanthropy

Philanthropy Institutional Practices do not Promote Equity

- Consistently Funding Same Organizations Does Promote Equity
- Equity Is Co-opted by Philanthropic Interests
- Equity is Watered Down with the Substitution of Disparity Language
- Philanthropic Efforts to Force Collaboration with “Anti-Black” organizations Does Not Promote Equity
- Tax Advantages of Charitable Donations May Sustain Inequity
- Philanthropy Places More Emphasis on Crisis Resolution Rather Than Real Equity Work
- Philanthropy is Biased Towards Larger, Better Resourced CBOs Creates Inequity in Funding
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Adopt Accessibility Tools for the Physically Impaired to Help Access Funding
- Funder Rules May Restrict Dissemination of Beneficial Knowledge to Communities

Question 2: What has been your experience (good and bad) with the process of funding your organization or the projects you are involved with? For example, identifying funding opportunities, developing the grant application, grant submission requirements, post-award grant administration, implementation, evaluation, and/or reporting of outcomes.

Negative Community Experiences with the Process of Funding Organizations and Projects

- Institutional Practices That Do Not Promote Equity
- Lack of Academic Institutional Support for True Community Engagement Work
- Philanthropic Institutions Biased in Favor of Outside Majority-Led CBOs
- CBOs with Proven Track-Records May be Penalized by Funders for Not Having Past University Collaborations
- CBOs Should Not Have to Focus on Community Deficits to Justify Financial Need
- Philanthropy and Majority-Led CBOs Co-opting Equity Movement with DEI and LGBTQ+

Leaving Out Minority-Led Communities and Other Groups

- Funder Requirements for Inclusivity May Undermine Community Engagement Initiatives

CBOs Need Additional Support to Be Able to Compete For Funding

- CBOs Need Capacity Building and Technical Assistance to Access Funding
- CBOs Require Dedicated Staff for Consistent Funding
- Smaller Grassroots CBOs Need Technical Assistance Throughout Grant Application Process
- CBOs May Need Fiscal Agents If They Lack Expertise and Staff to Oversee Funding Requirements
- CBO Capacity Building Required to Raise Funds, Including Board Membership and Staffing Decisions
- CBOs Need to Have a Certain Level of Research Experience to Compete for Funding
- CBOs Need to Better Understand Evaluation, and Data Collection to Improve Funding Efforts
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Adopt Accessibility Tools for the Physically Impaired to Help Access Funding

Community Recommendations for Enhancing Philanthropic Funding

- Philanthropy Needs to Adopt the Equity Approach Built by Sharing Knowledge and Funding, Which Is Power
- CBOs Need to Renegotiate for More Funding When Funders Expand Scope of Work
- Community Driven Funding Priorities Shifts Power Inequity from Funders to Communities
- Philanthropy Needs to Increase Use of Grant Reviewers That Have Experience with Community
- Metrics for Assessing Community Benefits Should Be Negotiated with Community Partners
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Transition to Deliverables Based Accounting for Scope of Work
- Philanthropy Needs to Develop Funding Models That Funds Community Partners Separately from Academic/Institutional Partners
- Philanthropy Needs to Develop CBO Funding Strategies That Create Long-Term and Sustainable Community Employment from Its Work
- Philanthropy Needs to Develop Funding Strategies That Require Greater Collaboration with

Academic Institutions

- Funder Requirements for Inclusivity May Undermine Community Engagement Initiatives

Question 3: How should philanthropists understand the role of race in advancing social change?

Establish Mutually Agreed Upon Definitions of Race, Racism, and Anti-Racism

- Use More Inclusive Language for Race
- Need Concrete Definitions of Race, Racism, Anti-Racism to Better Understand How It Impacts Inequity and the Work of Philanthropists
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Be Intentional About Not Using Culturally Offensive Terms Like Minority
- Philanthropic Institutions Have an Opportunity to Counter Narratives That Undermine Importance of Race for Inequity and Health Disparities

Community Knowledge and Perspectives Should Drive Equity Work

- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Learn About the Communities They Intend to Support from a Grassroots Community Perspective
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Visit, Engage and Interact with Communities They Want to Work with to Better Understand the People's Needs and Priorities
- Philanthropic Institutions Use of Deficit Framing Shows a lack of Community Knowledge
- Genuine Structural Change Requires Funder's Staff to be Certified in Community Engagement
- Avoid Stereotype Thinking When Working in Communities
- Philanthropy Should not Give money to Non-Tribal Organizations to Work in Tribal Communities Without Tribal Community Partners

Use Community-Driven Funding Priorities and Outcomes

- Community Wants to See Sustainable Outcomes from Philanthropic Funding Not Superficial "Fad" Or Pop-Culture Action to Serve Poor People
- Fund Community-Led Narrative Change Efforts
- Communities of Color Require Long-Term Funding Commitments; Interventions That are Directed by Community Needs and Priorities as well as Community-Led Approaches and Outcomes

Philanthropy Needs to Adopt New & Innovative Approaches to Funding Equity Work to Advance Social Change

- Philanthropic Institutions Need New Approaches and Innovative Thinking When Seeking to Invest in Communities of Color
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Create Multiple Tiers for Funding Different Levels of Structural Change
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Be Willing to Risk Their Reputation or to Support Controversial Work to Demonstrate Genuine Commitment to Equity Work
- Philanthropic Institutions Inclination to Fund Older Established CBOs with Diverse Leadership May Suggest a Bias Against New Innovative Approaches to Equity Work

Second Session - August 2, 2023 (N = 7) & August 9, 2023 (N = 15)

Question 1: How can philanthropic institutions be held more accountable (e.g., to community organizations, nonprofits, and the communities they support)? Please provide specific recommendations.

Philanthropic Institutions Need to Assess Organizational Structures and Practices that Promote Community Accountability

- Philanthropic Institutions Must Be Aware of Their Own Biases and Challenges That Undermine Community Accountability, Which Include Elitism, Power Inequity, Wealth, and Racism
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Establish Meaningful Relationships Between Funder, CBOs, and Community, Not Superficial Ceremonial Ones
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Encourage Bi-Directional Communication Between Philanthropic Institutions, CBOs, and Community Members
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Facilitate Internal Conversations at the Board, Founder and Other Administrative Levels About Internal Structures and Systems That Define Institutional Accountability to CBOs and the Community
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Recruit Board Members More Directly Connected to the Communities of Focus with a Genuine Stake in the Well-Being of the Community

Philanthropic Institutions Need to Incorporate a Narrative that is Intersectional and Utilizes Community Knowledge

- Ensure That Narratives About Communities Are Whole, Broad, and Include a Variety of Factors, Including an Intersectional Lens of Race, Sex, Class, and Other Social Factors.

- Institutional Policymaking Must Account for Diverse Populations Utilizing an Intersectional Lens
- Philanthropists Should Utilize Local Knowledge When Funding Work in Tribal Communities

Philanthropic Institutions Must Co-Create Metrics with Community for Determining Accountability and Success

- Philanthropic Institutions Must Change Metrics for Success Because What Is Success for a Specific CBO or Community May Differ
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Use Community Developed Measures in Selecting the Best Organizations for a Specific Type of Outcome
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Establish Community Developed Accountability Measures Agreeable to All Partners
- Project Timelines May Not Be Feasible in Real World Settings to Accomplish Verifiable Outcomes and Impacts
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Change How Evaluation Gets Done to a More Deliverables Based Evaluation Vs. Line-Item Budgeted Activities as Metrics (Outputs Vs Impact)
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Apply a Collective Unity Methodology as a Problem-Solving Strategy

Philanthropic Institutions Should Involve the Community in Developing and Adopting Grant Application and Review Processes

- Philanthropic Institutions Must Involve Community Leaders and CBOs on the Grant Review Committee
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Submit Community Leaders Review to the Board to Ensure That the Community Perspective Is Heard
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Reconsider How Grant Applications Are Scored Because High Scoring Institutions May Not Be a Good Fit for Work in Community Even Though They Have Technical Resources and Name Recognition
- Current Grant Scoring Rubrics May Unfairly Disqualify Low Scoring CBOs That are a Good Fit for Work in Community

Philanthropic Institutions Must Develop Alternative Funding Models That Promote Equity

- Philanthropic Institutions' Current Competitive Funding Model Does Not Work for Smaller CBOs

- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Develop a New Model for Charitable Funding That Does Not Depend on Philanthropic Institutions Who Represent the Systems and Structures, Which Reproduce and Maintain Inequity
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Provide Funding for Whole Communities, Not Limited to Singular CBOs in Community, Which Can Reduce Competition and Promote Collaboration Across Sectors and Organizations
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Adopt a Collective Funding Model That Empowers the Community to Make Systemic Changes in the Cycle of Funding Community Projects
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Implement a Block Grant Funding Model That Awards Money to Larger Blocks of Communities, Such as Tribes, with a Single Organization Serving as Grant Administrator for CBOs in Region

Question 2: How can philanthropic institutions actively adopt an “anti-racist” praxis? Share concrete recommendations on how they can ensure their organizational culture, norms, and policies do not perpetuate systemic, structural, or other forms of racism.

Philanthropic Institutions Need to Assess Organizational Structures and Practices that Reproduce Systemic Racism and Other Forms of Racism

- Philanthropic Institutions Should Use Reflexive and Self-Critical Thinking About One’s Place in the System of Racism and Practice a Solidarity with Other Groups as a Means of Deconstruction, Countering and Challenging Existing Systems of Inequity
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Be Self-Reflective Enough to Consider How Their Privileges and How Their Resources Were Acquired
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Not Only Should Support a Critical Race Perspective When Race or Racism is a Focus of the Project, But Also Philanthropic Institutions Need to Work to Understand the Value of Applying a Critical Race Lens to Issues Surrounding Racism.
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Assess Institutional and Community Power to Identify Racism Generated Power Inequity Within Their Institutions. This Assessment Should be Connected to the Adoption of a Critical Race Perspective and Intersectional Lens and Completion of Community Assessments to Identify Inequities (that May Be Grounded in Racism and Could Be Promoted Through Covert and Unintentional Racist Practices of Philanthropists)
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Dialogue with Community Members and Those Served by Philanthropic Activities.
- Philanthropic Institutions can Use the Community of Interest, Which is a Good Source for Determining Whether Practices and Policies Are Anti-Racist

- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Build a Clear Consensus for Definitions of Race, Racism, and Anti-Racism, then Create a Community of Practice Around These Definitions That Guide Their Actions

Philanthropic Institutions Must Ensure Equitable Board Representation

- Community Members Must Be Represented on Philanthropic Institution's Boards and They Need to Reflect the Representation of Communities of Color Where Most Philanthropic Work Is Conducted.
- Community Board Members Need to Be Part of the Philanthropic Institutions' Conversations About Funding Targets, Strategies, and Funding Priorities, Outcomes, and Impact
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Ensure That Board Composition Is Regularly Revitalized with New Members, New Leadership, and New Ideas

Community Recommendations for Institutional Practices that Facilitate Anti-Racism

- Philanthropic Institutions Should Establish Procedures that Account for How Racism Functions Within Their Own Institutions and Spheres of Influence
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Conduct Comprehensive Assessment Throughout Their Organization to Identify Opportunities for Anti-Racist Praxis as well as Identify Areas That Need Work
- Philanthropic Institutions' Evaluations of Internal Practices That May Have Implications for Racial Equity May Be Best Performed by External Evaluators of Color That Have Expertise in methods for Critical Race Analysis
- Grant Reviewers Need to Be Aware of the Uniqueness of Communities of Color, Especially Black Communities; They Are Not Monolithic

Question 3: What are some specific alternative funding models, mechanisms, or strategies that community organizations and nonprofits can implement to reduce their reliance on traditional cycles of philanthropic funding?

Community Recommendations for Alternative Funding Models

- A Self-Governance and Decolonial Model That Incorporates Self Governance As Well As Decolonial and Anti-Racist Practices for Promoting Equity and Anti-Racism
- A Faith-Based Model, Which Pools Dollars Collected by Faith-Based Organizations and Reinvest in the Surrounding Communities

- A Community-Based Organization Model, Which Encourages Philanthropic Institutions to Adopt a Local CBO and Donate a Set Amount Per Period
- Community-Led Collaborative Funding Models

◇ To Be Anti-Racist Requires Personal Virtue. At the Societal Level It Could Be Known as Solidarity With an Emphasis on Collectivity, Sharing, and Collaborating as a New Funding Model

◇ A Model That is Built on the Liberation Capital in Our Communities. There Are Many Creative Ways to Collaborate and Partner with Other Organizations. The Key Is Sharing of Resources and Supporting Our Own People

◇ Adopt “Community-Led Funding” as a New Approach That Identifies Community Priorities, Ideas, and Outcomes/Impact to Be Determined by Community People. Community Would Write Their Own Grants and Philanthropists Would Provide Funding for Hiring and Operational Support

◇ A Model in which Smaller CBOs Gather Together to Exchange and Share Resources Through a Bartering System. This Model Could Become Sustainable Since It Is Rooted in the Community and Builds on the Interrelationships of CBOs

Community Perspectives on Alternative Approaches to Funding Equity Work

- Prioritize Community Voice and Knowledge
- Developing New Models of Funding Requires That Community Voice Is Central and Directs the Conversation About Community Needs and Interests
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Recognize the Value of Community Knowledge, Science, in Order to Genuinely Change How Funding Decisions Are Accomplished in a Manner That Promotes Equity and Anti-Racism
- Changing the Field of Philanthropy Means Making Stakeholder Investment a Critical Aspect of the Project
- Philanthropic Institutions Need to Support Peoples Traditional Ways of Thought and Practices Across Various Cultures By Adopting Interventions That Fit with Local Culture, Which Increases Its Usefulness and Acceptability, and Takes Advantage of Existing Systems of Disseminating Local Information
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Transition Away from the Adoption of One-Size Fits All Plans.
- Philanthropic Institutions Should Share Lessons Learned, Examples, and Resources as Well

as Adopt a Spirit of Partnership to Craft Locally Led Teams of Experts for Equity Work

Valuing and Cultivating Community Power

- True Power Comes When Philanthropic Institutions Have Community Members Develop Principles for Community Engagement
- Philanthropic Institutions Must Align Their Mission and Objectives to Be More in-Line with the Community
- Power is Centered in the Community Since Philanthropic Institutions Are Dependent on Communities to Be a Charitable Organization.
- In Order for Communities to Benefit from Funding Philanthropic Institutions Must Partner with Communities and CBOs to Organize and Provide Community - Driven Projects for Funding