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INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the 2022 Snapshot of Today’s Philanthropic Landscape report produced by CCS Fundraising. For the past eleven years, this report has compiled and analyzed industry research to provide a synthesis of the current state of philanthropy.

Our 2021 Snapshot of Today’s Philanthropic Landscape report analyzed available data on how philanthropy responded to an unprecedented period of disruption in 2020. In the numbers, we saw US-based donors spring into action to help their communities, and we witnessed a steadfast commitment among philanthropists to advocate for justice using the power of philanthropy. We also observed the nonprofit sector’s agility and adaptability in a rapidly changing world.

In this year’s report, we assess what a “new normal” for philanthropy looks like after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and social justice reckoning. We also analyze which changes from the initial period of disruption seem likely to endure and what new and reemerging trends nonprofit leaders and fundraisers will want to monitor. Additionally, we offer a greater emphasis on gift planning, high net worth giving, and new digital fundraising trends that are becoming more prominent in the philanthropic ecosystem.

In June 2022, Giving USA released their estimates that US charitable giving remained relatively flat with a 0.7% decrease in inflation-adjusted dollars from 2020 to 2021, settling at $484.85 billion. However, overall charitable giving increased by 7.1% from 2019 to 2021. Even without accounting for the spike in giving in 2020, Americans are increasingly generous when we assess multi-year trends.

This news provides ongoing enthusiasm about the continued generosity of donors in America. Underneath these fluctuations, though, there are noteworthy themes that demand further study. One example is the “dollars up, donors down” phenomenon; though the total dollar amount given to charity by individuals has increased over the past few years, the number of individuals donating has decreased.

We look forward to diving deeper into current philanthropic trends in this year’s full report.

Thank you,

Tom Kissane, Vice Chairman
2022 Snapshot of Today’s Philanthropic Landscape Co-chair

Aashika Patel, Senior Vice President
2022 Snapshot of Today’s Philanthropic Landscape Co-chair
IMPACTING THE WORLD THROUGH PHILANTHROPY FOR 75 YEARS

In 1947, CCS Fundraising was founded by two social workers in Brooklyn, New York. During our 75-year history, we have partnered on projects that have defined the field of fundraising and championed some of the most important causes of our time. Today, CCS is the industry leader in nonprofit consulting, with over 18 offices around the world bringing innovative approaches to more than 600 nonprofits annually.

To celebrate our 75th anniversary, you will find some of our featured CCS clients from throughout the decades within each chapter of this report. We are proud to work with each and every one of our partners.

5,000 Nonprofit Partners

$80 Billion in Funds Raised

Partnerships in 6 Continents
KEY FINDINGS IN THE 2022 LANDSCAPE REPORT

Individuals, foundations, and corporations donated $484.85 billion in 2021.¹
Read more in the Snapshot of Giving Chapter on page 06.

Giving in six out of ten charitable sectors saw an increase from 2020 to 2021.¹
Read more in the Snapshot of Giving Chapter on page 08.

Individuals continue to drive US philanthropy, contributing $326.87 billion in 2021.¹
Read more in the Individual Giving Chapter on page 10.

The total amount donated by individuals has increased, but the number of donors has decreased.²
Read more in the Individual Giving Chapter on page 11.

Foundation giving decreased by 1.2% to $90.88 billion in 2021.¹
Read more in the Foundation Giving Chapter on page 33.

Corporate philanthropy was the fastest-growing giving source at 18.3%, totaling $21.08 billion.¹
Read more in the Corporate Giving Chapter on page 40.

Bequest giving declined by 11.4% to $46.01 billion.¹
Read more in the Gift Planning Chapter on page 61.

Grants from DAFs reached $34.67 billion, a new high.³
Read more in the Gift Planning Chapter on page 62.
SNAPSHOT OF GIVING

The uncertainty of the past two years has set the stage for new emerging trends in philanthropy and donor motivations. Despite economic, social, and political challenges, one thing remains true: Americans continue to give during tumultuous times.
US CHARITABLE GIVING HAS INCREASED OVER 7% SINCE 2019

Giving USA estimates that charitable giving in the United States reached $484.85 billion in 2021. On average, US individuals, corporations, and foundations donated $1.33 billion per day.

Economic, social, and political events from 2020 continued to have an impact on giving in 2021. Particularly influential factors included the COVID-19 pandemic, the racial and social justice movement, and one of the highest inflation rates in 40 years. Growth in giving has been linked over time to positive stock market performance. Despite the turmoil of 2020 marked by the COVID-19 pandemic, stock market performance in 2021 held steady, with the S&P 500 growing 26.9% in current US dollars. Similarly, the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) gained 18.7% in 2021, while the Nasdaq Composite gained 21.4%. The first half of 2022 market conditions varied significantly from 2021, with the S&P 500, DJIA, and Nasdaq Composite dropping 20.48%, 15.60%, and 29.06%, respectively.

Giving USA estimates that charitable giving in the United States reached $484.85 billion in 2021. On average, US individuals, corporations, and foundations donated $1.33 billion per day.

Economic, social, and political events from 2020 continued to have an impact on giving in 2021. Particularly influential factors included the COVID-19 pandemic, the racial and social justice movement, and one of the highest inflation rates in 40 years. Growth in giving has been linked over time to positive stock market performance. Despite the turmoil of 2020 marked by the COVID-19 pandemic, stock market performance in 2021 held steady, with the S&P 500 growing 26.9% in current US dollars. Similarly, the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) gained 18.7% in 2021, while the Nasdaq Composite gained 21.4%. The first half of 2022 market conditions varied significantly from 2021, with the S&P 500, DJIA, and Nasdaq Composite dropping 20.48%, 15.60%, and 29.06%, respectively.

Individuals contributed the majority (67%) of giving in the United States, donating $326.87 billion in 2021. When accounting for individual giving made through family foundations and bequests, the amount given exceeds 67%, and likely approaches 85%.
Six out of 10 charitable sectors tracked by Giving USA saw an increase in giving from 2020 to 2021. Giving to religion resumed moderate growth after a slight decline in 2020. After reaching record giving in 2020, giving to international affairs, human services, and education experienced low growth or declines in 2021. Overall, donors returned to giving to their pre-pandemic priorities, with public-society benefit and arts, culture, and humanities organizations experiencing notable growth.

The largest share of charitable dollars went to religion, which included congregations, missions, religious media, and other related organizations.

### Giving by Recipient Type

- Religion / $135.78B
- Education / $70.79B
- Human Services / $65.33B
- Giving to Foundations / $64.26B
- Public-Society Benefit / $55.85B
- Health / $40.58B
- International Affairs / $27.44B
- Arts, Culture, & Humanities / $23.50B
- Environment & Animals / $16.32B
- Giving to Individuals / $11.74B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>CHANGE SINCE 2020</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>$135.78B</td>
<td>Increased 0.7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$70.79B</td>
<td>Decreased 7.2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>$65.33B</td>
<td>Decreased 2.4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving to Foundations</td>
<td>$64.26B</td>
<td>Increased 4.4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Society Benefit</td>
<td>$55.85B</td>
<td>Increased 17.9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$40.58B</td>
<td>Increased 2.9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>$27.44B</td>
<td>Decreased 4.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture, &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>$23.50B</td>
<td>Increased 21.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Animals</td>
<td>$16.32B</td>
<td>Increased 6.1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving to Individuals</td>
<td>$11.74B</td>
<td>Decreased 2.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL GIVING

Giving by individuals comprises a significant majority of philanthropic dollars in the United States. A careful analysis of trends in donor behavior and preferences revealed critical information for nonprofits across sectors.
INDIVIDUALS CONTINUED TO DRIVE CHARITABLE GIVING IN 2021

Individuals remain the largest contributors to philanthropy in the US. It is important to note that while giving by individuals grew in 2021, it did not keep pace with inflation, which resulted in a relatively flat increase from 2020 when adjusted. \(^1\) Though giving is on an upward trajectory when measuring dollars donated, the number of individual donors continues to decrease. This phenomenon is referred to as "dollars up, donors down."

Growth in individual giving has been linked over time to positive stock market performance and an increase in disposable personal income (DPI), or income available for spending and saving. The Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) gained 18.7% in 2021, while the Nasdaq Composite gained 21.4%. \(^2\)

DPI increased in 2021 by 14.4% to $55,671 per capita, up from $47,673 in 2020. \(^3\), \(^4\), \(^5\) While these trends are optimistic, there is potential for an economic downturn in 2023. In a new survey by the Financial Times and the Initiative on Global Markets, nearly 70% of surveyed US macroeconomics experts believe that there will be a significant decline in economic activity in 2023 as defined by the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER). \(^6\) This poses possible negative impacts on individual charitable giving in the year to come. However, though the S&P 500 entered a bear market in June of 2022, charitable giving typically remains relatively immune to short-term market volatility. \(^7\)
The total amount of individual giving continued to grow, but the number of donors declined

Charitable giving is increasingly concentrated among wealthier households. Individual giving continued to be top-heavy in 2021, with $15 billion from individuals secured through mega-gifts.¹ This represents 5% of all giving by individuals in 2021. Though dollars raised through individual giving continues to increase on an annual basis, the number of individual donors in the US has continued to decline since the Great Recession. This trend reflects the “dollars up, donors down” phenomenon, which is when a small portion of a nonprofit’s donor base has an outsized effect on its fundraising result. When studying the organizations that partner with CCS, we found that the top 10% of all donors contributed to 92% of total fundraising dollars over a 10 year period. This reinforces the importance of a strong major giving program, as most of an organization’s revenue will come from a small group of highly engaged donors.

Of the general population gives ($2,890 on average, annually) ⁸

Of affluent* households give ($43,195 on average, annually) ⁹

* “Affluent” is defined as having an annual household income of more than $200,000 and/or a net worth of more than $1 million, excluding primary residences.

Given the decline in donors, organizations should continue to focus on activities that build personal relationships with their existing donors; it is more efficient to retain donors than to acquire new ones.

29%
First-Year, Offline-Only Donor Retention Rate

60%
Multi-Year, Offline-Only Donor Retention Rate ¹⁰
THE GREAT WEALTH TRANSFER IS CREATING SHIFTS IN GENERATIONAL GIVING

Over the course of the next several decades, the Silent Generation (those born from 1928-1945) and Baby Boomers (those born from 1946-1964) are expected to transfer between $30 and $68 trillion to adult offspring or to charitable organizations. This wealth transfer suggests that charitable giving from younger generations, including Millennials (those born from 1981-1996) and Generation Z (those born from 1997-2021), will increase in the coming years. According to research conducted by Blackbaud, Generation X (those born from 1965-1980) has surpassed the Silent Generation (those born before 1945) in total giving. However, the older generation is still giving more than Generation X per capita, with the average donor age in the US increasing from 62 to 65 since 2016. More than 20% of those in Generation Z expect to increase their giving in the coming years — almost twice as many as Boomers (12%) or the Silent Generation (9%). This data underscores the need for nonprofits to focus on younger generations as they plan their fundraising.

PERCENT OF GIVING BY GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent Generation (Born 1928-1945)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (Born 1946-1964)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X (Born 1965-1980)</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials (Born 1981-1996)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Z (Born 1997-2021)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE DONATION AMOUNT EACH YEAR PER GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Average Donation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent Generation (Born 1928-1945)</td>
<td>$1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (Born 1946-1964)</td>
<td>$1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X (Born 1965-1980)</td>
<td>$732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials (Born 1981-1996)</td>
<td>$481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Z (Born 1997-2021)</td>
<td>$341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS INSIGHT

As the philanthropic capacities of younger generations increase, organizations must adapt to the giving preferences of Generation Z, Millennial, and Generation X donors, who have an inclination towards online giving and other digital engagement. That said, the same foundational fundraising principles apply, and nonprofits should focus on building meaningful personal relationships and giving platforms to advance their fundraising goals.
ALMOST ALL DONORS ARE MOTIVATED BY IMPACT

In thousands of interviews with donors since 2011, CCS has found that individuals are most frequently driven to give by altruistic considerations, predominantly in the belief of the impact from their gift. Especially notable amid today’s policy environment is that tax considerations were the least commonly cited motivation. Donors increasingly seek opportunities to advance mission-driven organizations while finding personal meaning through their giving.

A survey of 13,648 donors worldwide conducted by Nonprofit Tech for Good confirmed that donors are committed to the societal benefit and impact of their charitable gifts. The majority of respondents held deep faith in the organizations they supported. In addition, they were actively involved in the causes they supported financially: 36% participated in marches and protests and 65% signed online petitions. Charitable giving has broadened to charitable living. Giving has been increasingly integrated into our everyday lives. Donors make employment, consumer, and investment choices through a charitable lens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATIONS FOR OVERALL PHILANTHROPIC GIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As cited by nonprofit donors interviewed in CCS Feasibility and Planning Studies, 2011-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Perceived/real impact of the gift: 97%
- Belief that you should give to the less fortunate: 92%
- Feeling that something is owed to the community: 82%
- Religious or moral obligation: 76%
- Asked to contribute: 63%
- Income tax deduction: 56%

Nonprofits succeed in fundraising when they can articulate the need for philanthropic support and the impact of that support. Creating a compelling need and demonstrable impact through your organization will resonate with donors who are looking to effect change in their communities.

CCS INSIGHT

Prefer to work for companies that engage in social responsibility

Purchase products from socially responsible businesses

Engage in impact investing

70%

47%

20%
THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC SHIFTED INDIVIDUAL GIVING DEMOGRAPHICS AND SECTOR TRENDS

Overall, there was a 9.4% net increase in households who gave directly to charitable organizations, individuals, or businesses for basic needs and healthcare from May 2020 to May 2021.

From May 2020 to May 2021, all household types increased their overall charitable giving. Giving by single men showed the greatest overall increase, whereas giving by single women showed the lowest overall increase — approximately 7% less than given by single men.

The economic shock of the pandemic had a clear impact on overall household giving in 2021. Loss of employment or income was strongly associated with shifts in charitable giving. The statistics above capture major trends for households that both were and were not financially impacted by the pandemic.

Note: Net change equals any increase in giving from May 2020 to May 2021 minus any decrease in giving during this time. Overall giving includes recurring or one-off contributions that households would typically make in the absence of the pandemic.

**NET CHANGE IN GIVING TO CHARITABLE CAUSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Marital Status</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Women</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Men</td>
<td>+10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Partnered</td>
<td>+10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+17.5% Net increase in giving from households that did not lose income in response to the COVID-19 pandemic from May 2020 to May 2021.

-2.4% Net decrease in giving from households that lost income in response to the COVID-19 pandemic from May 2020 to May 2021.

**CCS INSIGHT**

During times of crisis, nonprofits must meet their donors where they are. While it may not be possible to solicit supporters during these periods, it is important that nonprofits steward donors so they feel supported and valued during moments of transition.
Renewed attention and support of racial justice issues drove significant increases in household giving to charitable organizations supporting these causes in 2021.¹⁸

### HOUSEHOLD GIVING TO RACIAL JUSTICE CAUSES AND ORGANIZATIONS SOARED

2 in 5 US households supported or were involved in racial justice protests.

1 in 7 US households gave money to support racial causes and organizations.

1 in 4 US households supported racial justice in some form, including both financial and non-financial measures of generosity.¹⁸

#### DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLDS THAT GAVE MONEY TO SUPPORT RACIAL JUSTICE CAUSES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/marital status</td>
<td>More likely among single women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>More likely among Black and Hispanic/Latino households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>More likely among LGBTQ+ households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>More likely among younger households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>More likely among households with higher incomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Slightly more likely among households with children under 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>More likely in the Northeast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, single women, Black households, LGBTQ+ households, and younger households showed greater levels of giving towards racial justice causes and organizations.

### CCS INSIGHT

By pooling their time, resources, and knowledge, donors to philanthropic collaboratives can maximize their impact on important community issues. It is critical that organizations clearly articulate their values, strategies, and policies to ensure alignment among all collective giving participants.
Meaningful volunteer opportunities can strengthen the donor relationship with an organization. Time and time again, we see that individuals who donate their time to nonprofit organizations are more likely to donate their money as well. In fact, Fidelity Charitable reported that 39% of donors supported a nonprofit by volunteering before they made financial donations. Developing meaningful volunteer opportunities is a crucial aspect of an organization’s individual fundraising strategy.

Donors are more likely to give to organizations with which they have a personal connection or relationship. Moreover, volunteer involvement allows donors to stay actively engaged in the organizations they financially support.

The COVID-19 pandemic had a significant impact on volunteerism in the US in 2020, resulting in 66% of volunteers decreasing or stopping their volunteering. A December 2021 survey of a randomly-selected sample of individuals in the US revealed that the downward trend of volunteerism continued, with only 56% of respondents reporting volunteer time in 2021, as compared to 58% in 2020, and 64% in 2017.

Volunteer leadership is a key engagement opportunity that positively influences nonprofit fundraising. Engaging volunteer leaders as fundraising ambassadors is a powerful way to build a stronger culture of philanthropy. Nonprofits should leverage their volunteer leaders’ diverse stories, skills, and experiences to support their fundraising goals and activity.
COLLECTIVE FORMS OF GIVING GREW IN POPULARITY

Collective giving groups, such as giving circles and pooled funding, are broadly defined as entities that either pool or channel resources from multiple individual donors to nonprofits. These groups have skyrocketed in recent times and carry the prospect of unlocking billions of additional charitable dollars in the coming years. 24

Collective giving groups in the US have tripled in the last decade and engage people from a wide variety of racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds, gender identities, and age groups. Research has shown that collective giving groups allow individuals to:

- Give more strategically and proactively
- Volunteer and engage more in civic activity
- Give to a wider array of organizations and causes 25

With over $2 billion flowing annually from collaboratives working on a range of societal issues, the prospects for future growth from these groups are high. In a 2021 survey of collaborative giving groups conducted by The Bridgespan Group and funded by The Gates Foundation, respondents estimated that they could increase their grantmaking to roughly $15 billion annually, a five-fold jump from current spending, if more funders are recruited to these forms of group giving. 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charitable dollars deployed annually by collective giving groups in 2020</th>
<th>Potential charitable dollars to be deployed by collective giving groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2-3 Billion</td>
<td>$15 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS CASE STUDY
The CCS Data Analytics Team used a suite of predictive modeling tools to analyze United Way of Central Maryland donor portfolios. Together, we identified 27 new principal gift prospects and 293 major gift prospects, representing $10 million in new or additional fundraising opportunities. United Way used this information to develop strategic approaches to pursue these untapped philanthropic channels.
CRYPTOPHILANTHROPY IS HERE AND TRENDING

Cryptocurrency, a digital medium of exchange, has become an increasingly popular means of charitable giving. Despite some public skepticism around the legitimacy and security of cryptocurrency, an increasing number of donors are leveraging it in the world of philanthropy. It is estimated that 20% of the US population owns cryptocurrency, and it is likely that each nonprofit donor database already includes individuals who own cryptocurrency.

Many nonprofits have seen this growing trend and have started to accept gifts of cryptocurrency and NFTs (non-fungible tokens). CCS saw donations of cryptocurrency skyrocket in 2021. The Giving Block, a cryptocurrency donation solution, processed 1,558% more donations in 2021 than in 2020. Fidelity Charitable received $331 million in digital assets through their donor-advised funds, an increase of 1,082% from 2020.

The use of cryptocurrency among the philanthropic Millennial generation is on the rise — a trend that has the potential to make waves in the charitable sector. More than 1 in 3 Millennial investors own cryptocurrency; among the rest, half are likely to consider it in the next year. Given that 75% of Millennials consider themselves philanthropists, this opens a huge door for cryptophilanthropy. As The Great Wealth Transfer continues to happen, it is likely that more Millennials will own, invest, and donate cryptocurrency.

It has become clear that cryptocurrency investors are charitably inclined; however, there are some roadblocks to giving that cryptocurrency owners experienced. According to Fidelity Charitable, 46% said that it was difficult to find charities that accept cryptocurrency, and 44% said that it was a cumbersome process to donate to charities that do accept it. It is worth noting that since 2021, the value of Bitcoin (BTC) has gone down significantly. As of August 15, 2022, the value of Bitcoin was $24,312.54, compared to $41,157.15 at the close of July 2021. In the coming year, CCS will continue to monitor the philanthropic impacts of this drop in value.

2020 CHARITY DONATIONS

- 33% Of all cryptocurrency investors donated $1,000+ to charity
- 45% Of cryptocurrency owners donated $1,000+ to charity

CCS INSIGHT

With the increase in cryptophilanthropy, nonprofits must stay current to ensure they capture the hearts and minds of donors who prefer to give this way. Nonprofits should provide opportunities for their teams to learn about cryptocurrency and ensure their development systems are ready to accept this type of philanthropy. It is important to educate your donors on their options to donate cryptocurrency if you plan on accepting this form of giving.
Recent years have seen philanthropy hit record highs and play an ever-growing role in the response to society’s most urgent challenges. While philanthropic dollars are up, the number of individual donors has decreased, underscoring the increasing concentration of individual philanthropy coming from wealthier households. This trend, combined with the growing number of high net worth individuals in the US, has established High Net Worth, Very High Net Worth, and Ultra High Net Worth donors as key prospect pools in the nonprofit sector. It is critical for organizations to use a data-informed, nuanced, and strategic approach towards understanding and engaging these donors in order to tap into the transformative philanthropic potential they represent.

Habitat for Humanity
International
Atlanta, GA
Raised $593M
HIGH NET WORTH INDIVIDUALS CONTINUED TO INCREASE IN NUMBER AND WEALTH

The US population of high net worth individuals (HNWIs) (those with investable assets of more than $1 million, excluding primary residence, collectibles, consumables, and consumer durables) has grown by about 2.67 million individuals since 2008, reaching approximately 6.98 million individuals in total. The population of ultra high net worth individuals (UHNWIs) (those with a net worth above $30 million) rose by 9.3%, representing about 610,568 people. Despite various global challenges, the US minted 50 new billionaires in 2021, making up 7.6% of new billionaires worldwide. This increased the total number of billionaires in the US to 735, a 10% increase, for a total of $4.7 trillion in cumulative net worth. The number of billionaires increased to nearly 22 million people in 2021. These increases were fueled by gains in the stock market, which were aided by governments injecting money into the economy to soften the financial blow of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Despite the above nations being home to the greatest increases in UHNWIs, these countries are not the most charitable in the world. According to the Charitable Aid Foundation World Giving Index, the US ranked number 24 in charitable participation, followed by France at 83, China at 85, and Japan at 107. The UK takes the lead in this group with a global ranking of six.

TOP 5 COUNTRIES WITH LARGEST INCREASES IN UHNW INDIVIDUALS

13% US | 11% UK | 10% France | 8% Japan | 6% China

The US is home to:

- 4% of the world’s population
- 39% of the world’s millionaires
- 35% of the world’s billionaires

CCS INSIGHT

As the number of HNWIs (and potential donors) increases, be sure to approach this data within a larger context. This population is growing, but it is also changing. Understanding the evolving nature and demographic of this prospect pool is critical to tapping into its philanthropic potential. Consider the Great Wealth Transfer and the implications it has on the age and generational characteristics of high net worth philanthropic decision makers. Think about how the shift in the percentage of HNWIs that are self-made versus inheritors of wealth may affect giving patterns. These shifting trends may inform your strategy to cultivate, solicit, and build long-term relationships with high net worth donors.
Every year, the Chronicle of Philanthropy releases The Philanthropy 50, a list of the top 50 individuals who gave the most through publicly announced gifts over the course of a year. This year’s 22nd annual ranking of America’s leading donors features several new faces, including Jared and Monica Isaacman (total giving: $145M), Austin Russell (total giving: $70M), and Mark and Robyn Jones (total giving: $101M). All 50 donors combined contributed more than $33.4 billion to the charitable landscape.

Mirroring US philanthropic trends, giving from this list is concentrated among top donors with the largest amount of individual giving. This year’s top five donors, Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates, Elon Musk, Michael Bloomberg, William Ackman and Neri Oxman, and Mark Zuckerberg and Priscilla Chan, cumulatively gave over $24 billion, 74% of the total.

The majority (52%) of donors on the top 50 list supported either health and life sciences or education as their top sector for charitable giving. Interestingly, 36% of donors on the list selected multiple cause areas as their philanthropic priorities. 9

MacKenzie Scott is among the notable absences on The Philanthropy 50 list, due to her declination to provide the necessary information to The Chronicle. If Ms. Scott were included in this list, she would take the lead in charitable giving. Since first promising in 2019 to give away her entire fortune, the billionaire has given more than $12 billion to nonprofits, per a tally of her publicly announced gifts. 10 From June of 2021 to March 2022 alone, Ms. Scott donated $3.9 billion to 465 nonprofits. Other major donor absences may be attributed to multiyear gifts; the Chronicle’s rankings count multiyear pledges as a single lump sum in the year the commitment was made. 11
TECHNOLOGY FORTUNES CONTINUE TO DOMINATE THE PHILANTHROPY 50 LIST

Nearly one quarter of members in The Philanthropy 50 list gained their wealth from the technology industry. Finance and real estate also continue to be lead sources of wealth, cumulatively making up 36% of the members’ origins of wealth. These trends showcase that The Philanthropy 50’s dominant sources of wealth have evolved over time. For example, in 2000, 10 members of the list made their fortunes in media and entertainment. However, in the most recent list, only one member credited their fortune to the media and entertainment industry.

The 50 donors are distributed across 22 states. California is by far the most well-represented state, with 11 members residing there. New York and Massachusetts follow, with 10 members collectively residing in these two states. It is interesting to note that many of these donors have multiple residences beyond the primary residence documented by this data. This carries real implications for donors investing in multiple states beyond their state of primary residence.
AFFLUENT HOUSEHOLDS CONTINUE TO GIVE TO CHARITY AT HIGHER RATES THAN THE GENERAL POPULATION

HOUSEHOLD CHARITY DONATIONS

88.1%
Of affluent US households give to charity

48.8%
Of the general US population gives to charity

$40,000+
Average amount given to charity annually by affluent donors

$5,000+
Average amount given to charity annually by general population donors

The majority of affluent households (those with an annual income of more than $200,000 and/or a net worth of more than $1 million, excluding primary residence) in the US continue to give to charity, a trend that has encouragingly prevailed over the years. These households also tend to give more frequently and at higher amounts than the general US population as a whole.

On average, the total amount given by affluent donors was 17.5 times more than the amount given by donors in the general population.

CCS CASE STUDY

CCS partnered with the Holocaust Museum LA (HMLA) to identify high net worth donors to participate in their capital campaign. Through wealth screening, prospect research, and cultivation events, CCS was able to identify 266 donors with a collective potential capacity to give over $30 million. The team at HMLA partnered with these donors to successfully raise $33,452,865 to date for the Museum’s expansion project.

CCS INSIGHT

If your organization lacks access to wealthy donors and is unsure about where to begin, CCS recommends conducting an in-depth wealth-screen assessment of your entire database. An organization may have high net worth donors in their database that are undiscovered due to their giving history. A donor may give a small gift not because they lack capacity, but because they have never been asked for a major gift! Additionally, consider conducting a relationship mapping exercise, particularly with board members, to find these HNW donors.
AFFLUENT DONORS ARE MOTIVATED BY THEIR BELIEF IN THE MISSION

As previously discussed on page 13, donors of all income levels often report being motivated to give to charity by the impact that their gift can have in society. A similar trend appears among affluent households, in which many are motivated by the belief in an organization's mission.

In a study by BNY Mellon Wealth Management and Brown Yardley Research, 26% of high net worth investors claimed that belief in the cause and/or mission of an organization motivates their charitable contributions. It is worth noting in today's policy environment that, like individual donors in the general population, tax benefits rank near the bottom of factors influencing affluent philanthropy, with only 4% claiming that tax benefits impact their charitable decisions.  

PRINCIPAL MOTIVATIONS FOR CHARITABLE GIVING  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in the cause/mission</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism/helping others</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to give back</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes me feel good</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization does important work</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social accountability</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection with the cause</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/moral obligation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax benefits</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to make a difference</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith/religion</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance healthcare/medical research</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support educational organizations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased wealth</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the arts</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS INSIGHT

While it is important to utilize data showing the prominence of a belief in cause/mission and altruism as leading the motivations behind high net worth donor behavior, it is crucial to avoid overgeneralizations. Take the time to deeply research and speak to your donors individually to learn what uniquely motivates their philanthropy and what connects them to your organization in particular. There is no substitute for building authentic relationships with donors as people rather than as philanthropic prospects. You may even find a range of motivations and philanthropic visions within a couple or a family, so watch for nuance and pivot your strategy accordingly.
While understanding why affluent donors choose to give is important, it is also crucial to understand the reasons why these individuals choose not to give. Of the affluent households surveyed by Bank of America, 11.9% did not give to charity due to the reasons listed below. In looking at this data, it is important to consider the impact that the tumultuous COVID-19 pandemic had on affluent giving, as evidenced by 30.9% of respondents stating that they did not give due to prioritizing family financial needs.

### REASONS WHY AFFLUENT INDIVIDUALS MIGHT CHOOSE NOT TO GIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritized taking care of my familial needs</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No personal connection to an organization</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want to give</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not asked to give</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources to give</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intend to do all giving at the end of life</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of the request was not optimal</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain what causes to give to</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that gift would not have made a difference</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly complicated giving process</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CCS INSIGHT**

It is important to be sensitive to a donor's financial situation and concerns. Consider suggesting an alternative gift schedule that might work better for them, such as extending their annual gift to a three-year pledge. An often overlooked, but critical element of prospect research and wealth screening is to research a prospect's personal and professional financial and legal liabilities alongside their assets to paint a more comprehensive picture of their giving capacity. This way, they can still achieve their personal charitable goals in a manner that is financially feasible for them.
When it comes to decision-making around charitable giving by married/partnered affluent households, nearly half (49%) report that such decisions are made jointly.

High net worth individuals also demonstrate a propensity for developing clear charitable giving strategies. In a study by BNY Mellon Wealth Management and Brown Yardley Research, more than half (56%) of high net worth investors claimed to have a predetermined giving strategy. Of the remaining respondents, 22% said they would consider adopting one. However, nearly all (91%) of the respondents agree that a charitable giving strategy is a part of an overall wealth strategy.

When asked how their giving strategies might change in the coming years, the majority of respondents cited increasing the amount they give (68%) and giving to more organizations (51%) as the top two strategic categories. Given this, nonprofits would benefit from using vendor-generated alerts to quickly research and leverage wealth updates and giving decisions made by their prospects.

When broken down by generational demographics, the majority of Millennials and Generation X demonstrate the highest rates of using charitable giving strategies.

**USE OF CHARITABLE GIVING STRATEGIES BY GENERATIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS**

- **54%**
  - Silent Generation (Born 1928-1945)
- **39%**
  - Baby Boomers (Born 1946-1964)
- **79%**
  - Generation X (Born 1965-1980)
- **74%**
  - Millennials (Born 1981-1996)

**CCS INSIGHT**

It is up to the nonprofit to meet donors where they are by getting to know their donors, asking the right questions to understand their individual and family values, and reporting on the impact of their investment. Many savvy philanthropists seek out advice from nonprofits of interest to inform giving strategies. It is critical to bring all relevant information to the donor early to help inform their decision and ignite their philanthropic interests.
CHARITABLE GIVING AND ORGANIZATION ENGAGEMENT IS HIGHLY CORRELATED

In the same study by BNY Mellon Wealth Management and Brown Yardley Research, nearly all high net worth investors reported that they are at least somewhat otherwise engaged with the organizations/charities they support monetarily. Forty-two percent (42%) of investors indicate that they hold leadership positions or sit on the board of directors at the organizations to which they give. Another 42% of investors claim to volunteer their time and/or services at the organizations to which they give.14

LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT WITH ORGANIZATIONS AND CHARITIES TO WHICH HNWIs GIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very engaged</th>
<th>Somewhat engaged</th>
<th>Very little engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hold a leadership position</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I host events/fundraisers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer my time and/or services</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sit on the board of directors</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend events/fundraisers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS INSIGHT

It is imperative for organizations to provide their staff, donors, members, and friends with a suite of opportunities to get involved as a volunteer or thought partner, and regularly inquire about what areas of their involvement provide them the most personal satisfaction and enjoyment. Never underestimate the power of asking for advice and feedback, such as during a feasibility study or listening session.
AFFlUENT GIVING INCREASED IN THE WAKE OF COVID-19, PARTICULARLY TO LOCAL CAUSES

In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, studies have shown that over four in 10 (42%) high net worth individuals changed their giving behavior over the past two years. Encouragingly, another 35% expect to change their giving strategy in the next two years. Of those expecting to change their giving over the next two years:

68%  
Will increase the amount they give

51%  
Will give to more organizations

In a study conducted by Bank of America of a nationally representative random sample of 1,626 wealthy US households, 10% of surveyed affluent households who increased their giving since the onset of COVID-19 focused their giving on health and basic needs. Additionally, these households largely directed their giving towards the communities in which they live, such as to local charities, individuals, and businesses. In fact, one in four affluent households who increased their giving donated to individuals or local businesses in their community.

Many donors reevaluated their own giving strategies and priorities to focus on local needs in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Philanthropic support was needed more than ever, and it is key for nonprofits to consider ways to retain these new donors.

GEOGRAPHIC REACH OF GIVING AMONG AFFLUENT HOUSEHOLDS TO HEALTH AND BASIC NEEDS

90%  
Local (within one's community)

35%  
National (within the US but outside one's community)

15%  
International (outside the US and outside one's community)

CCS INSIGHT

Philanthropic priorities can shift based on the season in a donor’s life, the world around them, and opportunities in their local community. To retain and upgrade donors nearby, identify affluent donors in your database with local addresses and target them with opportunities to make a community-based impact.
The Chronicle of Philanthropy compiles The Philanthropy 50, an annual list of individuals who give the most through publicly announced gifts. These individuals cumulatively gave $33.4 billion in 2021. 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>2021 GIVING</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WEALTH SOURCE</th>
<th>TOP CAUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bill Gates and Melinda</td>
<td>$15,000,000,000</td>
<td>Medina, WA</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Elon Musk</td>
<td>$5,742,121,740</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Michael Bloomberg</td>
<td>$1,660,000,000</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 William Ackman and Neri</td>
<td>$1,200,000,000</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mark Zuckerberg and Priscilla Chan</td>
<td>$1,049,000,000</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sergey Brin and Nicole</td>
<td>$816,082,370</td>
<td>Mountain View, CA</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jack Dorsey</td>
<td>$764,647,138</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Denny Sanford</td>
<td>$725,000,000</td>
<td>Sioux Falls, SD</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Phil and Penny Knight</td>
<td>$700,000,000</td>
<td>Hillsboro, OR</td>
<td>Manufacturing; Retail</td>
<td>Scientific Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jeff Bezos</td>
<td>$510,700,000</td>
<td>Medina, OR</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Patrick and Shirley Ryan</td>
<td>$480,000,000</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Eric and Wendy Schmidt</td>
<td>$382,800,000</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Steve and Connie Ballmer</td>
<td>$355,900,000</td>
<td>Hunts Point, WA</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Pierre and Pam Omidyar</td>
<td>$332,000,000</td>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 John and Laura Arnold</td>
<td>$270,000,000</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Energy; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Goodwin Family</td>
<td>$250,000,000</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Cancer Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Charles Koch</td>
<td>$240,536,918</td>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sobrato Family</td>
<td>$212,100,208</td>
<td>Cupertino, CA</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Focus Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Irwin and Joan Jacobs</td>
<td>$209,880,379</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jerome and Rosalind Richardson</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>Food and Beverage; Professional Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jared and Monica Isaacman</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
<td>Easton, PA</td>
<td>Finance; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>John and Tashia Morgridge</td>
<td>$135,000,000</td>
<td>Portola Valley, CA</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Oscar Tang and Agnes Hsu-Tang</td>
<td>$125,000,000</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Daryl and Christine Burton</td>
<td>$123,900,000</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>William Miller III</td>
<td>$101,345,000</td>
<td>Vero Beach, FL</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mark and Robyn Jones</td>
<td>$101,000,000</td>
<td>Westlake, TX</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Frank and Monica McCourt</td>
<td>$101,000,000</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Harry and Linda Fath</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Penny Pritzker</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Family Wealth; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Arthur Riggs</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>Duarte, CA</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Julian Robertson Jr.</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>K. Lisa Yang</td>
<td>$82,043,000</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr, PA</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bruce and Elizabeth Dunlevie</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Melanie Smith Taylor</td>
<td>$79,534,920</td>
<td>Germantown, TN</td>
<td>Family Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>James and Paula Crown</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Paul and Joyce Robsham</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
<td>Wayland, MA</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Austin Russell</td>
<td>$70,000,000</td>
<td>Winter Park, FL</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Robert and Karen Hale</td>
<td>$63,068,040</td>
<td>Hingham, MA</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Helene Houle</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Family Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>John and Carolyn Sonnentag</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>Marathon, WI</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Agnes Neill Williams</td>
<td>$56,505,586</td>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Arley Cathey</td>
<td>$54,500,000</td>
<td>El Dorado, AK</td>
<td>Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Peter and Stephanie Nolan</td>
<td>$52,500,000</td>
<td>Hermosa Beach, CA</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Tessa Ader</td>
<td>$50,192,000</td>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td>Family Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Richard and Nancy Kinder</td>
<td>$50,035,000</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Donald and Andrea Friese</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Robert and Donna Manning</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>Swampscott, MA</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Paul and Cleo Schimmel</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Leonard Stern</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Family Wealth; Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Charles (Buddy) Weill Jr.</td>
<td>$48,200,000</td>
<td>Greensboro, NC</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After decades of steady growth, foundation giving decreased by 1.2% in 2021.¹
To combat this decline, foundations continued to evaluate opportunities for impact and engagement that stem from the COVID-19 pandemic and the racial and social justice movement. This resulted in new procedures and partnerships, including making mission-aligned investments, hiring diverse investment management firms, and increasing trust-based philanthropy.
FOUNDATION GIVING HELD STEADY AT 19% OF TOTAL GIVING

Breaking a multi-year growth trajectory, foundation giving decreased by 1.2% in 2021. However this decrease is marginal; foundation giving comprised the same percentage of total giving (19%) in 2021 as it did in 2020.

Foundation giving, inclusive of grants made by independent, operating, and community foundations, has grown markedly as a percentage of overall giving for decades. Foundations made up 6% of all giving in 1980, 7% in 1990, 11% in 2000, 14% in 2010, 19% in 2020, and 19% in 2021. As such, foundations continue to have a significant impact on American philanthropy today.

Foundation giving over time is closely linked to the performance of the stock market, since foundations are required to grant 5% of the value of their assets each year.

Of note, foundation giving metrics include grants made by independent, community, and operating foundations (private foundations that fund their own charitable initiatives). Independent foundations are sometimes referred to as private foundations and include family foundations. The foundation giving estimate does not include corporate foundation giving (see page 40 for more insights).

Giving by foundations is comprised of pledges, cash donations, in-kind contributions, and planned gifts. Notably, in their 2021 report, the Community Foundation Public Awareness Initiative reported a 41% increase in grant dollars through donor-advised funds in 2020. An increased emphasis by foundations on gift planning mirrors what we are seeing across the sector.
The events of 2020, including the COVID-19 pandemic and the racial and social justice movement, continued to shape foundation operations in 2021. Higher payout demands, especially to organizations with leaders of color who may lack connections to most foundations, have increased.

Foundations shifted their approach in working with nonprofit partners to ensure inclusion on awards and reporting. Foundations also deployed more unrestricted funding models and streamlined the application and reporting process to provide more flexibility to nonprofit partners.
INVESTMENT RETURNS REMAINED A SIGNIFICANT SOURCE OF MISSION SUPPORT FROM FOUNDATIONS

Applying stock market investment profits to mission-driven objectives remains a priority method of success among foundations. Foundations continued to leverage the steady growth of financial markets in 2021 to their benefit. With increased emphasis on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in 2021, foundations set intentions to ensure equity and prosperity for all. Substantial financing to meet short-term causes and set long-term sustainability will be needed to meet these aims.

REPORTED RETURN RATES IN 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>Community foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>Private foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>Private foundations with assets over $500 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintaining strong 10-year returns is important for foundations to uphold intergenerational equity and sustainable mission support. A 2021 Council on Foundations study confirmed the following:

83% Of 177 private foundations reported having long-term return objectives

73% Of 83 community foundations reported having long-term return objectives
FOUNDATIONS MAXIMIZED THEIR IMPACT THROUGH RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT ALLOCATIONS

An impact or program-related investment can:

- Fortify foundations with necessary capital while incentivizing a sustainable business model for long-term business
- Gain additional capital for foundations by providing a guarantee or taking a first loss position, which attracts low-risk investors
- Advance mission-aligned initiatives and therefore pay dividends to a foundation's goal through multiplying social impact

In the 2021 study conducted by the Council on Foundations, foundations reported seeing the largest potential increases of asset allocation in private equity, private credit, private real estate, and venture capital. Across these categories, 19% of participating private foundations said they seek to include investments ranking high on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria.

CCS client, The Gates Family Foundation, generously committed $48.6 million since 2011 to mission-aligned investments. Their impact investments are made across three different categories: mission-related investments, program-related investments, and socially responsible investments. As discussed by founder Bill Gates, wrap-around approaches to social impact remain important despite the limitations of disparity-based philanthropy as a solution to inequity.

CCS CASE STUDY
MLK Community Healthcare is a private, nonprofit, safety-net health system serving 1.3 million residents in South Los Angeles. CCS led strategic interviews with 25 influential regional and national funders to introduce MLKCH's future ambitions for community-based care and offer an opportunity to provide valuable feedback to MLKCH's proposed plans. These conversations produced detailed, individualized evaluations of the organization's vision from the highest level of foundation philanthropy and uncovered pathways to new potential investors. Increased investment from foundations on a local and national scale resulted from the guidance CCS offered in strategic relationship development of study participants.
FOUNDATIONS ARE INCREASINGLY HIRING DIVERSE INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT FIRMS

To align with their values, foundations are seeking purposeful partnerships with those who share a commitment to DEI. By collaborating with financial institutions with diverse leadership, foundations increase their credibility with vision-aligned firms.

DEI EFFORTS BY FOUNDATIONS

Thirteen percent (13%) of community foundations sought diverse managers in 2020, an increase of 8% since 2018.

In 2021, 29% of foundation staff were people of color, an increase of 2% since 2020.

Eighty-five percent (85%) of foundations reported that staff received a salary increase in 2020 and planned on further salary increases in 2021.

CCS INSIGHT

As donor-advised funds (DAFs) continue to grow in popularity, community foundations and other types of DAF providers see the opportunity to leverage impact investing through DAFs as a strategy for increased programmatic impact and deeper donor engagement. Add the DAF Direct app to your website’s donation page as a way for people to give through DAFs.
Many foundations are recognizing the opportunity to stay mission-aligned by having beneficiary communities determine funding priorities (rather than internal executives). In 2020, over 800 foundations signed the Council on Foundations pledge “A Call to Action: Philanthropy’s Commitment During COVID-19” to commit to significant operational changes like maximizing unrestricted grants and listening to partners, especially communities typically heard the least.⁹

In a study of 148 foundations by the University of Washington, 83% reported some form of direct stakeholder participation. However, only 10% reported allowing grantees or community members affected by the foundation’s funding to make decisions about fund allocation.¹⁰

In the same study, foundations reported that they use participatory approaches for several reasons but lack the capacity to implement fund allocation decisions based on stakeholder feedback. Moreover, less than one-third of all foundations evaluate the outcomes of stakeholder participation.

Overall, this research reveals a growth opportunity for foundations to include stakeholders in all levels of decision-making.

---

**800+**

Organizations committed to trust-based operational changes

**83%**

Of foundations report direct stakeholder participation

**10%**

Of foundations allow grantees to make fund allocation decisions

---

**CCS INSIGHT**

Fundraisers would benefit from using the prospecting tools provided by the Community Foundation Online. Using their LinkedIn integration, fundraisers can quickly see who they are connected to at any given foundation.
CORPORATE GIVING

In 2021, companies across the country became more strategic in their philanthropic decisions and looked for partnerships that would both advance their goals and make an impact in the community. Corporate philanthropy commitments increased by 18.3%. By embracing new and improved Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives and programs, companies expanded partnership opportunities with nonprofits that shared similar values.
CORPORATE GIVING MADE AN IMPRESSIVE COMEBACK IN 2021

In a reversal from the 6.1% decline in 2020, corporate giving showed strong growth in 2021, contributing $21.08 billion to overall giving. This amount includes cash and in-kind gifts made through corporate giving programs, as well as grants and gifts made by corporate foundations.¹

Corporate giving trends often align with GDP and corporate pre-tax profits. A 10.1% increase in GDP and 37.4% increase in corporate pre-tax profits in 2021 help explain the increase in corporate giving compared to previous years.¹ In fact, 97% of corporations gave the same or more than they had budgeted for in 2021. In a survey of corporate citizenship executives at 55 major public and private companies, The Conference Board ESG Center found that 94% of respondents plan to increase or maintain their corporate giving in 2022.²

GIVING BY CORPORATIONS, 1981-2021¹

CSS INSIGHT

With fluctuations in corporate pre-tax profits and GDP in 2022 to date, corporate giving rates remain less predictable this year. However, nonprofits can sustain relationships gained from last year’s corporate generosity by articulating the value that employees find in corporate philanthropy and demonstrating the impact of corporate gifts made in 2021.
CORPORATE DONATIONS REACHED AN ALL-TIME HIGH ON GIVINGTUESDAY IN 2021

When corporations, organizations, and people unite to address global issues, the philanthropic results are astounding. GivingTuesday is a global movement spurred by digital giving that provides companies with an opportunity to show their commitment to social impact and what is most important to their employees in a tangible way.

$112.6 Million

Corporations and employees donated a record-setting $112.6 million through the platform Benevity on GivingTuesday 2021. ³

CORPORATE DONATIONS ON GIVINGTUESDAY ³,⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$34M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$55M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$112.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23%

The YOY percent increase in the number of corporations that took part in Benevity’s 2021 GivingTuesday

83%

The increase in number of employees participating in GivingTuesday on Benevity from 2020 to 2021

165,000

The number of employee volunteer hours logged in Benevity on GivingTuesday in 2021 ³
NONCASH GIFTS BY CORPORATIONS DECREASED

The annual *Giving in Numbers* report by Chief Executives for Corporate Purpose (CECP) provides benchmarking data on corporate social investments among large* corporations. The preliminary 2022 *Giving in Numbers* findings, which are previewed in the 2022 *Giving USA* report, indicate that large corporations gave mostly in cash in 2021, including in grants and gifts from corporate foundations, as well as cash that went directly from the company to the recipient without passing through a corporate foundation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Noncash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of companies making noncash contributions, which includes in-kind gifts and pro bono services, decreased slightly from 76% in 2020 to 74% in 2021, but still increased by 6% over the past four-year period.

* The 222 companies surveyed by CECP in 2022 had a median revenue of $22.1 billion in 2021. 5

** The sample includes a matched set of 173 companies who responded to each *Giving in Numbers* survey from 2018 to 2021. Some data may vary by one percentage point from the 2022 *Snapshot of Today's Philanthropic Landscape* report due to additional data received and adjustments made by the CECP. 5,6
The Great Resignation saw 4.5 million people leave the US workforce in November 2021. Employees were no longer settling for jobs that felt transactional; they pushed for roles that held a greater purpose. Eighty-two percent (82%) of Millennials, the generation that constitutes the largest portion of the workforce, considered a company’s CSR efforts when deciding where to work.

Over half of employees surveyed by Groundswell said that it was important or very important to them that their company had a positive social impact on top of generating a profit. According to America’s Charities, 87% of corporations understand that their employees expect them to support causes and issues of importance to them.

Of employees reported that a charitable giving stipend would impact their sense of value alignment with their company.

EMPLOYEE STIPENDS

Of employees reported that they would be inspired to give more if their company matched donations or provided them with a charitable giving stipend.

EMPLOYEES VALUED CORPORATE GIVING

60%

Of employees reported that they would be inspired to give more if their company matched donations or provided them with a charitable giving stipend.

CCS INSIGHT

Nearly 40% of employees have little to no input on their company’s corporate giving, yet employee buy-in can benefit companies and nonprofits alike.

Corporations are putting greater focus and intentionality on revamping their CSR strategy, specifically harnessing employee interests to build authentic team morale, engagement and performance, and a culture that will attract new talent. Whether it is new employee-giving programs or volunteer opportunities, corporations are seeing a need to get creative on how they engage with causes their people care about.
CORPORATIONS CONTINUED TO PRIORITIZE RACIAL EQUITY EFFORTS

Eighty-five percent (85%) of corporate citizenship executives said that their companies contributed about the same or more to address racial equity in 2021 as they had in 2020. Ninety-seven percent (97%) reported contributing about the same or more to address racial equity in 2021 than they had budgeted for the year. While CEOs globally ranked economic opportunity/equality as their organization’s number one Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) priority, US CEOs ranked racial equality as their second highest priority. The ranking underscores how public awareness and outrage around key racial injustices and events in the US continued to impact corporate giving considerations. In fact, 88% of the corporate executives surveyed have evaluated, are evaluating, or plan to evaluate and improve the design and delivery of their corporate citizenship programs through a racial equity lens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG-SOCIAL PRIORITIES RANKED BY CEOs</th>
<th>GLOBAL CEOs</th>
<th>US CEOs</th>
<th>EUROPE CEOs</th>
<th>CHINA CEOs</th>
<th>JAPAN CEOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic opportunity/equality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial equality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy/voting rights</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/nationalism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS CASE STUDY
CCS partnered with the National Museum of African American History and Culture (NMAAHC) and its leadership on a landmark campaign. The campaign exceeded its $270 million goal by raising more than $320 million in private philanthropic support for its historic opening in Washington, DC. CCS was also retained by the museum to help manage their current campaign, Living History. The current campaign has received 52 corporate gifts, primarily through its Corporate Leadership Council (CLC): Corporations committing a $1 million gift over a five-year period receive specific benefits, including acknowledgment in several New York Times advertisements.
EMPLOYEE FEEDBACK

While the desire to give towards racial equity causes continued to grow in 2021, only 26% of employees believed their employer had fulfilled or exceeded a majority of its stated commitments to elevating racial and social equity, according to a survey by Benevity. Nearly 40% of employees said that they would be more likely to quit their job if their company did not prioritize racial and social justice. Facilitating employee engagement with corporate giving programs — both in allocating cash gifts and implementing in-kind programs such as volunteer days — is critical for maintaining transparency around how corporations are fulfilling their commitments.

RACIAL EQUITY IN CORPORATIONS

In addition to supporting nonprofits serving underrepresented communities, it is important for corporate giving programs prioritizing racial equity efforts to address internal representation. According to ISS Corporate Solutions, 17% of board members in the Russell 3000 index in 2021 were people of color. Corporate boards, foundations, and other decision-making bodies should strive to include a racially-diverse group of individuals reflecting a wide range of backgrounds, experiences, and philanthropic priorities. Balanced representation throughout the corporate giving process helps ensure that employees are meaningfully engaged on the issues most important to them while companies achieve their philanthropic objectives.
Digital giving, which can encompass activities like donating on a nonprofit’s website, giving in response to an online campaign, or digital crowdfunding, continued to grow in the 2021 philanthropic landscape. In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic drove a rapid increase in digital giving to nonprofit organizations. While the rate of increase slowed in 2021 from the year prior, the dollar value of online giving relative to other philanthropic sources remained largely the same. As digital giving settled into a more sustainable practice for nonprofits, new trends and best practices emerged.
ONLINE GIVING CONTINUED TO GROW

In 2021, the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic continued to drive digital giving, which has been rising for years. Online giving constituted 12% of all charitable giving in the United States. In a study by Blackbaud, 4,535 nonprofit organizations showed a 9% increase in online giving from 2020 to 2021. ¹ This was a more modest increase from the 21% spike that took place between 2019 and 2020. ² While this was a slight change from 13% in 2020, this should not be taken as an indicator that online giving is decreasing in popularity. ¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>2021 YOY ONLINE GIVING GROWTH</th>
<th>ONLINE AS % OF ALL GIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Communities</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Education</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Society Benefit</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The COVID-19 pandemic spiked online giving rates from 2019 to 2020, so a plateau was to be expected. Additionally, if Blackbaud’s findings are extrapolated to Giving USA’s estimates for overall charitable giving, digital giving would have totaled about $58 billion in 2021, which is comparable to $61 billion in 2020. ⁴

As pandemic-related needs increased in 2020, Human Services grew their digital giving by nearly 46%. When those needs waned in 2021, so did digital giving for that sector. However, the year-over-year trendline for Human Services remains strong. ¹

Giving to public-society benefit organizations grew online by more than 140% over the last three years, far outpacing the growth of other nonprofit sectors. ¹ This growth is attributed in large part to a strong connection between the racial and social justice movement, social media campaigns, and digital giving. As an example, in the wake of George Floyd’s murder in May 2020, ActBlue reported that $41 million was raised in 24 hours on a collective action day known as “Blackout Tuesday.” ⁵
**Small Nonprofits Continued to Receive the Most Online Donations**

In 2021, small organizations (budgets of less than $1 million) received a larger percentage of their gifts online compared to medium organizations (budgets of $1 million to $10 million) and large organizations (budgets of $10 million or greater). However, online gifts gained popularity among large nonprofits. Online giving to these organizations increased by 9.8% in 2021, 1.1 percentage points higher than the increase seen for medium organizations and 5.9 percentage points higher than seen for small organizations.

![Online Giving by Organization Size](image)

Compared to overall giving, online giving continued to be characterized by smaller gift amounts: Blackbaud reported an average online gift amount of $204, which is about four times smaller than the overall average gift size of $813. However, the average online gift amount grew by 15% in 2021, underscoring the increased importance of online fundraising. It is also worth noting that the average online gift amount for primary and secondary schools was $1,640, about eight times more than the overall average online gift amount.

![2021 Donation Amount by Sector](image)
MOBILE GIVING REMAINED AN IMPORTANT GIVING VEHICLE

In 2021, sustained mobile giving underscored the need for nonprofits to encourage ways to give through a phone or tablet. For the second year in a row, 28% of all online donations were made on a mobile device*, and mobile devices continued to drive nonprofit website traffic in 2021.¹ ⁶ As with online giving growth, the COVID-19 pandemic likely led to the plateau in mobile giving.

While mobile giving continued in importance, a visit from a desktop user remained more philanthropically valuable than that of a mobile user. While 54% of website visits were made using a mobile device, mobile users made less online donations and contributed less revenue than desktop users. The average gift made on a computer was $75, while the average gift made on a phone or tablet was $46. It is also worth noting that, while mobile giving trends suggest continued increases overtime, desktop traffic still grew by 14% in 2021.⁶ A number of factors could have contributed to this anomaly, including an increase in employees working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic leading to increased desktop usage, new internet privacy policies skewing website traffic statistics, and more.

*Mobile devices are defined as phones or tablets. Desktop devices are defined as any device with a screen more than 7 inches in diagonal, like desktop and laptop computers.

NONPROFIT WEBSITE SHARES BY DEVICE, 2021*⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Donation</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS INSIGHT

While desktop users gave more than mobile device users, mobile giving drove traffic to nonprofit websites. Using techniques to close the gap in giving between desktop and mobile devices is key to helping nonprofits maximize your digital giving and create parity between platform users.
HYBRID EVENT FUNDRAISING ROSE IN POPULARITY

As social distancing requirements and preferences shifted in 2021, hybrid events became an important hallmark of digital giving. In a survey of 1,000 fundraising event attendees, Classy found that 35% reported having attended a hybrid event. The demand for more hybrid and virtual events was also significant: Blackbaud’s 2021 study of 1,024 donors found that 56% wanted a virtual or hybrid relationship with their causes.

HOW DONORS IN 2021 WANTED TO ENGAGE AFTER THE ONSET OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance In-Person and Virtual</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Virtual</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Virtual</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizations that are hesitant about the return on investment of hosting a hybrid event should consider that 21% of virtual attendees in Classy’s survey said they would donate more than $100 compared to 19% of in-person attendees.

CCS INSIGHT

Providing both virtual and in-person engagement options ensures that organizations meet the needs and preferences of donors across different backgrounds and levels of access. Virtual and hybrid events should align with key organizational goals and objectives – from donor and prospect communication to cultivation and stewardship strategies.

While nonprofits continue to provide options to join events virtually, finding effective ways to communicate those options to donors is crucial. In 2021, only 16% of donors reported being aware of the expanded virtual offerings that 72% of professionals claimed to have expanded.
TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION AND DIGITALIZATION SPURRED NEW WAYS OF GIVING

Organizations sought alternate ways to connect with donors and solicit donations during the COVID-19 pandemic, which drove technological development. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of professionals surveyed by Blackbaud reported that their efforts to connect with donors through digital channels increased in 2021, which propelled innovative approaches to digital fundraising. In a survey administered by the Charities Aid Foundation, 72% of 1,080 charity leaders from the UK reported introducing, or planning to introduce, new methods of giving in 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Nonprofits Using Social Media Platforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92%

Of organizations plan on using social media as an engagement tool more than they had before the COVID-19 pandemic.

86%

Of organizations plan on sharing videos about their cause more than they had before the COVID-19 pandemic.

619

Professionals said that their organization overhauled their website.

1 in 4

Nonprofits reported being active on TikTok.

CCS INSIGHT

Only one in four charities surveyed by the Charities Aid Foundation reported having the knowledge to effectively fundraise through new digital technologies. Online engagement broadens audiences, ignites engagement, and enhances giving opportunities to nonprofits. In today’s evolving digital giving landscape, successful nonprofits will make organizational investments to develop and implement a strong digital fundraising strategy.
The majority of donors surveyed by Blackbaud said that they wanted the same level or more of digital engagement since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. This engagement could include social media, blog posts, podcasts, or virtual reality experiences. Moreover, 78% hoped organizations would encourage online giving or online donations at the same level or more.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONORS' PREFERRED FUTURE ENGAGEMENT METHODS IN 2021</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Same as During the Pandemic</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Not Sure or N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Signing an Online Petition</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Monthly Giving</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Sharing on Social Media</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Online Giving/Donations</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering Virtual Reality Experiences</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing/Posting Blogs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Audio Clips or Podcasts</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending e-Newsletters</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Videos About Nonprofit’s Cause</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating and Sharing Social Media Content</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting Fundraising Events</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCS CASE STUDY

CCS partnered with the Diocese of Austin in their *Encountering Christ* campaign, which has raised more than $102 million to date on its $85 million goal. Driven by digital fundraising approaches, such as social media storytelling, utilizing online donation platforms, and filming bilingual videos about the campaign’s mission, the campaign has garnered the two largest gifts in the Diocese of Austin’s 70-plus-year history.
DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION IN PHILANTHROPY

Catalyzed by the racial and social justice movement, nonprofits saw a heightened focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in 2021. Organizations assessed and addressed their DEI efforts on initiatives including: diverse representation in leadership, partnerships, and volunteers; fundraising messaging, practices, and priorities; staff training; and organizational values and priorities. Moreover, philanthropy for racial equity experienced a spike in 2020 and continued to climb in 2021.
UNDERSTANDING DEI IN PHILANTHROPY

CCS remains committed to building an inclusive firm that reflects the world and communities in which we serve. In this chapter, we take a closer look at the giving data for philanthropy related to DEI efforts. This analysis is accompanied by anecdotes that illuminate some of the ways long-held beliefs and practices around philanthropy are shifting for donors, organizations, and our broader communities due to the social pressures and events of the past two years. Our observations and questions are offered with humility and in support of organizations and donors pursuing the actualization of their missions in the most authentic, just, inclusive, and effective manner within their communities.

It should come as an unsurprising and welcome data point that philanthropy focused on racial and social justice continued to increase through 2021 and early 2022. Loosening of gift restrictions and donor reporting requirements, intentional commitments to grassroots groups that serve historically marginalized populations, and staff turnover ushering in new cohorts of leaders of color, all created new opportunities for nonprofit organizations to focus on deepening community connection and impact. However, along with this heightened focus on equity, justice, and inclusion across the nonprofit sector came an increasingly complex and tenuous ecosystem that challenged the status quo with fundamental reflections, including: how donors make decisions around giving or volunteering; how organizations should operate in this everchanging atmosphere; what staff expect from their managers, executives, and board leadership; and how the broader network of stakeholders within communities is invited to engage in a system with less hierarchy and more distributed power.

In reaction to the widespread social unrest and pervasive violence directed primarily toward Black and Asian communities across the United States, many organizations spent the second half of 2020 and early 2021 crafting statements of solidarity and inclusivity, and the past 12 months have put those statements to the test. Are they merely aspirational words on a website? Are the values and structures around those who hold power and decision-making authority fundamentally changing for the better? Are organizations effectively balancing their internal transformative processes while still meeting the moment during this critical window to drive much-needed policy and societal change? We invite you to reflect on these questions as you review the data and insights presented within this next chapter.
THE DESIRE TO GIVE TOWARD RACIAL AND SOCIAL EQUITY CAUSES CONTINUED TO GROW

From 2020 to 2022 to date, funding for racial equity has steadily climbed. While critical events in 2020 acted as a catalyst for this giving, an increasing awareness of inequities between racial and social groups has elevated this cause for donors. Candid reports that the amount of publicly announced donations in support of racial equity efforts has grown by $12.9 billion since July 2021, and by a staggering $23.7 billion over cumulative donations tracked between 2011-2019.¹

Candid also aggregated the areas of support in which these grants and pledges are being used. Program support, equal access, and general support are the leading equity-related areas of giving.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT STRATEGY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program support</td>
<td>$61,935,725,373</td>
<td>786,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal access</td>
<td>$37,361,245,284</td>
<td>68,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td>$32,752,177,368</td>
<td>466,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, advocacy and systems reform</td>
<td>$19,052,661,945</td>
<td>51,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building and technical assistance</td>
<td>$11,475,020,691</td>
<td>55,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital and infrastructure</td>
<td>$9,769,861,089</td>
<td>16,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>$6,687,915,852</td>
<td>54,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>$6,591,856,482</td>
<td>51,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$4,851,802,686</td>
<td>23,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement and education</td>
<td>$4,658,737,683</td>
<td>43,992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DONORS OF COLOR CONSISTENTLY ENGAGED IN PHILANTHROPY

The changing racial and ethnic demographics of current Americans have made a significant impact on philanthropy and giving to nonprofits. While following some traditional philanthropic trends, this increasingly diverse donor population self-determined new areas of focus and motivations for giving, grounded in community perspectives and lived experiences. They also leveraged new vehicles and tools for giving in the process. The Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy conducted a study of the giving patterns of today’s donors of color in the US. The study found that the majority of ethnic and racial groups give across the board.

MEASURING THE GIVING RATES ACROSS RACIAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS

The Everyday Donors of Color study also found that there are four key motivations for giving, as outlined below.

PRIORITY GIVING MOTIVATIONS FOR DONORS OF COLOR

01 Faith
02 Self-help
03 Reciprocity
04 "Level the playing field"
DEI is not a cause, but a value system and lens by which organizations choose to operate. As corporations felt pressure to assess ongoing DEI practices, so did the nonprofit sector.

Communities that have historically been under-resourced by philanthropy, with restricted access to grants and minimal donor attention, are now experiencing increased philanthropic access. Note that many of these changes are being driven internally by the demands of staff, especially at lower levels, within the organizations. Additionally, a growing group of funders (individual and institutional) are evaluating potential nonprofit partners, not just on program outcomes, but on the makeup of their staff, boards, and leadership. Funders are driving these changes within nonprofits where there was previously little momentum in some of these key areas. In the CCS 2021 *Philanthropy Pulse* survey report, more than half of 877 respondents reported making changes to their board recruitment and/or relations practices to make their fundraising activities more diverse, equitable, and inclusive. Additional practices that CCS has observed include:

### TACTICS EMPLOYED BY NONPROFITS TO EMBRACE DEI

- **52%** Made changes to board recruitment
- **32%** Made changes to staffing and/or leadership structure
- **46%** Modified the messaging used with donors and/or the case for support
- **49%** Offered DEI training for fundraising staff and/or board members
- **23%** Made changes to volunteer recruitment and/or relations practices

### 01
Explicitly highlighting areas and outcomes related to DEI, using more culturally sensitive language, and positioning donors as partners rather than heroes or saviors.

### 02
Evaluating gift acceptance and recognition policies to ensure that donors are aligned with organizational values and identifying ways to highlight grassroots community leaders and significant donors in recognition spaces.
In the CCS 2021 Philanthropy Pulse survey report, 62% of respondents reported that DEI is part of their organization’s strategic plans for future fundraising priorities. Additionally, an overwhelming majority of respondents said they are discussing DEI with their donors at least occasionally. It is also valuable to note that while many organizations aspire to incorporate DEI values into their fundraising practices, there is ongoing conversation around how to educate donors on the root causes, like structural racism, that necessitate the nonprofit’s intervention in the first place.

### FUNDRAISING SURVEY RESPONDENTS REPORTING THE INCORPORATION OF DEI CONCEPTS IN FUNDRAISING PLANS AND DONOR CONVERSATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorporate DEI Concepts</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Under consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Discuss DEI Concepts     | Yes, always | Yes, frequently | Yes, occasionally | No |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 4%                       | 27%         | 39%             | 29%               |

Organizations that incorporate diversity, equity, and/or inclusion in strategic plans for fundraising priorities

Organizations that discuss the concepts of diversity, equity, and/or inclusion in conversations with donors

### CCS CASE STUDY

CCS is consulting with the India Basin Waterfront Park project in San Francisco. Alongside four entities, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, Trust for Public Land, San Francisco Parks Alliance, and A. Philip Randolph Institute, the project aims to transform an underperforming and dilapidated shoreline into a 64-acre park that is centered in equitable development. The unequivocal goal of the project is to deliver a community space designed by and for the local neighborhood – which has historically suffered from neglect and disinvestment – while improving the economic opportunity and environmental health of its residents. Of particular significance are preserving the local residents’ unique cultural identity and celebrating the incredible contributions of this community to the city.

Ensuring equitable representation in the campaign leadership, the case for support, campaign infrastructure and planning, and donor engagement practices is playing a large role in advancing the standards of DEI in fundraising. It also ensures long-term alignment with the ethos of the project and self-identified needs of the local community.
In response to the 2020 racial and social justice movement, donor practices were called into question and insights were gained from the industry's reflection. For example, Echoing Green found that Black-led organizations had 24% smaller revenue sizes than their white-led counterparts. As a result, we are seeing a trend of funders, particularly foundations, revamping their decision-making according to the following factors:

01 The demographics of the population they serve and prioritizing the most marginalized

02 The internal DEI policies of the nonprofit

03 The diversity profile of the nonprofit's senior leaders and board members

04 The diversity profile of external professional partners

Thought leaders like Edgar Villanueva, author of Decolonizing Wealth, have been calling funder practices into question since before the murder of George Floyd and the COVID-19 pandemic, but these two events have accelerated the pressure those with vested interest across the nonprofit sector are putting on donors to consider equity and justice in their philanthropy.

The fundamental questions of who has input into resource distribution decisions, who is designing solutions to community challenges, and how the sector can empower more grassroots leaders of color to have an authoritative voice in these conversations are influencing how donors decide where to give and what restrictions they should put on gifts.

Some donors are specifically allocating a portion of their dollars to DEI causes and/or moving away from funding legacy nonprofits in favor of smaller grassroots organizations. Additionally, donors have started to rigorously assess organizations and their leaders' commitments to equity and whether those values manifest in the demographics of their staff, board, or vendors and subcontractors engaged in program delivery.

CCS INSIGHT

As nonprofit advisors, we are compelled to ask ourselves: What are our values and how are we living them out? This is an emerging way of thinking, and one on which we do not purport to be experts. However, given the trends, it is becoming the way of the future and may soon become the industry standard.

With this said, we pose these questions for practitioners to consider as they review data and trends:

a. How have changing demographics transformed the conversation around philanthropy?

b. How can I make an immediate impact in the nonprofit sector's shift toward diversity, equity, and inclusion?

c. How is my organization embodying its values?
GIFT PLANNING

As an evolving area of philanthropy, gift planning has been made more urgent by the pandemic, spurred by the ongoing and quickening wealth transfer, and elevated by increasing donor sophistication. Gift planning provides nonprofits the means to tap into the hidden potential of their donors by highlighting noncash assets that donors may not realize can be turned into charitable gifts. Noncash asset gifts and deferred (legacy) gifts are the two essential elements of a robust planned giving program necessary for nonprofits to achieve significant growth in revenue, programs, and internal capacity.
BEQUEST GIVING DECREASED IN 2021 BUT REMAINS A BROADLY POPULAR GIVING OPTION

In 2021, estimated bequest giving from estates represented 9% of total giving. The rate at which individuals leave bequests has remained relatively consistent from year to year. Giving USA estimates that about 5% of estates leave a charitable bequest, annually.

Although bequest giving decreased by 11.4% in 2021, it remained broadly popular and the most accessible legacy gift option for donors. However, the total amount of giving by bequest fluctuates from year to year due to a handful of very large gifts that substantially influence the aggregate total. The dollar amount of charitable bequests largely reflects estate values in a given year, which can include wealth from homes, investments, and other types of property.
DONOR-ADVISED FUNDS CONTINUED TO GROW AS A LEADING SOURCE OF GIVING

DAF PAYOUTS REACHED A NEW HIGH

- Grants from DAFs increased 27% from 2019-2020
- Grants from DAFs to charitable organizations reached a new high
- The DAF payout rate was 23.8%, the highest payout rate since 2011

The number of individual donor-advised fund (DAF) accounts in the US surged to over one million. Two point two (2.2) million grants were made from Fidelity Charitable DAF accounts to 187,000 nonprofits, with an average grant size of $4,407. Total grant dollars from DAFs grew 10% more than total grant dollars from independent foundations. Overall, contributions to DAFs increased more slowly than grantmaking.

- 27% Growth rate of grant dollars from DAFs
- $4,407 Average size of DAF grants made to nonprofits

CRYPTOPHILANTHROPY IS INCREASINGLY PROMINENT AMONG DAF ACCOUNTS

Cryptocurrency comprised $331 million of the total amount deposited in DAF accounts managed by Fidelity Charitable in 2021, as compared to $28 million in 2020.

Fidelity Charitable also reported that cryptocurrency donations increased to $158 million of the $10.7 billion that Fidelity donors contributed to DAF accounts.

+1,082% Percent increase of cryptocurrency donations to Fidelity Charitable DAF accounts from 2020 to 2021
NONPROFITS REPORTED DAFS AS THE MOST COMMON SOURCE OF PLANNED GIVING

The CCS 2021 Philanthropy Pulse survey confirmed that nonprofits received more gifts from DAFs than from any other planned giving source in the past two years, despite the potential in other assets like retirement plans. 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Nonprofits Reporting Gifts by Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor-Advised Funds: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciated Assets: 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequest: 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Plans: 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Trust: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Gift Annuity: 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOOKING AHEAD

Fifty-six percent (56%) of nonprofits said that they expected an increase in fundraising results from deferred gifts this year, signaling an opportunity for organizations to have a conversation with donors regarding their gift plans. By comparison, only 52% of donors reported telling organizations about their planned gifts. 6

CCS CASE STUDY

Miami City Ballet (MCB) engaged CCS to conduct a Gift Planning Assessment to identify actionable steps for harnessing the potential for planned gifts within their donor base. CCS’s recommendations aimed to strengthen MCB’s legacy society program through strategic activities designed to deepen the engagement of donors as “insiders.” In the year following CCS’s assessment, the Ballet grew their irrevocable and revocable gifts by more than $10 million, a 585% increase, surpassed their capital campaign goal by 18%, and increased membership in their legacy society by 50%.
Total US retirement assets increased by 11.6% for the year, totaling $39.3 trillion as of December 31, 2021. This number has nearly tripled since 2000. This means that in the US, retirement assets accounted for 32% of all household financial assets.

Early evidence of growth in asset-based giving can be seen in the results from the CCS 2021 Philanthropy Pulse survey report, in which 56% of respondents expected their organization to secure more deferred gift commitments in 2022.

However, nearly double the number of survey respondents received gifts from DAFs (80%) as compared to gifts from retirement plans (46%). The low frequency of gifts from retirement assets compared to DAFs in this survey highlights untapped potential due to the value of these assets in the US.

AN UNPRECEDENTED AMOUNT OF WEALTH WILL BE TRANSFERRED IN THE COMING DECADES.

By 2026, $150 billion will be passed from the Baby Boomer generation to their Millennial children. By 2047, that number will increase to a total of $68.4 trillion transferred across 45 million US households.

Planned giving prospects exist across these generations and have a myriad of philanthropic and financial objectives that nonprofits can and should seek to address through individualized planned giving strategies. For example, after considering planned giving options that frame a gift request as coming from a donor's assets versus their income, many donors will conclude that they can make a larger gift than they originally thought possible.
NONPROFIT LEADERS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO INVEST IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The CCS 2021 Philanthropy Pulse survey report confirmed that gift planning is the area in which fundraisers have the lowest self-assessed expertise. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of responding organizations felt that their fundraising staff members were only somewhat or not at all knowledgeable about gift planning.¹

Where should you start? Nonprofit leaders should work to:

- **Discuss planned giving strategies with the board of directors.**
- **Invest in professional development and training for your fundraising team and organizational leadership.**
- **Know who your best prospects are for deferred and noncash gifts.**
- **Increase fundraiser confidence in speaking with donors.**
- **Establish or improve messaging to prospects by age and life stage.**
- **Position your organization to achieve goals for growth in revenue, internal capacity, programs, or a combination of the three.**

### IDENTIFYING PLANNED GIVING PROSPECTS

| 01 | Segment donors into three broad categories: current planned gift donors; annual fund donors; and board, volunteers, and staff |
| 02 | Once donors have been segmented, qualify and identify new planned giving prospects using a Recency, Frequency, and Monetary Analysis |
| 03 | If available, review demographic data (age, marital status, heir status, etc.) to further segment new planned giving prospects |

### CCS INSIGHT

Gift Planning can appeal to every age and life stage. The first recourse for nonprofits with donors that are unable to contribute immediately, as much as they may aspire to, should be a planned giving strategy.
MORE INFORMATION

Thank you for reading the CCS 2022 Snapshot of Today's Philanthropic Landscape report. Please see the following pages for sources, credits, and more information about CCS Fundraising and our 75 years of transformational partnerships.
**PLANNED GIVING GLOSSARY**

**Gift Planning:** A culture of giving defined by an institutional commitment to donor-centric fundraising with an expanded focus on noncash assets.

**Planned Giving:** A distinct fundraising strategy utilizing noncash giving. Noncash giving is sometimes referred to as “asset-based giving.”

**Deferred Gift:** A type of planned gift in which a donor decides on the gift now and the gift is received by the charity at some point in the future, often after the life of the donor has ended. Some, but not all, planned gifts are deferred gifts.

**A Selection of Planned Giving Vehicles**

**Bequest:** A written statement in a donor’s will directing that specific assets or a percentage or a remainder of the estate will be transferred to charity after the life of the donor has ended.

**Charitable Gift Annuity (CGA):** An agreement where a donor makes a gift of cash or property and a charity agrees to make fixed payments to the donor for life. The charity then retains the assets after the life of the donor has ended.

**Charitable Trust:** A trust in which all unexpired interests are devoted to one or more charitable purposes. There are multiple types of charitable trusts, including the two listed below.

**Charitable Remainder Trust (CRT):** A trust that receives cash or property from a donor; makes fixed payments for a life, lifetimes, or term of years; and then distributes the remainder to charity.

**Charitable Annuity Lead Trust (CLAT):** A trust that receives cash or property from a donor and makes fixed payments to charity for a specified period. At the end of the period, it distributes the trust property to a specified beneficiary, usually family.

**Donor-Advised Fund (DAF):** As explained by National Philanthropic Trust, a DAF is “a philanthropic giving vehicle administered by a charitable sponsor. A donor-advised fund allows donors to establish and fund the DAF account by making irrevocable, tax-deductible contributions to the charitable sponsor. Donors then recommend grants from those funds to other charitable organizations. The charitable sponsor retains legal control over all assets in the DAF, and the donor retains advisory privileges to make non-binding recommendations regarding grants and investments.”

**Insurance Policy Beneficiary:** A donor names a charity as a beneficiary of an existing policy, either fully paid or partially paid, or a new policy. The charity would then receive the benefits of the policy after the life of the donor has ended.

**Qualified Charitable Distribution:** An otherwise taxable distribution from an IRA (other than an ongoing SEP or SIMPLE IRA) owned by an individual who is age 70 ½ or over that is paid directly from the IRA to a qualified charity.

**Real Estate:** A donor either gifts a piece of property to a charity or sells property to a charity for less than its full fair market value (bargain sale).

**Retirement Plan Beneficiary:** A donor names a charity as the beneficiary of a qualified retirement plan (e.g. 401k, 403b, IRA). The charity would then receive the benefits of the retirement account after the life of the donor has ended.

**Stock Gift:** A donor may choose to donate appreciated assets directly to a charity as a cash-equivalent gift or include stocks in a bequest.
Understanding Pre-Pandemic Trends in Charitable Giving

KEY FINDINGS


SNAPSHOT OF GIVING


INDIVIDUAL GIVING


HIGH NET WORTH GIVING

5. CNN Business, *A new billionaire has been minted nearly every day during the pandemic* (2022).
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Center for High-Impact Philanthropy, Program-Related Investments (2016).


Whizy Kim, Vox, Bill Gates Knows Philanthropy Alone Can’t Solve Inequality (2022).


CORPORATE GIVING


Benevity, A record $112.6 million donated to 43,000 causes through Benevity’s platform in 2022 (2021).

Benevity, 44,600 nonprofits supported through Benevity’s platform on GivingTuesday 2020 (2020).


Benevity, Great Resignation and Corporate Social Responsibility (2022).

DIGITAL GIVING


Charities Aid Foundation, Charity Landscape 2022 (2022).

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION IN PHILANTHROPY

Candid, Funding for racial equity” (Accessed August 26, 2022). As this data source only includes publicly announced gifts and gifts reported directly to Candid that are earmarked for racial equity, it is an underestimate of all giving in support of racial equity.
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For 75 years, CCS Fundraising has empowered many of the world’s greatest nonprofit organizations to advance some of the most important causes in history. As leading consulting experts in campaign and development strategy, we plan and implement fundraising initiatives to help organizations make a bigger impact — locally, nationally, and globally.

Members of the CCS team are highly experienced and knowledgeable across sectors, disciplines, and regions. Our unique, customized approach provides each nonprofit partner with dedicated professionals who help mission-driven organizations meet their most pressing challenges and achieve their most ambitious goals. While the results of our work are immediate, our impact is enduring.

170+
Feasibility and planning studies with over 5,000 interviews conducted annually

300
Cities across 15 countries where CCS engaged in partnerships last year

$15B+
In campaign goals at a time