A.B. 624 (Coto): Foundation Diversity and Transparency Act

A Community Response to an Organized Assault on Diversity

After decades of complaints from the diverse non-profit community, the Greenlining Institute conducted a study in 2005 of the 50 largest foundations in the country to quantify their giving to minority-led organizations. The report, Fairness in Philanthropy, found that minority-led organizations received just 3% of total grant dollars from the nation's largest foundations. Greenlining conducted a similar report in 2006 that found 3.6% of grant dollars going to minority-led organizations. Although Greenlining's methodology differed from previous reports on grant giving to communities of color, the findings were very similar – communities of color were being "short changed" by foundations.

Foundation leaders were repeatedly invited by Greenlining to propose new methodologies for studying grant giving to minority communities. Only 3 foundations agreed to participate in a constructive dialogue. Alarmed by the findings, the Chairs of the California Latino, Black, and Asian/Pacific Islander Legislative Caucuses held hearings to discuss grant-giving to minority communities. Only 3 private foundations accepted the invitation to participate at this historic hearing.

Due to the lack of cooperation and transparency from foundation leaders, Assemblymember Coto introduced A.B. 624, *The Foundation Diversity and Transparency Act.* Proponents of AB 624 argue that the public has the right to know where foundation grants are invested, especially when foundations receive \$40 billion is tax benefits.

Foundation Arguments	Community Response			
1. Argument: It would impose onerous reporting requirements for foundations.	Response: This is not true. Most foundations already require this data from non-profit organizations and many foundations openly provide their own diversity data.			
2.Argument: It would impose onerous	Response: This is not true. Nearly all non-profit organizations regularly			
reporting requirements for small non-	provide diversity data to funders. This argument is clear attempt to "divide			
profit organizations.	and conquer" the non-profit community.			
3. Argument: Foundations should not be	Response: AB 624 maintains the independence of foundations while			
regulated by the state and should be left to operate independently as they wish.	providing the public with greater information on how their tax dollars are being spent.			
4. Argument: The ethnic makeup of a	Response: We completely agree. Data from our annual foundation study			
non-profit board, staff, or beneficiaries	though shows that the foundations which give the most to communities of			
should in no way be a measure of	color are also led by people of color. Conversely, foundations which give			
whether a non-profit does a good job.	the least to communities of color have no diversity in their board or management. For example:			
	-			
	Rank in	Foundation	% of Grant	Leadership
	Giving to		Dollars	
	Minorities		to Minorities	
	1	California Endowment	19.6	Minority
	2	California Wellness	13.9	Minority
		Foundation		
	9	Wayne and Gladys Valley	0.36	White
		Foundation		
	10	Gordon and Betty Moore	0.00	White
		Foundation		
5. Argument: AB 624 is not needed	Response: This is not true. The research that is being produced by the			
because the Northern California	foundations is not transparent. For example:			
Grantmakers Association is already	1. Foundations have made <u>no commitment</u> to making the data public.			
producing research on diversity.	2. Only a small fraction of foundations are going to participate in this			
	study.			
		dation lobbyists have commit		
	1 indiv	idual foundation diversity per	rtormance. This w	all protect non-

diverse and will obscure the laudable work of diverse foundations.