
Appendix: Interview and Case Study Methodology

Over thirty foundations were chosen for review using interview and case study methodologies. Twenty-nine grantmaking institutions participated in the study. Data from the Council on Foundations (CoF) was used to assist in the selection of foundations for the qualitative interviews. An analysis of the 1997 *Foundation Management Series* (Council on Foundations 1998a) and the 1998 *Grantmakers Salary Report* (Council on Foundations 1998b), as well as unpublished data took place to examine the following indicators:

1. The percentage of staff that were people of color.
2. The percentage of board members that were women.
3. The percentage of board members that were people of color.

We decided not to use the percentage of women on staff as an indicator since in most foundations women comprise a majority of staff.

These indicators came from the following information provided by CoF:

1. A list of foundations with at least one minority member on their staff (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, or Other) that indicated that it “was OK to contact them” from the 1998 *Grantmakers Salary Report*. Data was provided by asset size and foundation type.
2. A list of foundations with at least one woman on their board that indicated that it “was OK to contact them” from the 1997 *Foundation Management Series*. Data was provided by asset size and foundation type.
3. A list of foundations with at least one person of color on their board that indicated that it “was OK to contact them” from the 1997 *Foundation Management Series*. Data was provided by asset size and foundation type.

Two indices were created. One index consisted simply by adding together the percent of minority and the percent of women on the board (divided by 100) to produce a “board diversity score.” Since there was overlap among the minorities and women (i.e., minority women), this index is **not** to be interpreted as the percent of minorities and women on the board. Rather, it is simply an index to rank foundations relative to each other. Another index was constructed that added together the percent of minorities on the board, the percent of women on the board, and the percent of minorities on the staff (divided by 100). The foundations were then sorted by their score.

The final sorting resulted in a list with the highest scoring foundations, in terms of diversity, at the top of the list. These top foundations were identified as good candidates for

the case study interviews. Score alone was not sufficient, however. These rankings were used only as guides. Attempts were made to ensure that the final foundations chosen for interviews not only had a high diversity score, but also varied in terms of region, foundation type, and asset size. References were made back to the master list – containing information on assets, type, and region – to select a wide range of exemplary foundations.

In addition, a number of other foundations were added to the list when it was determined that their omission from the diversity rankings was not due to a lack of diversity, but because they were not respondents in the CoF data. Some judgments were made therefore, to add foundations with good reputations that were not represented in the CoF data. We chose organizations based on reputational analysis from pre-test interviews with leaders in the field.

Table 13. Diversity Indices

Minorities on Boards and Staff, Women on Boards, and Composite Indices

| Foundation Type | % Minority of Staff | % Minority on Board | % Women on Board | Average Index 1 | Average Index 2 |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Community | 22.0 | 12.3 | 31.7 | .516 | .901 |
| Corporate | 23.2 | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| Family | 12.6 | 2.2 | 44.5 | .615 | .825 |
| Independent | 24.9 | 11.6 | 25.6 | .557 | .940 |
| Public | 24.3 | 12.7 | 38.0 | .630 | .887 |
| All | 22.5 | 10.0 | 33.6 | .579 | .888 |
| # Respondents | N/A | 644 | 644 | 213 | 102 |

Notes: (1) Index 1 constructed from unpublished data on minorities on boards and women on boards; Index 2 constructed from the latter, but also adding minorities on staff.

Source: 1998 *Grantmakers Salary Report*, Council on Foundations, 1998; *Foundation Management Series, Ninth Edition, Volume II: Governance*, Council on Foundations, 1998; indices constructed from unpublished CoF data by Dr. Lynn Burbridge.

Looking at the first column in Table 13, we see that independent foundations at 24.9% have the greatest ratio of people of color on staff followed by public charities and corporate foundations. Community foundations rank fourth on this scale. Family foundations rank last. On the measure of percent of people of color on the board of trustees, public charities rank first followed by community foundations, independent foundations, and family foundations at the bottom.

If we examine foundation types by the percentage of women on their boards, family foundations rank first (44.5%) followed by public charities, community foundations, and independent foundations. On Index One (minorities and women on the board), family foundations rank second after public charities, their ranking perhaps inflated by the female

family members on their boards. On our most comprehensive measure, Index Two, private independent foundations rank first, community foundations second, public charities third, and family foundations last.

Family foundations are the least diverse by type. Except for placing women (presumably family members) on their boards, they rank last on all other measures except average Index One, which takes the percent of women on the board into account. Independent foundations do better. One possible explanation is that because of their substantial assets, they are in the best position to invest resources in the pursuit of diversity, using, for example, specialized recruiting firms and offering highly competitive salaries. This explanation gains support from the fact that the strength of the independent foundations showing on average, Index 2, comes from their hiring of minority staff. They do less well in placing women or people of color on their boards, ranking fourth and third in these categories respectively.

Grantmaking public charities, other than traditional community foundations, ranked high on people of color staff and people of color and women board members. The explanation rests, in large part, on the number of these organizations that characterize themselves as “progressive,” committed to issues of social justice and equity. As discussed in William Díaz and Aileen Shaw’s chapter on community foundations and progressive public charities, these organizations have been motivated by ideology to diversify, and the results are reflected in our statistics.

At each of the several types of grantmaking organization selected, we interviewed key foundation administrators to obtain the “institutional” view of the motives for and the processes of change that the foundation had undergone in increasing diversity. Initially, funding limitations restricted the interviews to top administrators at each organization. Not surprisingly, this resulted in an overwhelming number of white subjects. At the time the interviews took place the twenty-nine organizations in our study were headed by fourteen white men, ten white women, two Latinas, one African-American woman, one African-American man, and one Asian man. Four were gay, lesbian or bisexual. None had a disability. Interestingly, of the twelve CEOs using the title “President” rather than “Executive Director,” nine were white men. The interviews revealed the need to reach other more diverse staff not represented at the top level, especially program officers. Subsequent funding enabled us to interview staff with diverse characteristics.

In Phase 2 we used diversity as our primary criteria. We asked the CEOs originally approached to choose 2-3 individuals with diverse identities according to ethnicity, gender, race, disability, and sexual orientation from their staff and board. These interviews enabled us to deepen the original picture that emerged from CEO interviews. Interview subjects also were selected to reflect geographic variation. Our sample follows very closely general population trends. For instance, in the South, where 55% of the country’s black population

resides, (U.S. Census Bureau 2000b, p. 1) diversity is perceived as a mostly black/white issue. Asian Americans, on the other hand, according to the most recent Census data, are concentrated (53%) in the West (U.S. Census Bureau 2000a, p. 1). In the Western states, diversity is more inclusive in terms of population, and also reflecting the more liberal sociopolitical climate, sexual orientation. In fact, three-quarters of the Asian Americans and almost half the gay/lesbian staff we interviewed work in California.

Among those interviewed, the demographic breakdown is as follows:

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| White | 30 |
| Black | 12 |
| Hispanic | 9 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 5 |
| Native American | 2 |
| Men | 27 |
| Women | 31 |
| Heterosexual | 46 |
| LGBT | 11 |
| Disabled | 1 |

In addition to these 58 respondents, 51 staff or trustees attended the focus groups for a total of 109 respondents. Three focus groups were held to supplement the interview process. A focus group of progressive grantmakers took place at the 1998 NNG Conference in Minneapolis to explore issues of interest to diverse staff and board. In December 1999, NNG held a focus group in California with members of the Steering Committee of the newly renamed Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues in order to gather additional data and methods for identifying this population of interest. Díaz held a focus group in Chicago in the spring of 2000 to discuss the emerging patterns among interview subjects. Díaz hosted two final focus groups on people with disabilities in February and March 2001.

References

- Council on Foundations. 1998a. *Foundation Management Series, Ninth Edition*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations.
- Council on Foundations. 1998b. *1998 Grantmakers Salary Report*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000a. *The Asian and Pacific Islander Population in the United States: Population Characteristics, March 1999*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000b. *The Black Population in the United States: Population Characteristics, March 1999*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Institutions Interviewed

A Territory Resource
AT&T Foundation
Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation
Boston Women's Fund
C. S. Mott Foundation
The California Wellness Foundation
The Chicago Community Trust
Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta
Community Fund Riverside County
Dyer-Ives Foundation
Flintridge Foundation
The Ford Foundation
Foundation for the Mid-South
General Mills Foundation
Evelyn & Walter Haas Jr. Fund
Headwaters Fund
Hyams Foundation
Jewish Fund for Justice
W. K. Kellogg Foundation
Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Public Welfare Foundation
The Rockefeller Foundation
The San Francisco Foundation
Levi Strauss Foundation
The Saint Paul Foundation
Tides Foundation
Wells Fargo Foundation
The Wieboldt Foundation

