

**EFFORTS TO ADDRESS
GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE:
A Look at Foundation Funding**

Ms. Foundation for Women
Building women's collective power to ignite change

Acknowledgments

The Ms. Foundation thanks the following people for their generous assistance with this report:

JOSIE ATIENZA

The Foundation Center

KARMA COTTMAN, Program Director

National Network to End Domestic Violence

SUE ELSE, President

National Network to End Domestic Violence

ROBERT ESPINOZA, Director of Research and Communications

Funders for LGBTQ Issues

CAT FRIBLEY, RSP Coordinator

Resource Sharing Project of the Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault

STEVEN LAWRENCE, Director of Research

The Foundation Center

ANNE MENARD, Director

National Resource Center on Domestic Violence

JILL MORRIS, Director of Communications

Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape

SARAH PIERSON BEAULIEU, Director of Development and Partnerships

Be the Change, Inc.

AMY ZUCCHERO, Program Officer

Women's Funding Network

Interviewees

JODI LIGGETT, Director of Research and Public Policy

Arizona Foundation for Women

KATHY PALUMBO, Director of Community Partnerships

Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta

LUPITA REYES, National Program Director

Verizon Foundation

PAMELA SHIFMAN, Director

DAVINIA TROUGHTON, Assistant

Initiatives for Women and Girls

NoVo Foundation

Consultants

JEANNE ARGOFF

NANCY CUNNINGHAM

Design

ELAINE HIN

Ms. Foundation Staff

BRENNAN LYNCH, Program Associate

PATRICIA ENG, Vice President of Program

ELLEN BRAUNE, Vice President of Communications

The Ms. Foundation for Women thanks the Verizon Foundation for providing funding for this report. We also thank the donors to our work on gender-based violence for their longstanding commitment to ending violence in the lives of women and girls.

Ms. Foundation for Women, "Efforts to Address Gender-Based Violence: A Look at Foundation Funding"

Copyright © 2010 Ms. Foundation for Women

Contents

3	Acknowledgments
4	Executive Summary
5	Introduction
7	Gender-Based Violence Funding 1994 - 2008
9	Extent of Gender-Based Violence Funding
15	Going Beyond the Numbers
20	Recommendations
23	Appendix A: Foundation Interviews Arizona Foundation for Women
25	Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta
27	NoVo Foundation
29	Verizon Foundation
31	Appendix B Methodology
32	Appendix C Foundation Respondents
34	Appendix D Practitioner Respondents
35	End Notes

Executive Summary

Gender-Based Violence Funding by U.S. Foundations

Gender-based violence is one of the most insidious and pervasive problems affecting women. Throughout the world, it is estimated that one in three will be raped, beaten, coerced into sex or otherwise abused in her lifetime.

While foundation support of work to address gender-based violence has existed for many years, little research has been conducted on the level or type of funding in the United States. Spurred by this paucity of data and analysis together with the importance of recognizing the fifteenth anniversary of the 1994 Violence Against Women Act, the Ms. Foundation for Women undertook a multi-pronged study to measure the scope, focus and impact of funding in this critical area.

Key Grantmaking Findings

- Foundation Center research comparing funding by the top 100 foundations in 1994 and 2008 shows that the number of foundations supporting gender-based violence issues increased 143 percent over that time period, while the dollar amount of funding increased three-and-a-half fold.
- Sixty-nine (69) diverse foundations responded to the survey and reported awarding 1,042 grants totaling \$67,344,220 to gender-based violence issues in 2008.
- By far, the highest percentage of funding addressed issues of domestic violence, followed by sexual assault, child sexual assault, violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer people and female trafficking.

- Intervention and direct-service programs garnered the majority of funder dollars, followed closely by prevention strategies.
- Grantees employing a social-service approach to their work received the most grant dollars, with a social justice perspective receiving the second highest level of support, followed by human rights and feminist perspectives. Faith-based approaches received by far the least amount of foundation support.

Key Recommendations

- Include systems change, policy, and advocacy along with direct services funding
- Increase support for violence prevention
- Create connections across the full spectrum of gender-based violence issues
- Create connections between gender-based violence and other major issues addressed by philanthropy
- Provide general operating support and multi-year grants, especially during times of financial hardship
- Don't underestimate the effectiveness of non-grantmaking activities
- Be kind with In-Kind
- Consider how to use your "bully pulpit" more effectively
- Build a gender-based violence funder community

Introduction

When the Ms. Foundation for Women was founded more than 35 years ago, violence against women was just becoming part of the lexicon in the United States. Over the years, the Ms. Foundation has worked diligently to draw attention to the pervasive culture of domestic, sexual, and other forms of gender-based violence and to support the inspiring efforts of women who work to change the core conditions of gender inequality.

In survey after survey, violence continues to top the list of women's concerns, and a report released by the World Health Organization in 2005 reveals that women throughout the world are more at risk of experiencing violence in intimate relationships than in any other setting.¹ Statistics paint a vivid picture of the impact of continued gender-based violence against women. For example:

- One in four women experience domestic violence in their lifetime.²
- Forty percent of girls aged 14 to 17 report knowing someone their age who has been hit or beaten by a boyfriend.³
- The Gender Public Advocacy Coalition documented 70 cases of young people who were violently murdered simply because they did not fit into the traditional ideal for masculinity or femininity.⁴
- As many as 83 percent of women and girls with developmental disabilities are the victims of sexual assault.⁵
- One in three women around the world will be raped, beaten, coerced into sex or otherwise abused in her lifetime.⁶

In 1995, attendees of the United Nations World Conference on Women unanimously declared that violence is one of the most critical areas requiring attention. Now, 15 years later, gender-based violence continues to be a top priority.

While these statistics may no longer seem shocking, they underscore how deeply embedded gender-based violence is globally. To take the current temperature of work being done in the area of gender-based violence in the U.S., the Ms. Foundation embarked on a research project with a focused inquiry on how the foundation community addresses this issue.

The philanthropic sector prides itself on championing society's most difficult problems and advancing the common good. With gender-based violence so deeply embedded into our social fabric, what is philanthropy's response? In the U.S. alone, foundations awarded more than \$45.6 billion dollars in grants in 2008. Where are all these dollars going?

The data-gathering project that is the subject of this report focused on a 15 year period—beginning with the passage of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994—to understand the scope, focus and impact of foundation giving addressing gender-based violence. Two on-line surveys, one to practitioners in the field of gender-based violence and one to foundations, were distributed to collect information on funding trends and gaps as well as potential opportunities that could have a significant impact on this issue. In addition, four diverse foundations were interviewed to paint a more in-depth picture of the varied approaches funders are taking to address gender-based violence (see Appendix A for interview summaries).

This is a beginning inquiry. As such, it is not meant to be comprehensive in its scope or analysis, but rather to establish a baseline for developing knowledge and

information to enable us to understand the philanthropic sector's response to gender-based violence.

A Bit of History

On September 14, 1994, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was signed into law, marking a watershed in the history of the women's anti-violence movement. It was the first law to create a comprehensive response to the problem of gender-based violence at the national level. And it was a monumental achievement on the part of advocates who had worked to keep women safe through grassroots activism, raising awareness, and by establishing a safety net of shelters, crisis programs, counseling and other core supports for women facing violence in their lives.

VAWA dramatically changed the trajectory of the movement, enacting policy changes while also funneling federal funding to state and local government programs that helped sustain and grow anti-violence programs in every state. That funding transformed what was a scattered presence of shelters and programs into a more cohesive safety net for women throughout the country. While the largest proportion of these funds supported law enforcement agencies and crime prevention efforts, VAWA also offered more stable funding for a burgeoning network of services and advocacy efforts.

The impact was significant. Since 1994, the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by 64 percent and the number of women killed by an intimate partner has decreased by 24 percent and 48 percent for men. In its first six years alone, VAWA saved nearly \$14.8 billion in net-averted social costs.⁷ But there is still so much more to be done.

With funding now coming almost exclusively from government, the anti-violence sector is extremely vulnerable to budget cuts and has few avenues for critiquing systemic failures. In this 15th anniversary year of VAWA, an economic crisis has provoked draconian cuts to state and local funding in the area

of violence against women. Foundation support is more critical than ever. We hope this report is useful in providing baseline information and in sparking an effort among grantmakers to work more collaboratively to address these issues.

Defining Gender-Based Violence

Article 1 of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women adopted in 1993 provides a context for defining gender-based violence in its definition of violence against women: "Any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life."⁸

The Ms. Foundation recognizes the broad spectrum of anti-violence work and, in this report, defines gender-based violence as including, but not limited to: child sexual assault; sexual assault; domestic violence; violence against the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer community; female trafficking; stalking; and sexual harassment.

About the Ms. Foundation for Women

The Ms. Foundation for Women, a social justice foundation, delivers strategic grants, capacity building and leadership development to over 150 grassroots and national advocacy organizations throughout the United States. Its support enables groups to create connections across issues, constituencies and policymaking levels to strengthen social movements and ignite change on behalf of women, families and communities. Since 1973, the Foundation has granted more than \$50 million to organizations in rural and urban areas nationwide.

The Ms. Foundation has a long history of supporting anti-violence work including early funding of domestic violence shelters and rape-crisis hotlines, support for men engaged in anti-violence work and groundbreaking work on advancing a community-based, social justice approach to preventing child sexual abuse.

Gender-Based Violence Funding


1994 - 2008

On this 15th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), it is fitting and important to review the progress foundations have made in their support of gender-based violence.

One measure of the significance of gender-based violence funding in the field of philanthropy is the number of foundations supporting the issue. In 1994,

the Foundation Center collected data from 1,029 foundations for reporting purposes. Of those, 199 foundations (19 percent) were identified as gender-based violence funders. By 2008, the Center identified 484 foundations out of 1,490 total funders tracked (32 percent) as supporters of gender-based violence programs—a 143 percent increase in the number of foundations funding gender-based violence.

CHART 1: Growth in Gender-Based Violence Funding Between 1994 and 2008




It is interesting to note that one-third (33) of the top 100 foundations that funded gender-based violence in 1994 still supported the issue in 2008.

Another telling measure is the total dollar amount of grants awarded to organizations that address gender-based violence. In 1994, \$16,430,223 was granted to gender-based violence organizations and programs; adjusted for inflation, this represents \$23,869,610 in 2008. In 2008, the total funding had increased to \$80,333,827—nearly three and a half times the amount of funding in 1994. The number of

grants awarded also increased significantly from 417 in 1994 to 1,451 in 2008.

It is important to note that the Foundation Center's data only includes grants of \$10,000 or more awarded to organizations by private and community foundations. For community foundations, only discretionary and donor-advised grants are included.

CHART 2: Amount of Gender-Based Violence Funding 1994 and 2008



However, when viewed as a percentage of foundation giving as a whole, gender-based violence funding increased only slightly—from 1.5 percent of total giving in 1994 to 1.8 percent in 2008.⁹

In addition to the amount of funding, it is revealing to consider who is supporting the issue. Forty of the top 100 largest foundations (by asset size) funded gender-based violence programs or organizations in 2008. While this is impressive, it is even more striking that seven out of the top ten grantmakers support gender-based violence programs. This degree of support from the largest grantmakers in the United States can be seen as a springboard for engaging the philanthropic leadership to advocate for additional funding from their colleagues throughout the country.

Foundation Survey Results

To assist the Ms. Foundation for Women in analyzing the response of the philanthropic sector to gender-based violence, online survey respondents were asked a series of questions about the extent of their gender-based violence funding and how it fit into their overall grantmaking patterns and priorities. They were also asked to estimate what percentage of their funding focused on:

- Specific issue areas (such as sexual assault and domestic violence);
- Particular strategies for achieving results (like prevention, criminal justice and intervention); and
- Explicit lenses through which their grantees approach gender-based violence (feminist, social service or human rights, for example).

Extent of Gender-Based Violence Funding

Sixty-nine (69) foundations reported awarding 1,042 grants totaling \$67,344,220 to gender-based violence issues in fiscal year 2008. Unlike the Foundation Center data detailed in the previous section, which included grants of \$10,000 and above, the Ms. Foundation survey asked respondents to include all grants of any amount supporting gender-based violence issues. To ascertain recent trends in the amount of funding in the field, funders were asked to report their gender-based violence grants

from 2006 through 2008. As seen in Chart 3 below, giving to gender-based violence more than tripled between 2006 and 2008.

Independent foundations contributed by far the largest increase, followed by corporate funders, public foundations, women’s foundations and family foundations. Funding from the three community foundations and two unspecified foundations responding to the survey decreased (see Chart 4).

CHART 3: Foundation Funding for Gender-Based Violence for 2006 -2008




CHART 4: Dollar Amount of Gender-Based Violence Funding By Fiscal Year and Foundation Type

FOUNDATION TYPE	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF GRANTS		
	2006	2007	2008
Community Foundations (3)	\$ 144,000	\$ 177,500	\$ 129,500
Corporate Foundations (3)	7,353,000	7,487,000	9,900,000
Family Foundations (9)	3,185,292	3,449,847	3,349,106
Independent Foundations (11)	4,884,662	39,290,600	45,684,781*
Public Foundations (8)	1,649,000	1,237,739	3,620,641
Women's Funds (33)	3,507,702	4,697,306	4,216,792
Unspecified Foundations (2)	550,000	363,000	443,400

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the number of foundations responding.

* One independent foundation increased its gender-based violence funding from \$1.6 million in 2006 to \$40 million in 2008, contributing significantly to the increase in funding by private foundations.

While independent foundations awarded the largest amount of funding, on average they awarded the fewest number of grants (eight per foundation). This is typically true of independent foundations, since they tend to award larger grants than other

foundations. The three corporate foundation respondents gave the largest number of grants, with an average of 92 grants per funder—nearly four times more grants per funder than any other foundation type.


CHART 5: Number of Gender-Based Violence Grants By Foundation Type in 2008

FOUNDATION TYPES	NUMBER OF GRANTS BY FOUNDATION TYPE	AVERAGE NUMBER OF GRANTS BY FOUNDATION TYPE
Community Foundations (3)	27	9
Corporate Foundations (3)	277	92
Family Foundations (9)	118	13
Independent Foundations (11)	87	8
Public Foundations (8)	137	17
Women's Funds (33)	343	10
Unspecified Foundations (2)	53	27

When asked if their gender-based violence funding would increase, decrease or remain the same in 2009, 65 percent of the respondents stated they would either maintain or increase their giving in this area. Of those reporting an increase, 84 percent were women’s foundations.

Respondents were asked how many years they had funded gender-based violence issues. The community foundations responding to this question have supported gender-based violence programs an average of 19 years—longer than the other foundation types. The average length of support for independent, corporate, family and women’s foundations cluster between 12 and 15 years, while public foundations averaged the fewest years of support—nine.

CHART 6: Projected Funding for Gender-Based Violence in 2009 Compared to 2008




How Gender-Based Violence Funding Fits into Overall Funding Patterns and Priorities

Nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of the respondents reported that grants for gender-based violence represented less than 25 percent of their overall grantmaking in 2008, while only three percent of respondents awarded 75-100 percent of their grants to gender-based violence issues.

It is notable that gender-based violence funding represented a larger proportion of overall funding for family foundations and women’s funds than for other types of grantmakers responding to the survey, while independent and public foundations devoted a significantly smaller percentage of their overall funding to this issue.


CHART 7: Percentage of Overall Grantmaking Related to Gender-Based Violence



Inclusion in Mission Statement

Funders were also asked how gender-based violence fits within the mission of their organization. Twenty-eight percent (19) said it is a priority area in their mission statements. However, inclusion in mission does not necessarily translate into increased funding of gender-based violence issues, since over one-third (37 percent) of the foundations with gender-based violence in their mission awarded less than 25 percent of their 2008 grants to this issue, and nearly two-thirds (63 percent) of those said less than half of their funding was awarded in this area.

CHART 8: Geographic Scope of Gender-Based Violence Grantmaking



Geographic Scope and Population Served

The majority of foundations surveyed fund in their local communities; nearly one-fifth fund state-wide or nationally and over 15 percent fund internationally.

Respondents were asked which populations their organization explicitly prioritizes through targeted grantmaking. The chart below thus covers the grantmakers' entire portfolios, not just their

gender-based violence funding. Seventy percent of the foundations surveyed funded organizations targeting low-income women. Nearly 82 percent of the women's funds targeted this group, a much higher percentage than for other foundation types. Programs targeting girls received nearly 60 percent of the responses. On the lower end, programs targeting men and older people received the least amount of funder support.¹⁰

CHART 9: Populations Targeted By Gender-Based Violence Funders




CHART 10: Project Support

Type and Duration of Support

In keeping with overall national grantmaking trends, survey respondents favored project-based grants over general operating support. Approximately 70 percent of the respondents stated that over 50 percent of the gender-based violence grants they awarded supported specific projects.





CHART 11: General Operating Support



Gender-Based Violence Issues Supported

Respondents were asked what percentage of their dollars went to organizations focused on specific violence issues. Domestic violence received the highest proportion of funding, with 60 percent of the respondents awarding at least 50 percent of their gender-based violence grant dollars to this issue and nearly a third funding *only* domestic violence. All three corporate funders and about one-third of the family, public and women’s foundations exclusively funded domestic violence in 2008. Trafficking and violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer people received the least amount of support from all foundation types, followed by child sexual assault.¹¹

Gender-Based Violence Strategies

In response to a question about the primary strategies employed by their grantee organizations, most of the respondents said that they funded a higher percentage of programs employing


intervention and direct services than other strategies listed; nearly 40 percent committed at least half of their gender-based violence grant dollars to these strategies. Prevention received 50 percent or more of the gender-based violence funding from nearly 30 percent of the foundations responding, and tied with intervention for the highest amount of support from 17 percent of the funders. Healthcare and criminal-justice strategies received the least amount of funding. Women’s foundations provided significantly more funding for prevention than any other foundation type.¹²

Perspective

Respondents were provided with a list of perspectives or approaches to gender-based violence—faith-based, feminist, human rights, social justice, social service and “other.” They were then asked to choose up to two approaches prioritized by their foundations and employed by their grantees. They reported that they fund grantees using social service approaches in much higher numbers than other approaches, with close to two-thirds selecting this grantee perspective. Grantees with a social justice perspective received the second highest amount of funding, while faith-based grantees received by far the least amount of foundation support.

The community (3) and corporate foundation respondents (3) *only* funded grantees that took a social service or feminist approach. Family and independent foundations funded grantees across all approaches except faith-based, with the highest percentage of funding going to social service grantees. Public foundations awarded the most funding to social justice and human rights approaches, while women’s foundations gave the most funding to grantees adopting a social services lens, followed closely by organizations with a social justice perspective.¹³

CHART 12: Primary Approach of Grantees By Foundation Type



The Importance of Non-Funding Activities by Foundations

Foundations provide vital services to their grantees and communities that go far beyond making grants. Grantmakers responding to the funder survey listed a broad range of “in-kind” support including:

- Organizing convenings;
- Referring applicants/grantees to other funding sources;
- Capacity-building workshops/trainings and facilitation of technical assistance;
- Advocacy with community and policy leaders;
- Material development and distribution; and
- Dissemination of research and best practices.

Late in 2009, Verizon did a Safety Net PSA, which directed the public to our website where we have a classroom-style internet training on how to use technology to cope with domestic violence: how to use GPS, caller ID, what to do on the internet. That program trains not just shelter staff, law enforcement personnel, judges and others in the domestic violence community, but also our employees and the general public because it's on our website.

~ Verizon Foundation

Going Beyond the Numbers

In addition to the funder survey, four in-depth interviews representing different types of foundations were conducted to provide a deeper look into gender-based violence funding, a separate survey was sent to practitioners for an on-the-ground perspective. Twenty-seven practitioners responded, ranging from state-wide domestic violence and sexual assault coalitions to national, regional, state and local non-profit organizations. Excerpts from these interviews and information from the practitioner surveys are interspersed in this next section of the report.

Taken together, the practitioner survey and grantmaker interviews provide rich qualitative data that enhances the quantitative results from the funder survey. The practitioner survey included a number of questions that allowed respondents to identify foundation funding gaps, as well as issues they want foundations to be aware of.

FUNDING GAPS

An overwhelming majority of practitioner organizations have budgets that are almost exclusively government funded, despite many efforts to secure more significant foundation funding and other sources of funds. Practitioners try to address root causes and systemic changes through the limited non-governmental funds they secure, but find it difficult to piece together enough support for more comprehensive strategies.

Although no formal question about the economy was included in the survey, a number of respondents noted that the economic downturn has created a rise in gender-based violence while simultaneously imperiling domestic violence and sexual assault services through funding cuts.

A survivor cannot truly transition without economic resources. Government funding has almost disappeared in many areas. We are doing our best to fill that gap.

~Arizona Foundation for Women

Provider groups identified a number of areas in which they had difficulty raising funds and seven areas emerged as the most troublesome. Listed in priority order, these are:

- Operating costs/flexible funding
- Prevention
- Funding serving marginalized populations
- Sexual assault (as differentiated from domestic violence) services
- Policy work
- Advocacy and social change
- Training

The following funding gaps were noted by practitioner respondents and further supplemented by foundation representatives who participated in in-depth interviews:

OPERATING COSTS, FLEXIBLE FUNDING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

The need for more funding directed towards operating costs is generic to foundation grantmaking. This funding gap was listed by more respondents (10) than any other and aligns with the funder survey, which reported significantly more funding to specific projects than to general operating. Despite this trend, some funders are increasing their general operations and capacity-building funding.

General operating funds are the most useful and most needed. That way the experts in whatever field uses those funds in the way that's best and hopefully that ameliorates some of those gaps. But the gaps are caused by too much need and too little money.

~Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta

We often provide capacity-building grants because we want organizations to be strong and thrive over the long term.

~NoVo Foundation

PREVENTION

One-third of the practitioners listed prevention as a funding gap, and others discussed aspects of prevention as issues they wanted foundations to be aware of. Interestingly, the quantitative data in both the practitioner and funder surveys indicate that a significant amount of funding *is* going to prevention activities. Practitioners reported that they received more foundation funding for prevention than for any other area (\$4.26 million) and the funders reported that prevention was second only to intervention/direct services in the funding they disbursed. While the practitioners' response was skewed by a \$2 million grant to one practitioner, even without that grant, prevention would have ranked in the middle of the priority funding areas.

It's not enough to respond to what has already occurred, we must work to educate our communities about sexual violence and take research-supported efforts to prevent it.

~Comment from practitioner survey

Answers to the open-ended survey questions shed some light on this issue. While some respondents had difficulties obtaining prevention funds in general, others reported that obtaining funding for prevention was particularly difficult in rural areas and for specific populations like women with disabilities. A number of other respondents noted that obtaining funding for prevention can compete with getting grants for services to primary survivors and that the type of prevention funding that could have the greatest

impact on the field—support for comprehensive prevention strategies tied to public policy development and implementation leading to social change—is something that “most funders seem reluctant to fund.”

The seeming contradiction between the practitioners' *perception* that they have difficulties obtaining foundation grants for prevention and the data from this survey indicating that prevention received more funding than most other areas could be an indication of the importance of prevention activities and the fact that—seen in its broadest context—it is a complex and far-reaching issue. Two practitioner comments make this point:

"Prevention" activities are those intended to prevent the first-time occurrence of sexual violence. So, we're not talking about rape risk reduction ... (but rather) ... work to change the social conditions that encourage and make sexual violence possible.

Preventing violence against women is social change. It is targeting attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, environments and policies that contribute to violence against women and promoting those that stop violence against women.

Another respondent pointed to a further difficulty with prevention funding by noting that, while prevention is “equally, if not more, important than direct services...it takes a lot longer to show results.”

I believe that the way in which we've developed our strategy to try and remain focused in domestic violence prevention is critical. You have to start at prevention when kids are young, because this is a learned behavior.

~Verizon Foundation

Practitioners were asked to list the activities their organization undertakes in the area of prevention. The survey produced a list of responses, topped by training, education and community awareness. Other activities included school and work-based programming, technical assistance, work with law enforcement agencies, policy work, systems-change work, media and marketing.

Some practitioners appeared to focus on prevention mainly as a service they deliver to clients (safety training, for example), communities (public awareness activities), schools (teen dating violence education) and workplaces (educational materials). Others, while noting the importance of those discrete activities, stressed the importance of combining them with advocacy, policy implementation and work to create systems change.

Some of the funders who participated in the interviews (see Appendix A for interview summaries) also expressed concern about the need for more prevention funding. One noted that prevention education should begin at an early age so that children learn appropriate behavior, and another echoed the practitioners' frustration that needs, or gaps, are "often set up against each other."

I would say that the biggest gaps are around prevention, especially around social norm changes that can make violence unacceptable. We need a deep cultural transformation. We need to move from an exploitative, dominating system in which women and girls are at the bottom to a system in which there's respect for all people, including women and girls.

~NoVo Foundation

FUNDING SERVING MARGINALIZED POPULATIONS

Obtaining foundation funding for marginalized communities emerged as the third most difficult area. Those groups specifically mentioned were women of color, Native Americans, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer people, and women with disabilities. Specific needs for those groups include:

- Support to help Native programs with general operations, navigating tribal government politics and building stronger regional inter-tribal networks, and
- Support for building coalitions and partnerships between gender-based violence organizations and disability organizations, since people with disabilities are a "high-risk population for sexual assault."

While no specific programmatic needs were mentioned for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer populations, one practitioner said: "Some potential funders don't understand the heightened risk of gender-based violence that transgender and gender queer populations face and have not been willing to support our work because we serve these populations in addition to women."

FUNDING FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS

A number of practitioners pointed out the increased difficulty of obtaining funding for sexual assault services, as differentiated from domestic violence programming. One organization that provides both domestic violence and sexual assault services said that its domestic violence programs received significantly more foundation funding and noted that foundations "seem to understand the dynamics (of domestic violence) better." Some expressed doubt that all funders understand the difference between sexual assault and domestic violence. One thought that domestic violence funding is more palatable to conservative funders because it can be seen as an issue within the family, whereas sexual assault is "the violence people do not want to talk about." Others pointed out the increased need for foundation funding for sexual assault by noting that state funding also tends to focus on domestic violence.

One aspect of sexual assault that is a growing concern is child sexual abuse. One funder cited it as an area that she recognized as extremely important but was nevertheless not able to fund because her foundation's gender-based violence resources were committed elsewhere. Another identified it as a new funding initiative.

We see the issue of child sexual abuse as one of the core issues of violence and exploitation. There is so much evidence of the devastating impact it has on society but there is not a corresponding level of response and intervention. We also need to think about why this is happening in such numbers and how are we going to prevent it from happening in the first place. We can't only be cleaning up the mess.

~NoVo Foundation

POLICY WORK, ADVOCACY AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The practitioners who listed policy work, advocacy and social change as funding gaps expressed awareness of the difficulties inherent in supporting these issues. They noted that this type of work takes time to achieve results. Many referred to the perceived conflict between supporting victim services and systemic solutions—“Most funders want to fund...direct services and aren’t particularly interested in funding policy work...”—while also noting that primary prevention and services to primary survivors “can’t happen without a strong public policy and practice piece which most funders seem reluctant to fund.”

This perceived conflict is found in many areas of funding, where advocating for institutional change can get to the core of the issue but can also drain funding from essential direct services. Some respondents in the practitioner survey also noted that, in addition to funding for institutional advocacy focused on changing policies and practices, increased support is also needed for another type of advocacy which is actually a direct service—that is, well-trained victims’ advocates, especially for victims of sexual assault.

While a number of respondents cited the need for social-change funding in general terms, one respondent—from a state domestic violence coalition—painted a detailed portrait of the kind of organization s/he believed to be most capable of achieving social change:

The most cutting-edge and sustainable approaches can often be found among social-change-oriented programs in communities of color, queer and immigrant/refugee communities - which usually don’t operate a shelter or a 24/7 crisis line and thus have more breathing room and reflective thinking to look at long-term social change. Foundation investments in new initiatives should be carefully considered to account for local programs’ capacity to carry out non-crisis services. We have seen mainstream, well-managed, well-funded domestic violence programs attempt to take on social change and fail miserably. Something is missing in terms of

moving from the shelter services model to long-term community engagement, and the missing link is probably structural (social services vs. social change).

Although some of the practitioners’ comments indicated that it might be difficult to find partners in the private funding world to assist with advocacy, policy work and systems change, the grantmakers who participated in the in-depth interviews *did* recognize the importance of these approaches. Not only did they fund in these areas, but three of the four foundations interviewed engaged in advocacy work themselves.

We have a very robust advocacy arm. In addition to advocating at the state level to maintain or, in better times, grow funding that supports vulnerable women and their families, we also work pretty aggressively on the legislative side arguing for and getting statutes enacted that enhance penalties for domestic violence offenders. A lot of 501(c)(3)s think that they are not allowed to talk to policy makers but that’s not true. You can speak truth to power and we think that’s a great investment.

~Arizona Foundation for Women

TRAINING

Two of the four respondents who cited training as a funding gap identified training for victim advocates as a specific need. One highlighted an increased need for sample materials and training modules in rural areas so that “isolated advocates can have the same training opportunities as those in urban areas.” National and state organizations that provide training for local nonprofits noted that declining state and national funding is putting training for local organizations in danger.

OTHER GAPS

The funding gaps listed above were all cited by four or more practitioners. Others were noted by fewer respondents but still emerged as significant issues when the practitioner survey is considered along with the funder survey and interviews.

One of these issues is the importance of *funding programs that involve men* in domestic violence and sexual assault work. These programs work with men to make them part of the solution and hold them accountable for the violence they commit.

One practitioner noted that this involvement is needed “in order to solve the problem at the deepest levels of society.” Two of the funders who were interviewed for this study did support men’s groups, but they also agreed with the participants that more funding in support of involving men in gender-based violence issues is needed to, in the words of the NoVo Foundation representative, “change the dynamics that make it acceptable for men to use violence and not speak against male violence when they see it.”

We have an auxiliary group, the Men’s Anti-Violence Network (MAN), which has as its mission public education and public policy—strictly focused on abuser accountability and justice for victims. They lobby on our behalf in the capital, speak out on law and order issues, and have relationships with law enforcement and prosecution offices.

~ Arizona Foundation for Women

The *special challenges of working in rural areas* include difficulties in providing services to far-flung and isolated areas and the conservative nature of many such areas, which makes public awareness of sexual assault particularly difficult. *Faith-based organizations* also reported having particular challenges, the primary one being their perception that “funders are suspicious” of them.

The need for *research* to document both needs and potential solutions, for *public education* and for *community outreach* were also brought up as gap areas.

People find [sexual violence] uncomfortable. Every year that we have funded this issue, we have hosted an annual summit where we bring together national partners and local partners...to bring more awareness and credibility to this issue.

~ Verizon Foundation

Other gaps listed by both the practitioners and the funders who were interviewed were *transitional living and affordable housing, legal assistance, especially in the family law system, and economic security* for women who have survived gender-based violence.

Recommendations

Foundations play a critical role in addressing and preventing gender-based violence as a core component of any social change effort. With government support dwindling, the stakes are higher than ever and foundations need to step in to address urgent needs. The following recommendations, drawn from the funder and practitioner surveys and interviews, offer areas for expanded engagement from the philanthropic community:

Include Systems Change, Policy and Advocacy Along with Direct Services Funding

While it is critical to support the immediate needs of those impacted by gender-based violence, it is equally important to address the underlying causes of violence through transforming systems and social conditions. This is an essential corollary to government funding of direct services and where foundation funding is most needed.

Increase Support for Violence Prevention

Prevention practice includes a diverse range of activities, but the common aim should be to prevent the first-time occurrence of gender-based violence. While risk reduction is important, the focus should be to change the social conditions that make gender-based violence possible.

Create Connections Across the Full Spectrum of Gender-Based Violence Issues

While there is a need to deepen expertise and practice to address specific areas of violence, a corresponding tendency to view various types of violence as separate and distinct creates a hierarchy and competition for scarce resources. The lion's share of funds traditionally supports efforts addressing domestic violence. Although sexual and domestic violence overlap and are connected in many ways, sexual abuse is often overlooked and under-resourced.

This impinges on the field's ability to recognize the connection and interplay between the various forms of violence. For example, women with a childhood history of sexual abuse are 4.7 times more likely to be subsequently raped.¹⁴ While it may be necessary for individual funders to choose one form of violence over the other to create a more focused grantmaking strategy, funders can look for ways to integrate approaches addressing all types of gender-based violence into their grantmaking. Connecting the dots is a good strategy for helping the field of gender-based funding to coalesce.

Create Connections Between Gender-Based Violence and Other Major Issues Addressed by Philanthropy

Most funders responding to this survey do not have missions that explicitly focus on gender-based violence, yet they support critical work in this area. Some grantmakers understand gender-based violence as a core issue underlying all other program areas. For example, one survey respondent concerned about health care, supports an initiative to change the cultural acceptance of violence against women and children by bringing the voices of men to the table, and working on primary prevention efforts aimed at children from birth to 3 years of age. Other initiatives bring the voices of domestic violence survivors into the anti-poverty movement, affordable housing efforts and early childhood education. These kinds of efforts highlight the importance of working more holistically to address the interwoven issues affecting society that defy single-focused solutions.

Bring the Margins to the Center

Placing the most marginalized communities at the center of our efforts builds stronger, more inclusive policy solutions that have the potential to yield long-term social change. Practitioner respondents

expressed the need to bring the voices of communities of color, Native people and Indian nations, people in poverty, people with disabilities, immigrant communities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer communities from the margins into the center. Deeper expertise and engagement come from within these communities, especially in dealing with most sensitive issues of gender-based violence. Foundations can play an important role by continuing to challenge the philanthropic field to be accountable and by opening dialogue between state coalitions, national groups and other practitioners.

Support Men's Efforts to End Gender-Based Violence

It is clear that violence in all its forms will never end without men engaging in both the examination of connections between masculinity and violence and coordinating with women to end gender-based violence. Over the past decade, a number of men's organizations and projects addressing gender-based violence have been created. The best of these work closely with women's organizations or are projects housed in organizations that are run by and work directly with women. Efforts by men tend to be newer initiatives, and it is important to ensure that philanthropic support for men's efforts is sensitively and appropriately balanced with support for work led by women.

Invest in Rural Outreach

While gender-based violence programs have proliferated in more populated urban areas, few programs extend into the harder-to-reach rural areas. Direct foundation support or investment in enhanced communication technologies is especially needed in rural communities.

Consider Faith-Based Strategies

This is the area that received the least amount of support by survey respondents. However, there is great potential for funder support and practitioner outreach to train faith-based leaders and organizations to respond effectively to gender-based violence.

Provide General Operating Support and Multi-Year Grants, Especially During Times of Financial Hardship

The economic crisis has disproportionately affected those with the fewest resources. In such times, appeals to support hotlines, shelters and counseling increase significantly. The economic situation is also impacting domestic violence programs and shelters nationwide; many are closing or are in imminent danger of doing so due to severe cutbacks in government and other funding. The most basic services that comprise the safety net for women are dissipating.

Practitioners find it increasingly difficult to sustain or grow their organizations effectively when the majority of support they receive from foundations is short-term and project-specific. Multi-year general operating grants produce stronger organizations with greater capacity to support short-term direct services and affect long-term social change. Healthy non-profits need flexible funding sources to carry out their missions, especially in times like these. Funding that prioritizes "new" initiatives or projects puts existing initiatives and even core services at risk.

Don't Underestimate the Effectiveness of Non-Grantmaking Activities

Foundations can engage in a host of activities beyond awarding grants. Some of the more common activities include:

- Organizing convenings of funders, of grantees, of funders and grantees, etc.;
- Referring applicants/grantees to other funding sources;
- Capacity building workshops/trainings and facilitation of technical assistance;
- Advocacy with community and policy leaders;
- Material development and distribution;
- Initiating media/communications campaigns; and
- Dissemination of research and best practices.

Be Kind with In-Kind

In-kind services from foundations can be especially important when grant budgets are shrinking. Corporate funders often donate products, as with the Verizon program to donate cell phones to shelters. Many foundations organize volunteer days for their employees to volunteer for a day (or more) at local non-profit organizations, and others participate in fundraising events or donate furniture or equipment.

Consider How to Use Your “Bully Pulpit” More Effectively

Seven of the largest ten foundations in the United States support efforts to address and prevent gender-based violence. One-third of the top 100 foundations by asset size funded gender-based violence in 1994 and continue to support anti-violence work in 2008. This powerful and diverse group of funders could individually and collaboratively promote increased awareness of the scope and impact of gender-based violence and actively encourage their colleagues to support these issues.

Build a Gender-Based Violence Funder Community

Foundation respondents expressed strong interest in receiving the results of the study and were eager to learn more about their colleagues working in this area. While it may not be the right time to form an affinity group on this topic, many funders expressed interest in an informal forum to share experiences, engage in dialogue and gain further knowledge on a broad range of gender-based violence issues. Regular teleconferences or occasional local, regional or national gatherings would provide an opportunity for this exchange.

The field of gender-based violence is quite broad, comprising a number of disparate areas of work from child sexual abuse, to violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer people and people with disabilities, to trafficking, sexual assault and violence against women. A number of funders have supported this work for decades and have a good understanding of the issues and the practitioners engaged in the work. Others are relatively new to the issues; and still other funders are committed supporters but lack a certain depth of knowledge because it is not a primary focus of their foundation. Providing opportunities to expand knowledge of both the range of issues and the capabilities of the nonprofit organizations to effectively address these issues is critical to advancing the field.

Appendix A

Foundation Interview

ARIZONA FOUNDATION FOR WOMEN

JODI LIGGETT, Director of Research and Public Policy

What motivated your foundation to begin funding domestic violence?

The founders saw that domestic violence funding didn't really exist. No one was taking a comprehensive view. So it became pretty much the founding purpose of the Foundation—both specifically and as part of the lack of resources for women's issues. We have expanded the mission, but domestic violence remains fundamental.

What other issue areas do you fund?

Economic self-sufficiency and access to healthcare, but we are going to drop out of healthcare because it's become a national issue and there are other partners in our community that can take the lead. We are going to focus on safety, domestic violence in particular and economic self-sufficiency as it relates to that. A domestic violence survivor cannot truly transition without economic resources. This re-orienting is in response to a severe state budget crisis. Government funding has almost disappeared in many areas. We're doing our best to fill that gap. We are a small foundation, and we've been very cognizant of our scale. Because of that we focus on best practices and innovations. If somebody has an idea that nobody else will fund because it has never been done before and our research tells us that it's consistent with the current thinking or an innovation, then that's what we're interested in funding. For example, we funded Jewish Family Services' shelter without walls, which surrounds a woman with the resources she needs to get out and immediately move into her own housing while also having supportive services available, as an alternative to the traditional, more expensive domestic violence shelter.

What other ways has the recession impacted your domestic violence grantees and grantmaking?

Arizona has the worst or second-worst revenue shortfall in the country. It's not just funding for domestic violence shelters but, rather, the entire safety net that is being dismantled—we have one of the highest foreclosure rates, highest spikes in unemployment, highest rate of discouraged workers. We have a \$3 billion shortfall on top of already catastrophic cuts to human services across the board. At the same time, unlike previous recessions, giving is also down for us and other funders. Our grantees have also had to, radically in some cases, scale back what they are able to do. Most get some kind of government funding, particularly for shelters or other transitional living programs. We've kind of been their lobbyist on a couple occasions; if they felt that they were getting unfair contract reductions, we've been able to do some advocacy and shore up their resources.

Could you say more about the Foundation's advocacy work?

We have a very robust advocacy arm. In addition to advocating at the state level to maintain or, in better times, grow funding that supports vulnerable women and their families, we also work pretty aggressively on the legislative side arguing for and getting statutes enacted that enhance penalties for domestic violence offenders. We believe firmly that government has a role to play especially when you're talking about physical safety and basic survival, and we expect them to do their part. With part of the money we raise, we lobby. A lot of 501(c)(3)s think that they are not allowed to talk to policymakers but that's not true. You *can* speak truth to power, and we think that's a great investment. We often work with community partners, and often we are the lead. We have an auxiliary group, the Men's Anti-Violence Network (MAN), which is about 10-years old

and is made up of 50 or so very high profile business leaders—including the CEO of the Arizona Diamondbacks and a key executive from almost every major corporation. MAN—which is one of our programs and does not have independent organizational status—has as its mission public education and public policy, strictly focused on abuser accountability and justice for victims. They lobby on our behalf in the capital, speak out on law and order issues, and have relationships with law enforcement and prosecution offices. They also do public awareness and prevention work.

The idea of having men advocate on our behalf originally came about because our policymakers weren't listening to women. It's a completely different environment now; our work is now hand-in-hand. While MAN speaks out on the law-and-order side, the rest of our organization works on the safety net.

Can you say a little more about the research that the Foundation conducts?

Every few years we publish a Status of Women Report, usually with the help of the Institute for Women's Policy Research. They provide state ranking and data on the economic status of women: educational attainment, access to health insurance coverage and poverty rates. We supplement that with additional social justice data, including numbers of women incarcerated, teen pregnancy, and incidence of domestic violence. It provides an "apples to apples" comparison and annual data, so we can say with authority that things are getting better, worse, etc. We do tons of policy briefs and "quick-hit, debunking" kind of research. We also do quicker, ad hoc stuff, especially in the last two sessions, helping policymakers understand the impact of cuts, particularly on women. We've been documenting the human toll as a result of the loss of domestic violence beds and access to legal services.

What do you see as gaps in funding? What kind of funding is most useful or needed?

It's very frustrating to be in this situation because it's so much about trying to keep what you have. We're turning away more than half of all women seeking *shelter* every night. We think we've got to take care of that first, to make sure that everyone is physically safe—so everyone

who needs to leave can leave. They also need *transitional living*. A very close second, even co-equal, need is *legal assistance, especially help in the family law system*. That's where all of their plans to escape and achieve independence really just collapse. Their abuser is able to use the legal system and child custody to maintain access, power and control. There's also a whole *public awareness* piece that needs attention. And then, there are women's needs more generally: there were *economic security gaps* to begin with, but those gaps have widened considerably over the last two years. The last critical need is *affordable housing*. All of these are of special concern to vulnerable women—you can't escape home violence if you don't have the economic means to do so. (*Emphasis ours*)

How can we engage other funders in this work?

Because of the severity of our economic situation, we have become the lead organization in the back-to-basics movement here. For instance, we challenged our local United Way to target its funding on people in crisis and on folks in the greatest need. They responded extremely well. Huge groups like the United Way and AARP got on board and mobilized their constituencies in shelter issues, walk for safety and some legislative issues. This collaboration was an outgrowth of our effort to embed ourselves in the larger community and to position ourselves as a thought-and opinion-leader. We joined several coalitions, many of which are comprised of providers and frontline organizations that provide service but don't have our ability to talk to people in both parties and to craft messages. This coalition work is on the merits, but it's also about establishing personal relationships. If you've done your time and proven yourself useful in any number of ways, then you can challenge a big group when the time comes. For example, we've challenged United Way, saying that "you need to tell your board, 'We have to focus on basic needs this year.' The Boy Scouts are important, but what about a campaign for working poor?" And I really think that we've been instrumental in redefining violence against women in Arizona, as not just a "social issue," but as a crime. If you believe in justice for victims of crime, you ought to be fully funding our shelter system, because these women *are* crime victims.

**COMMUNITY FOUNDATION FOR
GREATER ATLANTA**

KATHY PALUMBO, Director of Community Partnerships

How does gender-based violence funding tie into your mission and grantmaking program?

Our issue is community. We're a community foundation. We used to have priority areas and priority populations. We don't any longer, as of about a year ago. We have a grantmaking program for the arts and for AIDS and the Common Good Funds. And all of those, at this point, are funding general operations. The Common Good Funds have no priority issue, no priority population. Our goal is to fund organizations that we believe are important and are in need of being sustained to increase the quality of life in our community. One of the lenses we would use to determine whether or not to fund an organization is to ask what partnerships they are engaged in. How does that expand their reach? How does that have an impact on systems that have an impact on their issue? So if an organization like the Partnership Against Domestic Violence applies to our Common Good Funds, we review their application and note the critical importance of the service they provide. What they do is partner with a broad range of other local organizations that deal with issues of domestic violence and sexual exploitation. They are part of a local cohort that provides direct services and lobbies around funding issues with the state. *That* influences how the courts function. So our little pot of money helps them and their partners, some of whom we also fund, with this systemic work. But we would not make a grant to an organization that just says, "We're a domestic violence organization and therefore..." That wouldn't be a priority of ours. Neither the service nor the population served is the lens. The partnerships and the systemic work are the lenses.

What was your previous framework?

We did have priority areas, and we probably made 80 - 120 small grants a year—around \$20,000 to \$25,000. This year we'll make about 40 grants (some are two year—previously they were all 12-month grants) and the average size will be about \$120,000. We really bumped up the monetary value and the duration of our grants.

Can you talk about your funding around gender-based violence over the past 30 years?

One of our priority areas for a long time was simply women, children and families—not just families. Obviously, sexual exploitation and domestic violence were part and parcel of that priority area.

What are a few examples of your gender-based violence grants in the past year or two?

We funded Men Against Violence and a couple domestic violence shelter programs. We also give grants to two organizations that focus on sexual exploitation of young girls. We provide grants to Atlanta Legal Aid and the Atlanta Volunteer Lawyers Foundation, which all have specific domestic violence programming. You can look at this funding in two different ways. You can specifically fund services focused on domestic violence, and that's really important. Or you can fund organizations for which domestic violence is part and parcel of what they see in the life cycle of human beings and which have programs to respond to that in one manner or another. By doing the latter, our reach is broader, if not deeper. Other grants that fall into the latter category are those to Families First and Jewish Family and Career Services. Both provide a real breadth of services to individuals and families, and both have domestic violence programming and education for adults and young people as part of their services.

Does the Foundation engage in any gender-based violence activities other than funding?

Our convenings and research generally are around helping local non-profits build their capabilities. It's capacity building. This year, for instance, we had a convening and offered a grant to a group of seven girls-serving organizations that were all having difficulties raising funds. Every single one of them has a piece in their programs that teaches young girls about the issue of domestic violence—what it is, how to avoid it, etc. Their programming is focused on young women's self-esteem. They were all facing the dilemma of not being able to raise money and having to cut back on staff and programming. One way we offered assistance was to join with the Women's Fund and Junior League to provide them with money for a consultant to help them decide on a combined project to build their capacity.

They looked at what they might want to do collectively, and one thing they decided to do was a combined marketing campaign. They have also received training on public policy advocacy, especially on county and state issues. All of our domestic violence shelters that receive state money have had severe cuts to their budgets. So part of their strategy will be to work with those organizations to see if they are going to restore those cuts.

How else has the recession impacted your gender-based violence grantees and grantmaking?

We are in the Southeast, and it is historically the poorest part of the country. We've never had the breadth and depth of services that you might find in New York City. And so it exasperates the issue.

I just made a list this morning of organizations that have closed locally. A good number of non-profits in our region have cut back their budgets or have had that imposed on them, and that has meant a reduction in program and services and therefore a reduction in staff. Some organizations have merged, and we're also noticing that there's more of a willingness to partner with other non-profit organizations. As a community foundation, we already have our money from the previous year. We didn't have to reduce our grants this year, and the grants from our donor advised funds actually increased this year.

How can we engage more grantmakers in gender-based violence funding?

Well, since we don't have an issue area, it would seem inappropriate for us to tell another foundation that they should have an issue area. There is a local family foundation, the Patilla Foundation, in town that has been asking all of the other foundations in town to include some questions in their applications and site visits around child sexual abuse and exploitation and a number of us have done that. Part of the reason for doing that is to collect that information, but the larger piece is to begin to have a community conversation. That's one of the ways we can engender that conversation.

What do you see as the funding gaps, and what kind of funding is most useful and needed?

General operating funds are the most useful and most needed. That way the experts in whatever field use those funds in the way that's best. And hopefully that ameliorates some of those gaps. But the gaps are caused by too much need and too little money. In our region there's probably very little discussion, or not enough discussion in public schools about gender-based violence. *(Emphasis ours)*

NoVo FOUNDATION

PAMELA SHIFMAN, Director
DAVINIA TROUGHTON, Assistant
Initiatives for Women and Girls

What was the motivation for the NoVo Foundation to begin funding around gender-based violence?

Our founders saw that the world was out of balance and that we were living in a world based on systems of domination and exploitation. They wanted to focus the resources of the foundation on transforming the world into one based on partnership and collaboration. One of the most striking examples of domination and exploitation is the situation of girls and women around the world, including the United States. They saw that violence against women and girls is a huge barrier to changing that system and creating the kind of world that we want to live in. Also, they were stunned by how little attention and how few resources were being spent in an area that has such a devastating impact on every culture and community in the world.

How does gender-based violence funding fit with the mission and grantmaking of the Foundation?

The overall mission of the NoVo Foundation is to seek a transformation in global society from a culture of domination and exploitation to one of collaboration and partnership, empowering girls and women as the primary agents of change. Within that, we have three initiatives that we are broadly focused on. One initiative focuses on social and emotional learning for children, which we see as completely linked to the issue of ending violence against women and girls. Violence is a learned behavior that boys are taught to embrace and girls are taught to accept; so it's thinking about how we can be creative in helping people relate to each other in ways other than those stemming from domination and in helping children work together. Another big area is empowering adolescent girls in developing countries—including addressing violence in the lives of girls and empowering them so they have voices and options. The third broad area is ending violence against women and girls globally, including in the United States.

Can you give us a few examples of grants that exemplify your grantmaking strategy?

One organization that we are really proud to work with is an organization based in India called Apne Aap, which is working to prevent sex trafficking and sexual exploitation of girls and women. It's based on a self-help model in which the most marginalized and discriminated against girls and women in red light areas work together to transform their own lives and the lives of their children. These are women and girls in the most desperate circumstances who are figuring out how to escape the sex industry and transform their lives. Apne Aap organizes survivor conferences throughout India so that women and girls can speak out about their lives and strategize together for better options. Apne Aap also organizes hearings for parliamentarians and other elected officials to allow policymakers to hear directly from survivors of prostitution and sex trafficking.

Another more local example is the Rebecca Project for Human Rights in Washington, D.C. We are funding a project that supports girls in juvenile detention facilities. So many of these girls end up in the juvenile justice system as a result of years and years of violence, abuse and exploitation. Then they are treated as criminals instead of victims. The Rebecca Project is doing fantastic work to bring these girls' voices to policymakers, including Congress. They do a lot of their work through art and writing. It is the linkage of personal transformation and social transformation that they do incredibly well. We are also supporting A Call to Men, a national organization that is based on feminist human rights principles that works with men to end violence against girls and women. These men, working closely together with women and girls, challenge the dynamics that make it acceptable for men to use violence and they encourage men to speak about violence toward women and girls when they see it.

A final exciting project I'd like to mention is our collaboration with the Ms. Foundation for Women on a multi-year project to build a stronger movement to end child sexual abuse in the United States. We see the issue of child sexual abuse as one of the core issues of violence and exploitation. There is so much evidence of the

devastating impact it has on society but there is not a corresponding level of response and intervention. We also need to think about why this is happening in such numbers and how are we going to prevent it from happening in the first place. We can't only be cleaning up the mess. We need to move upstream and prevent the abuse before it happens.

In addition to giving grants, does the NoVo Foundation engage in other activities related to gender-based violence?

Yes and we hope to do more. We are a fairly new foundation, and we see our role as being more than a grantmaker. We often provide capacity-building grants because we want organizations to be strong and thrive over the long term. We funded some research with Lake Research Partners in advance of the work we are doing with the Family Violence Prevention Fund and Women Thrive Worldwide to build a constituency of Americans who are committed to ending violence against women and girls globally. We try to be good partners with our grantees by providing the most helpful support we can—and focusing on the needs of the grantees, rather than the interests of the NoVo Foundation.

How do you engage with other funders in this work?

One of our biggest commitments is to engage other funders in this field. We feel very strongly about it. For example, we nominated Ruchira Gupta, the founder and executive director of Apne Aap, to receive the 2009 Clinton Global Citizen award so we could raise the profile of this extraordinary organization and encourage other donors to fund initiatives to end sex trafficking. We also work closely with the Nike Foundation on our investments for adolescent girls, and a major part of our work in this area is making the case with other donors that funding adolescent girls is the best way to combat poverty and to promote social change. It's a smaller component, but we also host fundraisers or "friend-raisers" at our office to introduce our grantees to others who may be interested in their work.

How can we engage more funders in gender-based violence funding?

Part of our strategy is to make the case that other funders don't have to change their funding priorities in order to integrate ending violence against women and girls into what they do. For example, we need to do a better job articulating to health funders that ending violence against women and girls is completely critical to promoting health. We can also do a better job at making the case for donors who are working on poverty that violence both causes and exacerbates poverty for girls and women.

What are the gaps in gender-based violence funding, and what kind of funding is most useful and needed?

Let me start by saying that there are gaps all around. There is not enough funding for *shelters, rape crisis centers, legal services, for medical and psychological support services for survivors to heal*. And there are huge gaps around *prevention, especially social norm change that makes violence unacceptable*. We need a deep cultural transformation. We need to move from an exploitative, dominating system in which women and girls are at the bottom to a system in which there's respect for all people. It's truly a fundamental shift that needs to happen. *(Emphasis ours)*

How has the recession impacted your gender-based violence grantees and grantmaking?

We've had to become more targeted and streamlined in our grantmaking. Many of our grantees have had to cut back, and I think our answer to that is being committed to doing this advocacy work with other foundations to ensure that there isn't such a small pool of funders supporting this issue.

VERIZON FOUNDATION

LUPITA REYES, National Program Director

What motivated the Verizon Foundation to begin domestic violence funding?

Verizon has been committed to supporting the issue of domestic violence prevention for more than a decade. Our commitment began with the Verizon Wireless HopeLine program (read below). Since then, the company's commitment to the issue has grown to be one of the key issues addressed by the Verizon Foundation and across the company.

Traditionally, domestic violence has been an issue many people have not talked about, saying it is a private matter, but in reality, domestic violence is an issue that impacts the whole of society, crossing all culturally and societal lines. It's also a business issue: 1) one in four women will be a victim of domestic violence in their lifetime, and 2) 20 percent of employed adults are victims of domestic violence. We have close to 230,000 employees, about half of which are women. So if you take 115,000 and take 20 percent of that, it's a pretty big number. We believe in providing a safe place for women and men, and we want our employees to be secure when they come to work.

Many of our senior leaders are supportive of the prevention of domestic violence. When our employees experience domestic violence, we offer access to free employee assistance programs and if necessary, relocate them and it's all kept confidential.

Is there any coordination between Verizon Wireless and the Verizon Foundation?

The Foundation is the philanthropic arm of Verizon. We award approximately \$67 million each year in grants to support nonprofit organizations throughout the country and around the world. The Verizon Foundation supports the philanthropic efforts of all our employees in every business unit. With Verizon Wireless, one connection is HopeLine, a program, where anyone can donate no-longer-needed cell phones to be refurbished or resold, to support domestic violence survivors. The proceeds are used to support domestic violence prevention shelters. In addition, some of the refurbished phones are donated to shelters with free minutes allotted to them.

How does domestic violence funding tie into the mission of Verizon Foundation and its grantmaking practices?

Domestic violence prevention, along with education, literacy and Internet safety, are the key social issues addressed by the Foundation, so the majority of the Foundation funding goes to nonprofits supporting those issues. It's all part of our mission to impact social change.

How do Verizon employees connect with the Verizon Foundation?

We have a "matching incentive program" that allows an employee to volunteer at a shelter or any nonprofit; if they volunteer for 50 hours or more, the Foundation donates \$750 to that nonprofit. Another way is less formal, but just as impactful. Annually, we sponsor corporate-wide employee giving campaigns and for three years now we've done "Shower for the Shelters," where we engage employees and work with the National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) to have them connect us with their domestic violence coalitions across the states. Our employees donate diapers, bottles, anything that would be useful in a shelter. Each year we collect between \$400,000 and \$500,000 worth of goods to deliver to shelters across the country.

Can you give a few examples of your domestic violence grants and explain how they fit your grantmaking strategy?

One example is our partnership with **National Family Justice Center Alliance** (NFJCA) which created the Family Justice Center Institute (FJCI), the technology training arm for NFJCA. FJCI funded through a three-year Foundation grant, stems from an initiative that began in 2003 when the Bush Administration authorized and funded the creation of 13 Family Justice Centers (FJC) across the United States. FJCI educates employees about core FJC principles and best practices, including hosting webinars for training and demonstrating efficient uses of a centralized FJC intake system. In October 2009, FJCI launched a one-year trial to test the use of an electronic safety deposit box through thumb drive technology. The trial will test security protocols for storing and retrieving confidential information of domestic violence survivors. The key benefit is the ability to store documents in a safe centralized place with the opportunity to retrieve quickly as necessary.

Another example is a partnership formed with NNEDV and its **Safety Net** program. Safety Net hosts annual trainings on the safe uses of technology. Safety Net trains shelter staff, law enforcement, judges, social workers, survivors, our employees and the general public. Late in 2009, Verizon issued a Safety Net PSA, which directed the public to our website where we have classroom-style internet training resources on how to use technology to help keep domestic violence survivors safe. Resources include how to use GPS, caller ID, and tips for what to do on the internet.

What are the funding gaps and what kind of funding is the most useful and needed?

I think a major gap exists because people find domestic violence uncomfortable to address. But I think we are getting better at explaining it and people are more receptive once they know and hear the statistics.

When you have opportunities to use celebrities that are supporting the prevention of domestic violence and college and universities that have established prevention programs—I think you begin to address that discomfort factor.

In terms of the most useful and necessary funding, I don't think there's any one answer. The most logical and reasonable answer is that you have to start with prevention when kids are young because domestic violence is a learned behavior. So *prevention at an early age* is a high priority for the Foundation. I've also seen a lot of good work done in *capacity building, especially involving use of technology*. I also think that *engaging the community at large and particularly men* is impactful.

Should there be more discussion among funders about domestic violence, and what would that look like?

Yes. We collaborate with some companies and corporate foundations: Allstate Foundation, Liz Claiborne, and Avon Foundation, for example. We have talked about working together; and we *should* do it, but we haven't done it yet. Having senior leaders come together from Macy's, FedEx and other corporations would be tremendously impactful.

Appendix B

Methodology

A four-pronged approach was taken to gain broader insights and present a richer picture of the level and nature of foundation funding and the needs and challenges faced by gender-based violence practitioners. The process was comprised of the following elements:

- An online survey of foundations
- An online survey of practitioners
- In-depth interviews with foundations
- A Foundation Center database search

A questionnaire was sent to a sample of 500 foundations across all foundation types including independent, family, community, corporate and public foundations. A large number of women's funds were among the sample. The foundations chosen to receive the questionnaire were identified through the Foundation Center's database and met the criteria of grantmakers who funded a range of gender-based violence issues including domestic violence, violence against women, sexual assault, child sexual assault and child abuse. Seventy-three (73) foundations responded to the survey during the period from late 2008 through early 2009.

In an effort to obtain a more detailed analysis of funding sources and fundraising challenges, an online practitioner's survey link was sent to domestic violence and sexual assault coalitions in each state. In addition, the survey was sent to a small sample of national and local organizations addressing gender-based violence issues, including several men's groups concerned with sexual violence prevention.

The information was collected from late 2008 through early 2009. Over 100 practitioners were contacted, 27 of whom submitted completed surveys.

In addition to the two surveys, in-depth interviews were conducted in late 2009 with four foundations representing a range of foundation types.

The following foundations participated in the interviews:

- Arizona Foundation for Women—a state-wide women's fund;
- Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta;
- NoVo Foundation—an independent foundation with a national grantmaking program; and
- Verizon Foundation—a corporate foundation with national scope.

One major purpose of the study was to compare gender-based funding in 2008, the year the survey was fielded, to gender-based violence funding in 1994, the year the Violence Against Women's Act (VAWA) became law. Data for this comparison was provided by the Foundation Center, which conducted a custom search of its database covering 1) the total amount of gender-based violence funding and total grants awarded by United States foundations and 2) the top 100 foundations awarding gender-based violence grants in 1994 and in 2008. The 1994 data includes all grants of \$10,000 or more awarded to organizations by 1,029 of the largest private and community foundations in the United States. The 2008 data includes all grants of \$10,000 or more awarded to organizations by 1,490 of the largest private and community foundations.

Appendix C

Foundation Respondents

Foundation	FY08 Funding*	Number of Grants
A Woman's Work	\$15,000	35
American Jewish World Service	\$234,000	16
Anonymous	\$443,400	8
Anonymous		45
Anonymous	\$30,000	
Anonymous	\$5,100	4
Anschutz Family Foundation	\$85,000	12
Arizona Foundation for Women	\$150,000	16
Avon Foundation for Women	\$4,800,000	116
Birmingham Foundation	\$35,000	1
Bangladesh Women's Foundation		10
Boston Women's Fund	\$34,050	3
Bucks County Women's Fund	\$2,500	1
Carolyn W. and Charles T. Beaird Family Foundation	\$50,000	3
Chester County Fund for Women and Girls	\$30,000	2
Chicago Foundation for Women	\$163,000	14
Coastal Community foundation		
Community Endeavors Foundation	\$15,000	1
Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta	\$100,000	4
Delta Research and Educational Foundation	\$3,000	2
First Hospital Foundation	\$73,000	3
FISA Foundation	\$307,145	6
Frontera Women's Foundation	\$5,000	6
Fund For Global Human Rights	\$750,000	90
Global Fund for Women	\$2,116,392	113
Hartford Courant Foundation	\$20,000	2
Healthcare Foundation of New Jersey	\$69,600	2
Incarnate Word Foundation	\$100,000	7
International Women's Development Agency	\$500,000	9
Jewish Women's Foundation of Metropolitan Chicago	\$53,000	4
John Gogian Family Foundation	\$135,000	9
Johnson Family Foundation	\$888,721	47
Lamson Howell Foundation		

Foundation	FY08 Funding*	Number of Grants
Little Angel Foundation	\$497,885	28
Liz Claiborne Foundation	\$400,000	11
Mary's Pence		2
Missouri Foundation for Health	\$2,385,641	16
Mongolian Women's Fund /Mones/	\$38,494	5
Ms. Foundation for Women	\$430,000	24
NoVo Foundation	\$40,000,000	36
Reconstruction Women's Fund	\$101,111	26
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	\$5,031,000	24
Rozaria Memorial Trust		
Springfield Foundation	\$27,000	21
The Bingham Program	\$127,036	10
The Community Foundation of Western North Carolina	\$47,000	4
The Constantin Foundation	\$50,000	2
The Hadassah Foundation	\$75,000	3
The Memorial Foundation		
The Overbrook Foundation	\$500,000	12
The Rachael and Ben Vaughan Foundation	\$7,500	
The Women's Foundation of Colorado	\$35,000	2
The Women's Fund of Greater Birmingham	\$105,000	3
The Women's Fund of The Community Foundation of Middle Tennessee	\$34,900	9
Trio Foundation of St. Louis	\$20,000	4
Verizon Foundation	\$4,700,000	250
Vermont Women's Fund	\$62,600	7
Waitt Institute for Violence Prevention	\$1,200,000	2
Watertown Community Foundation	\$2,500	2
Women of the ELCA	\$25,000	15
Women's Foundation for a Greater Memphis	\$56,000	5
Women's Foundation of Montana		
Women's Foundation of Southern Arizona	\$11,665	1
Women's Fund for The Fox Valley Region, Inc.	\$12,873	6
Women's Fund of Central Indiana	\$82,000	6
Women's Fund of Greater Milwaukee		
Women's Fund of Miami-Dade	\$40,000	4
Women's Fund of Mississippi	\$6,000	
Women's Fund of Rhode Island	\$23,000	3
Women's Fund of Western Massachusetts	\$30,000	6
Women's Fund of Winston-Salem		

*Figures above includes total grant dollars for gender-based violence and number of gender-based violence grants awarded in fiscal year 2008

Please note:

- Survey respondents were asked to enter **approximate** values if exact values were not available.
- Not all respondents provided grants information

Appendix D

Practitioner Respondents

A Call to Men
American Samoa Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
Attorney General's Sexual Assault Task Force
Battered Women's Project
Black Church and Domestic Violence Institute
Coordinadora Paz para la Mujer
Florida Council Against Sexual Violence
Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence
Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Indiana Coalition Against Sexual Assault
Maryland Coalition Against Sexual Assault
Michigan Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment Board
Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
Montana Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence
Nevada Coalition Against Sexual Violence
Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence
Prevention Institute
Project Safeguard
RightRides for Women's Safety
Safe Havens Interfaith Partnership Against Domestic Violence
South Dakota Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
Texas Association Against Sexual Assault
Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information and Services
Women of Color Network
Wyoming Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault

End Notes

¹ WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women: Summary Report of Initial Results on Prevalence, Health Outcomes and Women's Responses. Geneva: WorldHealth Organization, 2005.

² Thoennes, Nancy and Patricia Tjaden. *Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence*. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institute of Justice, 2000.

³ Domestic Violence Resource Center. "Domestic Violence Statistics." Domestic Violence Resource Center. Web. 25 Feb 2010. <<http://www.dvrc-or.org/domestic/violence/resources/C61/>>.

⁴ GenderPAC. 70 Under 30. Washington, D.C.: GenderPAC, 2008.

⁵ Best, Margaret C. and Liz Stimpson. *Courage Above All: Sexual Assault Against Women with Disabilities*. Toronto: Disabled Women's Network, 1991.

⁶ United Nations. General Assembly. *In-Depth Study on All Forms of Violence against Women: Report of the Secretary General*. New York: United Nations, 2006.

⁷ Campaign for Funding to End Domestic and Sexual Violence. *FY 2010 Appropriations Briefing Book*. Washington, D.C.: Campaign for Funding to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, 2009.

⁸ United Nations. General Assembly. *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women*. New York: United Nations, 1993.

⁹ In 1994 total giving was \$11.29 billion--1.5% went to gender-based violence programs. Total giving in 2008 was \$45.6 billion, of which 1.8% went to gender-based violence issues.

¹⁰ Populations Targeted by Gender-Based Violence Funders*

Low-Income Women	70%
Girls	59%
Women of Color	36%
Boys	15%
None	15%
LGBT	12%
Disabled Women	11%
Incarcerated Women	9%
Elderly	5%
Other	5%
Men	3%

*Respondents were asked to report on all issue areas they support. Therefore the total exceeds 100%.

¹¹ Gender-based Violence Issues Supported by Respondents

ISSUE	<25% OF FUNDING	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
Child Sexual Assault	40%	11%	3%	
Sexual Assault	28%	29%	8%	6%
Domestic Violence	15%	18%	28%	32%
LGBT Violence	34%	8%	3%	
Trafficking	31%	5%	2%	

*Respondents were asked to report on all issue areas they support. Therefore the total exceeds 100%.

¹² Gender based Violence Strategies Supported by Respondents

STRATEGY	<25% OF FUNDING	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
Intervention and Services	11%	34%	22%	17%
Prevention	18%	31%	12%	17%
Children & Youth Services	29%	25%	8%	9%
Public Education	18%	18%	9%	11%
Criminal Justice	29%	15%	6%	5%
Healthcare	29%	14%	6%	2%

*Respondents were asked to report on all issue areas they support. Therefore the total exceeds 100%.

¹³ PRIMARY APPROACHES OF GRANTEE PROGRAMS

Social Service	63%
Social Justice	48%
Human Rights	30%
Feminist	22%
Other	15%
Faith-Based	6%

*Respondents were asked to report on all issue areas they support. Therefore the total exceeds 100%.

¹⁴ Merrill, L.L., et al. Childhood Abuse and Sexual Revictimization in a Female Navy Recruit Sample. Naval Health Research Center, 1997.

Ms. Foundation for Women

Building women's collective power to ignite change

12 MetroTech Center

26th Floor

Brooklyn, NY 11201

P: 212.742.2300

info@ms.foundation.org

ms.foundation.org