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A collaboration between New England Blacks in Philanthropy (NEBiP) and SisterFund, Ujima Legacy Fund and the Community Foundation for a greater Richmond, Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power highlights the heritage of Black philanthropic giving in Greater Richmond and analyzes attitudes, motivations, giving practices and trends of the region’s Black donors. The study offers two frameworks developed by NEBiP to guide and deepen conversations on Black giving, a Black donor typology and Linked Philanthropic Equity (LPE), a framework that offers a pathway for an intentional Black giving strategy. The study’s intent is to offer insight on the attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, practices and current trends of Black giving in the region.

New England Blacks in Philanthropy is dedicated to informing, reforming and transforming the practice of philanthropy by bringing forth a paradigm shift from focusing on the deficits of our communities to our assets.

NEBiP, 101 Federal Street, Suite 1900, Boston, MA 02110 www.nebip.org

Sisterfund is a giving circle of African American women whose mission is to pool time, talents and treasure to support organizations that are working to transform the lives of African American women and girls. Since 2015 Sisterfund has awarded $195,000 in grants to eight organizations in our community.

SisterFund, 3409 Moore Street, Richmond, VA 23230 www.sisterfundrva.org

Ujima Legacy Fund is a giving circle of Black men. Ujima Legacy Fund supports projects in the Richmond region that promote equitable outcomes among youth and young adults, with emphasis on underserved Black/African American youth. Since 2013, the Fund has supported 14 projects with a total of $328,000.

Ujima Legacy Fund, 3409 Moore Street, Richmond, VA 23230 www.ujimalegacyfund.com

The Community Foundation for a greater Richmond is a leading partner and advocate for philanthropy and service in the Richmond region. The Community Foundation manages more than 1,200 charitable funds with assets exceeding $1 billion.

The Community Foundation for a greater Richmond, 3409 Moore Street, Richmond, VA 23230 www.cfrichmond.org
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Dear Friends and Colleagues,

It has truly been an honor and pleasure to collaborate with the Greater Richmond Black philanthropic community to understand the deep historic and cultural roots, and appreciate how evident that tradition is today. We are proud to share with you our findings and recommendations in Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power.

As this report attests, Greater Richmond’s Black community is not—and has never been—monolithic. Significant inequities existed in the past and persist today across our communities, but we believe that the potential and existing donor base in the Greater Richmond Black community remains undervalued and largely untapped. We know from our research that Black philanthropists are particularly motivated to give to organizations that are making a difference in our communities by challenging racial inequities to attain real economic and social justice.

The mission of NEBiP is to inform, reform and ultimately transform the philanthropic mindset by focusing on the considerable assets of our Black communities instead of the familiar focus on the deficits in our Black communities. With solid quantitative and qualitative data to support our vision, the report concludes that Black philanthropy has been a cultural norm pre-dating slavery and today we have considerably greater resources and disposable income to invest in our well-being.

Similar to our previous reports on Black philanthropy in Boston (2015) and Cincinnati (2018), the story of Greater Richmond’s Black philanthropy is steeped in tradition. In this report, we provide baseline data that illuminates two frameworks that NEBiP developed to guide further understanding of Black donors and their giving patterns and behavior.

The unprecedented events of 2020 are like none we have witnessed in modern times. Our Greater Richmond project launched before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, virulent demonstrations of White supremacy, and the divisive presidential election. These events have undoubtedly complicated the work of the Greater Richmond Black philanthropic community, but they have also galvanized this community and a far broader community beyond. There are many to generously thank for the Giving Black®: Greater Richmond report, including three of the leading philanthropic entities of Greater Richmond: SisterFund, Ujima Legacy Fund and the Community Foundation for a greater Richmond. We are deeply appreciative for the bold leadership, constructive partnership and collaborative spirit of Stephanie Glenn, VP of Diversity and Engagement of the Community Foundation for a greater Richmond, L. Robert Bolling, CEO of ChildSavers and Veronica Fleming, Principal of Veronica Fleming Consulting. This study would not have been possible without the extraordinary dedication and commitment of time, talent and support of the Greater Richmond Advisory Council.

Thank you to the hundreds of people who supported and motivated our work. A special thank you to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for its support, and my personal thanks to my team, including researcher Marissa James and program director Ariel Baker. We always learn in these endeavors how much work we have ahead of us, but what we took from Greater Richmond was a deep appreciation for the enormously talented and courageous Black men and women who built the path to social justice on which we all now walk. Without further ado, we present Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power.

Sincerely,

Bithiah Carter
President, NEBiP
New England Blacks in Philanthropy’s (NEBiP) mission is to inform, reform and ultimately transform the philanthropic mindset by de-emphasizing deficits and elevating the assets of our communities. Our report Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power highlights the legacy of Black giving and analyzes attitudes, motivations, giving practices and trends of Greater Richmond’s Black donors. The study offers two frameworks developed by NEBiP to guide and deepen conversations on Black giving, a Black donor typology and Linked Philanthropic Equity (LPE), a framework that offers a pathway for an intentional Black giving strategy.

The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond study represents the culmination of an 18-month collaborative process between NEBiP and three leading philanthropic entities of Greater Richmond: SisterFund, Ujima Legacy Fund and the Community Foundation for a greater Richmond. Insight was gleaned from focus groups, one-on-one interviews and an online survey accessed by nearly 600 participants. Survey respondents were mostly comprised of well-educated Black women who were employed full-time. Most respondents reported a median household income that exceeded $80,000. Of the respondents who provided geographic information, slightly more than half lived in Richmond City proper, mostly in Southside, and the remaining respondents lived in various localities of Greater Richmond. Survey respondents spanned across six generations from the G.I. Generation to Generation Z, with Generation X and Baby Boomers comprising most of the survey respondents.

Greater Richmond’s early years reveal a rich tradition of Black giving, anchored by the Black church, mutual aid and beneficial societies, and by personal and social networks. Traditions of Black giving predate the city’s beginning, as enslaved Blacks who survived the transatlantic Middle Passage relied on their West African cultural practices of giving, caring and sharing to survive. Early Black philanthropists exhibited a great deal of ingenuity and collective power by pooling resources to establish Black churches and missionaries, resisting racial tyranny through rebellion, purchasing freedom for the enslaved, providing for the sick and needy, burying their dead, protesting police brutality, establishing a public school system for Black children and building the city’s first Black orphanage. In short, these early philanthropists defended Black dignity and sought political and social rights within hostile systems of racial oppression.

Early traditions of Black giving still resonate for current Black donors of Greater Richmond. The Black church is still central to Black giving, as most Black donors ranked attending religious services and church as their top donation destinations. As in the past, personal networks and social organizations remain important vehicles for Black giving as Black donors ranked their networks as top recipients for their discretionary giving. Unlike the past, the Black church no longer serves as the primary center for mobilizing Black communities. Over time, Black collective action has shifted to other institutions and organizations, such as the Crusade for Voters in mid-century to Black Lives Matter today. Led by a younger generation of Black donors, their renewed activism is fueled and supported by newer platforms of Black giving, such as internet-based giving, bypassing traditional means of Black philanthropy. Broader trends in charitable giving provide additional context for understanding contemporary Black giving. In the 2019 “Generosity Index” report, which ranks the generosity of the 50 U.S. states, the District of Columbia and Canada’s 13 provinces, Virginia ranked 7th out of 64 localities. There is less known about Black donors’ views and motivation for giving, so Giving Black®: Greater Richmond lands at an opportune time as we all try to navigate what lies ahead.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A LEGACY OF BLACK INGENUITY & COLLECTIVE POWER

Highlights of RVA’s survey findings:

- Top ranking of economic equity as Black donors’ most important and most overlooked issue
- Black donors are divided as to whether or not Richmond is a place of economic opportunity
- Extended friends and family, and higher education institutions, are priority donation destinations
- Opposition to an organization’s politics and convictions were a barrier for Black donors’ giving
- Agreement of most Black donors that nonprofits have improved Black lives in Richmond, but opinions vary
- Belief of most Black donors that their well-being is linked to the well-being of other Black people

Black donors’ perceptions of their connection to others offers an opportunity for a different type of intentional Black giving. NEBiP developed the Linked Philanthropic Equity (LPE) framework as a pathway for strategic Black giving that leverages the interconnectedness between Black donors and the Black community. Although Greater Richmond Black residents are taking the economic brunt of the pandemic, they also possess key assets in their communities, like the location of highly regarded universities and colleges. In 2018, the city’s poverty rate had declined and its median income increased, with Richmond ranking among Forbes magazine’s “Top 10” places for Blacks to live.

We offer several recommendations informed by Black donors’ astute observations and keen insight:

1. Increase and raise the visibility and participation of Black donors in community philanthropy
2. Build upon the momentum of Giving Black®: Greater Richmond to strengthen Black donor networks and connections
3. Engage, support, promote, and increase the leadership of younger Black philanthropists
4. Offer tools, resources and capacity building opportunities to increase knowledge in philanthropic wealth management
5. Build a cross-sector network of Black donors, thought leaders and nonprofits to embrace and promote the success of nonprofits that improve Black communities
6. Increase, promote, and involve Black donors in increasing economic equity and well-being for Black communities and other issues that disproportionately affect Black communities
7. Amplify and map Black-led organizations and assist in building better bridges to Black communities to increase investments in racial and social justice work
8. Set the narrative straight by articulating Greater Richmond’s Black philanthropy story

The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity and Collective Power report provides an opportunity to revisit Greater Richmond’s rich tradition of Black giving, a legacy which continues to inform the foundation of the region’s current Black philanthropic community. Its intent is to offer insight on the attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, practices and current trends of Black giving in the region. NEBiP remains dedicated to countering the discounting, devaluation and under-appreciation of Black philanthropists. We offer tools to guide conversations with deeper analysis on the current and future status of Black philanthropy. With appreciation, NEBiP is highly confident that the Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power study will advance conversations and move the Greater Richmond community forward on its journey to racial equity.
SELECTED KEY EVENTS IN GREATER RICHMOND

HISTORY OF GIVING BLACK®

1790-1820
In 1790, the population of Richmond was 3,761, of which 1,479 were enslaved Blacks and 265 free Blacks. From its incorporation in 1782 to 1820, Richmond became the fifth largest city in the South.*

1880s
This was a “Golden Era” for Richmond’s Black businesses on Second Street (The Deuce) in the Jackson Ward district.”

1920s
True Reformers in Richmond founded the first Black bank in the United States - The Savings Bank of the Grand Fountain, United Order of True Reformers.

1968
Richmond leaders founded the Greater Richmond Community Foundation to channel philanthropic efforts toward addressing inequalities for people who have historically been disadvantaged.

2013
The Black men’s giving circle, Ujima Legacy Fund (Ujima), was established.

Greater Richmond Is...

HISTORIC CRADLE OF BLACK CAPITALISM
BLACK POWER
BLACK INGENUITY
GIVING BLACK®
BLACK NETWORKS

We Are
Here’s what we heard from our survey respondents.

84%
Have obtained a college degree or higher
EDUCATION

$80K+
Household income reported by nearly two-thirds
INCOME

33%
Believe Richmond is a place of economic opportunity
OPPORTUNITY

#1
Most important social issue
ECONOMIC EQUITY

$5000+
Given by 25% of households in 2019
PHILANTHROPY

SisterFund, a Black women’s giving circle, was founded.

Ujima and SisterFund met with NEBiP to discuss the creation of Giving Black®: Greater Richmond.

Ujima, SisterFund and the Community Foundation invested in the Giving Black®: Greater Richmond study to take a deeper dive into the trends and impacts of Black philanthropy in our region.

The Community Foundation welcomed its first Black board chair along with the highest number of Black board members since its inception. Ujima, SisterFund and the Community Foundation hosted the first-ever regional Black Philanthropy Month celebration in August.

The Community Foundation for a greater Richmond establishes the Vice President of Diversity and Engagement, a senior level position within its executive team.

At the conclusion of the Giving Black® study research, Ujima, SisterFund and the Community Foundation will focus on how this data can power the next steps toward a more inclusive philanthropic community.
Situated along the banks of the James River, the “River City” evolved from a sleepy port village to the region’s leading industrial and manufacturing center - powered by enslaved Black labor. Its early inhabitants, many forcibly brought, were determined to survive and make the best of their circumstances in the city that became the slave-trade hub of the Upper South, the capital of the Confederacy and the emerging beacon of a multicultural, new South.

Greater Richmond’s Black traditions of giving predate the city’s beginning. By Richmond’s founding in 1737, Black residents had been living in its vicinity for nearly 70 years. Enslaved Blacks, who survived the transatlantic Middle Passage and were transported to southern plantations, carried with them the West African traditions of giving, caring and sharing for their families and others, which served as a source of strength. These West African traditions of caring for others developed alongside other early practices and institutions of Black giving in Greater Richmond, including Black churches, mutual aid groups and beneficial societies.

Black philanthropic traditions were no easy feat for Black communities in Richmond’s early years, as the Virginia colony was the first to legally designate African inhabitants as slaves for life. Yet, both free and enslaved Black Richmonders continued to find and create opportunities for Black giving of time, talent and treasure. Their giving was grounded by two traditions: Black churches and mutual aid networks. Black people used these traditions of collective power to respond to their community members’ basic human needs. As Richmond became the slave trading capital and gateway of the upper South, the city’s shifting economy from trade to industry created small cracks through which common philanthropic practices and Black enterprises would expand.

FROM PORT OF SLAVERY TO POWERHOUSE OF BLACK INGENUITY

Established in 1737 and incorporated in 1782, Richmond transformed from a sleepy port village to the region’s leading industrial and manufacturing center, powered by enslaved Black labor, who along with freed brethren, used their ingenuity to find and create opportunities for Black giving. For thousands of years, Native Americans established trade routes in the Greater Richmond area and in the 1700s, wealthy White plantation owner William Byrd and his sons settled in Richmond because of its established trade routes, mild climate, fertile soil and access to waterways. Its population rapidly increased, fueled by post-American Revolution migration and by the relocation of the state’s capital to Richmond in 1782.

Most of Richmond’s Black population was enslaved, numbering close to 40% of the city’s total population. From 1790 to 1820, their numbers jumped from 607 to 1,235.

Pre-Civil War Richmond was a rapidly growing manufacturing and industrial hub centered around tobacco processing. Trading of the enslaved was the city’s most important and lucrative industry that supported the processing of this cash crop. In a four-block area, Richmond had over 69 slave traders and auction houses. Nearby, the African Burial Ground was the city’s first burial ground for free and enslaved Blacks. It served as the location for the city’s gallows, where it is believed that Gabriel Prosser, a literate enslaved blacksmith who led a failed rebellion for Black emancipation in 1800, was executed. Richmond, as the nation’s second largest slavery trading center after New Orleans, served as a gateway for an estimated 300,000 enslaved Black men, women and children who were sent against their will further South.
Against this backdrop, enslaved and free Black Richmonders relied upon their ingenuity to find and create opportunities for giving. Their lives demonstrated that Black giving is always possible even under the most trying of circumstances. Early Black giving was shaped by the nature of urban slavery in Richmond and by Whites’ overregulation of Blacks’ movement.

Richmond’s unique system of urban slavery created some opportunities for Black giving by providing free and enslaved Blacks greater economic and social autonomy. Enslaved Black Richmonders were “hired out” by their slaveholders to manufacturing industries and allowed to live apart from their owners while they earned extra money after fulfilling work quotas. Free Blacks could negotiate their own labor agreements. The more fortunate enslaved Black Richmonders acquired experience in skilled trades, which allowed them to establish Black businesses. Others used the extra money to purchase freedom for themselves or their families.

Laws prohibiting Black Richmonders from congregating also shaped early Black giving. Blacks who met were taking a risk, making themselves more vulnerable to arrest, physical punishment, emigration from Virginia and/or revocation of their free status. Following the discovery of Gabriel Prosser’s planned rebellion in 1800, White elites passed laws regulating Blacks’ behavior, which were also tightened after the 1831 Nat Turner’s Rebellion. Yet, evidence suggests that Black Richmonders were willing to take these risks to join the many mutual aid and beneficial societies.

Black Richmonders joined and actively participated in several mutual aid groups and benevolent societies that connected them with families and churches, offering a network of support. Borrowing from African and European traditions, these groups served Black Richmonders’ economic and social needs, including charity, and were a source of early Black giving. Burial was one of the more common functions of mutual aid groups and benevolent societies. The Burying Ground Society is one of Black Richmond’s earliest examples of a benevolent group and served as a model for Richmond’s future benevolent groups.

In 1815, a group of free prosperous Black property owners created a “Burying Ground Society of the Free People of Color of the City of Richmond,” bought a plot of land for $240 and raised $733 from membership fees to purchase burial plots for its members. Petersburg’s free Blacks created a similar group, the Beneficial Society of Free Men of Color. For Black Richmonders, informal networks served as an important source for Black giving. As an example, enslaved Black Richmonders relied on their informal and fictive kin networks (i.e., individuals who were not related, but were treated as such) for funds to purchase their freedom. Between 1830 and 1860, 225 enslaved individuals in Richmond purchased their freedom. Also, Black workers donated their extra cash to fund the Underground Railroad and several “secret escape networks and organizations” to liberate other enslaved people.

First African Baptist Church, circa 1865
Source: Belsches, 9
WORK AND PRAY: ROCK O’ MY SOUL

The Black church served as one of the most important centers for the philanthropic traditions of Greater Richmond’s Black community. Richmond’s first Black church, First African Baptist Church (formerly First Baptist, from the 1780s to 1841) served as a base for Black Richmonders’ political, economic, social and philanthropic efforts. Three Black churches in the Richmond area met to form the First African Baptist Church. With financial support by the city’s White elites, Black congregants pooled their resources to buy the First Baptist Church building and renamed it First African Baptist. Black members combined additional resources to resolve the Church’s remaining debt, an example of the collective power of its Black congregants.7 The First African Church would outgrow its 1,500 seats, which led them to establish a separate “colony” church, the Third African Baptist Church, later renamed Ebenezer Church.

In 1815, under the auspices of First Baptist, free and enslaved Black Richmonders funded the nation’s earliest Black missionaries, Lott Cary and Colin Teague. Working together, Richmond’s enslaved and free Blacks established the African Baptist Missionary Society and raised $700 ($14,209 in 2020 dollars) to fund Cary and Teague’s inaugural trip. In the following years, the African Baptist Missionary Society sent Lott an impressive sum of $100 ($2,000 in 2020 dollars) every year to support his mission.9

Greater Richmond’s early philanthropic tradition can also be found in Black churches’ efforts to provide relief to other vulnerable communities. In the 1840s, First African members sent funds abroad to the Irish population suffering from famine. In 1848, First African created the Poor Saints Fund, whose purpose was to assist the “needy and helpless from disease and old age.” Church trustees “attended to all applications of aid,” collected donations and visited the poor. First African Baptist assisted Black Richmonders in purchasing their own freedom, as the Church accomplished for the enslaved Thomas Browne, who successfully appealed to First African for funds to purchase his freedom and later became a minister in Boston.10

Who was Lott Cary?

Lott Cary, one of the earliest Black missionaries, led an extraordinary life. Lott was born into slavery in 1780 in Charles County, Virginia. He was hired out at a Richmond tobacco industry, was allowed to make extra profit selling tobacco waste and saved enough money to purchase his and his two children’s freedom. Lott joined first African Baptist and obtained a license to preach. After his 1821 trip, Lott stayed in Liberia where he died in 1828.9
First African Baptist Church served as a safe haven for Black Richmonders seeking redress of grievances. In 1865, the church hosted a meeting of 3,000 Blacks who complained about the mistreatment and abuse from the military command and the police. The crowd approved the plan and Richmond’s Black churches collected donations to fund the delegation of Black men, who met President Andrew Johnson in June 1865.11

**FREED BLACK TO BLACK FREEDOM**

In post-Civil War Richmond, Black people generously gave their time and talent to establish a school system for Black children. Within days after the Confederate defeat in April 1865, Black Richmonders established schools in the basement of several Black churches. The following month, they met to appoint teachers, establish school hours and create an administrative structure. By August 1865, Richmond had five public schools and four private schools for Black children. Northern White philanthropic groups were surprised by the talent, level of literacy, teaching skills and ongoing work by Black Richmonders.12

Black giving continued to operate through Black benevolent societies and mutual aid groups. By the 1870s, Black Richmond was home to over 400 voluntary associations and Black Richmonders actively participated and networked. Freed people participated in numerous secret political societies and charitable groups. Existing channels of relief were overwhelmed and often denied to African-Americans, who turned towards their churches and each other for relief. For example, The United Sons of Love was a benevolent organization whose purpose was “to care for the sick, look after the poor and bury the dead.” Benevolent societies also developed under the auspices of Richmond’s Black churches.13

Beneficial societies showed Black Richmonders the benefit of pooling resources together to advance a collective need. They were enormously popular, and several Black businesses capitalized on their popularity. They laid a strong foundation for the city’s most successful future Black business enterprises, including True Reformers and Maggie Lena Walker’s International Order of St. Luke.

Black women are often unheralded for their significant contributions to early Black philanthropy. Formerly enslaved Richmonder Lucy Goode Brooks was an early children’s advocate. A mother of seven, Brooks gave generously of her time and talent, and leveraged her networks on behalf of Richmond’s Black children. Goode was able to secure funds to establish Richmond’s first Black orphanage. After the Civil War, Black children, abandoned by their former slave owners or in search of their families, roamed Richmond streets. Both of Richmond’s existing orphanages only accepted White children. Black children’s precarious plight led Brooks to spearhead the effort and she brought the cause to her Ladies Sewing Circle of Charitable Causes (sewing circles were used by Black and White southern women to support causes). To build the orphanage, Brooks leveraged her networks, petitioned the Richmond City Council for the land, and sought support from the Quakers, who used their networks to secure funding.

Mostly due to her vision and leadership, the Friends’ Asylum for Colored Orphans opened in May 1868. Today, Brooks’ organization still stands as the nonprofit FRIENDS Association for Children.14
TRUE REFORMERS: CRADLE OF BLACK CAPITALISM

By the 1900s, Richmond, with many of its successful Black businesses centered in the Jackson Ward district, earned Black Richmond its reputation as the “Wall Street of the South.” The Jackson Ward district housed both True Reformers and the St. Luke Penny Savings Bank, two of Greater Richmond’s most successful Black economic enterprises. Both of their foundations were undergirded by the early Black philanthropic traditions of mutual aid and beneficial societies as they couched their economic services in a message of self-help and racial uplift. Jackson Ward also housed the Southern Aid and Insurance Company, the nation’s first Black-owned life insurance company.15

Founded by Reverend William Washington Browne, the United Order of True Reformers represented one of the nation’s most successful Black economic empires. The True Reformers chartered the nation’s first Black-owned bank which would operate in 24 states at its height. Browne’s empire included a hotel, newspaper, real estate and a home for the elderly.

Browne’s ingenuity would transform the True Reformers from its roots as a temperance society to become an economic powerhouse. True Reformers is an adaptation of Black Richmonders’ early philanthropic tradition of Black giving through the network of mutual aid and beneficial societies.16

Maggie Lena Walker serves as another example of the important role of Black women in early Black philanthropy. Walker, founder and first woman President of a chartered bank, the St. Luke Penny Savings Bank, oversaw its reorganization into the Consolidated Bank and Trust Company. Until recently, Consolidated Bank was the nation’s oldest independent bank.

“When community took care of community, that was Black philanthropy, because...[it was] the type of society where we created wealth, presence and recognition and value for our people.”

True Reformers, Hall and Bank Building
Source: www.blackpast.org

True Reformers, Grocery Store
Source: www.encyclopediavirginia.org
Walker gave generously of her time, treasure and talent. She actively participated in over 10 groups, holding major leadership positions in several, such as the Independent Order of St. Luke, Richmond Council of Colored Women and the Richmond Urban League.

Richmond’s post-Civil War Black community has been described as fully immersed in a network of self-help groups and benevolent societies and Walker’s experience reflects that reality. Similar to Reverend Browne of the True Reformers, Walker revived St. Luke’s membership by de-emphasizing its charity focus and restructuring the group’s economic viability. Her vision for the St. Luke Penny Savings Bank and enterprise was inclusive. She valued input and participation from women and the Black working class, which set her apart from Black Richmond’s other middle-class leaders, such as Richmond’s Planet editor John Mitchell, Jr. Walker’s enterprises included a newspaper, department stores and an educational loan fund for young people. She served as a champion for the political rights of women and Blacks.

Although Black Richmonders today are likely aware of the incredible accomplishments of philanthropist Maggie Lena Walker, they are less likely to know about Eliza Allen. She was an effective recruiter and organizer for both the True Reformers and the International Order of St. Luke. Born into slavery in 1840, Eliza Allen worked as a laundress and rose to become the only female board member on the True Reformers Savings Bank. The early success of Reverend Browne in reviving the fledgling United Order of Reformers’ chapters was largely due to Allen’s organizing and recruiting skills. She organized a large chapter (chapters were known as fountains) of 90+ members in Petersburg and three Richmond chapters.
Eliza Allen’s prowess in recruiting speaks to the power of her networks and her skill of organizing secret societies of enslaved women, including the Consolation Sisters, Tabitha, and the Sisters of Usefulness.

She also served as the right worthy grand vice chief of Maggie Walker’s International Order of St. Luke and held leadership positions in several other societies. Allen moved seamlessly between working class and elite networks.

By 1900, the Jackson Ward district’s “Black Wall Street” served as the center of Black Richmond’s political and economic life. Prominent Black leaders, such as Maggie Walker and John Mitchell, Jr., resided there and the neighborhood housed the nation’s first chartered Black-owned bank, the first bank with a woman president, and the first Black-owned life insurance company, as well as numerous professional businesses. Businesses like the True Reformers invented a business model that represented Black ingenuity. They developed a new type of economic enterprise, infusing their business model with the underlying mission of racial uplift, which catalyzed the growth of Greater Richmond’s Black business community. Jackson Ward’s bustling theatre and arts culture was known as the “Harlem of the South” in its heyday of the 1930s.

Black Richmond’s most successful economic enterprises, True Reformers and St. Luke Penny Savings Bank, rested on the shoulders of the Black businesses which preceded them. The remarkable life of Black business owner Gilbert Hunt stands as a testament to Black ingenuity, even under the region’s oppressive slavery system. Although not as common, former and current enslaved individuals could become business owners. Gilbert Hunt is one early, remarkable example. Born in 1780, Hunt apprenticed at a carriage-making business in Richmond and became a successful blacksmith. Years later, he rescued over 200 people from burning buildings on two separate occasions. Despite his heroic efforts, he did not obtain his freedom until 1829.
The Jackson Ward district was widely recognized as the “Birthplace of Black Capitalism.” Its vibrant arts and theatre culture added to Jackson Ward’s reputation as “Harlem of the South.” Famous Black entertainers performed there, including Richmond’s hometown son and philanthropist Bill “Bojangles” Robinson, revered for his dancing skills, but less known for his philanthropy. During the 1930s, he paid over $1,000 for the city of Richmond to install a stoplight to help schoolchildren cross a busy intersection.21

During the Jim Crow era, Black Richmonders continued to participate in voluntary associations, fraternal organizations, social clubs and affinity groups. These groups were the foundation for Black giving and other social interests.

From the 1880s to the 1960s, Black Richmonders strategized to restore their political rights that were stripped from them in Virginia’s 1902 constitution. As early as 1884, former high school principal John Mitchell, Jr. founded the black newspaper Richmond Planet to advocate for Blacks’ political rights. By the early 1900s, the damage to Black voting rights was evident. In 1900, Jackson Ward’s registered Black voters numbered 3,000. Three years later, there were just 33 voters. Petersburg’s number of Black voters steeply dropped by three-quarters.22

Ironically, middle and upper class Black Richmonders’ economic success at the turn of the century coincided with their political disenfranchisement. Yet, Black Richmonders remained resilient and used their collective power to pursue multiple strategies to resist Jim Crow laws and to restore their political rights. Pioneering Black historian Dr. Luther P. Jackson founded the Virginia Voters League to increase Black voter registration by persuading Blacks to pay their poll taxes. Undoubtedly, traditions of Black giving continued, but with an increased attention on politics. Black Richmonders
founded the Crusade for Voters and fundraised to pay Black voters’ poll taxes. In September 1956, Crusade for Voters launched a “Special Registration” day, financed by special fundraising projects and contributions from activists. Two Supreme Court decisions, the 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education ruling striking down Plessy vs. Ferguson’s “separate but equal” doctrine and the 1955 “with all deliberate speed” ruling, opened a new battlefront in the civil rights struggle for quality public schools. White Richmonders engaged in a campaign of massive resistance to keep schools segregated. In the end, Black Richmonders’ resilience reaped dividends as Richmond elected Henry L. Marsh III as its first Black mayor in 1977 and later with the election of L. Douglas Wilder as the state’s first Black Lieutenant Governor (1986-1990) and Governor (1990-1994).

The era of Marsh’s first mayoral term coincides with the beginning of a Richmond-born tennis champion, philanthropist and social justice advocate Arthur Ashe. His coming-of-age experiences in racially segregated Richmond affected him deeply. After finding peace, Ashe returned to Richmond and selflessly gave his time, talent and treasure to the city’s youth and to humanitarian causes globally. He established a mentoring program for at-risk youth and advocated for their quality education. Ashe marched against apartheid in South Africa and the mistreatment of Haitian refugees. After disclosing his AIDS diagnosis, he established a foundation to defeat the disease. His legacy was memorialized with a statue on Monument Avenue in 1996, three years after his death, a fitting tribute to his incredible legacy.

Philanthropy exists in the lives of ordinary, yet extraordinary non-celebrity philanthropists. A Giving Black advisor explained that in her work in the nonprofit sector, she sees “how the small donors and individuals make that sacrifice as equally as impactful.” Certainly, the late Richmond philanthropist Thomas C. Cannon, Sr. embodies that sentiment and was an exemplar of Black giving. As a postal worker on a modest salary, he gave generously, approximately $150,000 (in increments of $1,000 checks) over 30 years to organizations and individuals of different incomes, races and ages that he found worthy. He and his wife Patricia lived modestly while working overtime and on weekends to fund his donations.
GIVING BLACK® AND MOVING FORWARD

Black giving in Greater Richmond’s early years reveals a rich philanthropic spirit and tradition, anchored by the Black church and the personal and social networks of mutual aid, beneficial societies and secret societies. Early Black philanthropists exhibited a great deal of ingenuity and collective power by pooling resources to establish Black churches, supporting missionaries, resisting racial tyranny through rebellion, purchasing freedom for enslaved family members and friends, providing for the sick and needy, burying their dead, protesting police brutality, building schools, caring for orphans and defending their dignity, as well as political and social rights against hostile systems of racial oppression. As a Richmond interviewee noted, “pulling together as a community has been a big motif that we’ve seen from multiple generations.” The collective power of Greater Richmond’s Black community proved to be formidable in affecting positive change.

Early traditions of Black giving still resonate for Greater Richmond’s current Black donors. The Black church is still central to Black giving, as most Black donors reported attending religious services, with 100% of Generation Z and nearly three-quarters of Millennial respondents reporting attendance. Based on survey findings, Greater Richmond’s younger Black donors are less disaffected from church than their fellow counterparts as reported in other Giving Black®-studies.

High church attendance was reported among the youngest Black Donor respondents, Generation Z and Millennials.

Church was ranked as Black donors’ top donation destination. Black churches are key in Black giving, as many interviewees associate their earliest memories of philanthropy with the Black church. As an interviewee recalled, her mother “always put in all the money she had” and said she should “always give to the church because the Lord has been the best.” Another interviewee offered a different opinion on the significance of the church in Black giving, noting “that the church has, as an institution, actually lost a lot of confidence over the years, as it pertains to Black giving.” Dr. Tyrone Freeman, Black philanthropy expert, notes the Black church is still central in the landscape of Black giving and its programming dollars “are frequently redistributed into the community to support education, to support rent, for youth, or soup kitchens, or other types of initiatives.”

Unlike the past, the Black church no longer serves as the only center for mobilizing Black communities. Black collective action has shifted to other institutions and organizations. Recently, the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement has served as a catalyst to refocus attention on racial inequities. Their visibility in combating police violence and calling out vestiges of White supremacy in the public sphere defined

Do you attend religious services?

Nearly 75% of survey respondents, across six generations, reported attending religious services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.I. Gen (Before 1927)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad./Silent Gen (1927 – 1945)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (1946 – 1964)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (1965 – 1980)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials (1981 – 1994)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z (1995 – 2015)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their leadership. In turn, BLM in Greater Richmond has re-energized other efforts focused on elevating the assets of Greater Richmond’s Black community, such as BLK RVA. BLK RVA is a collaborative initiative and campaign between Richmond Region Tourism (RRT) and over 20 community leaders to celebrate the Black cultural, historical, economic and artistic experience in the Richmond region and to focus attention on its features as a multicultural hub. Together, BLM and BLK RVA bring attention to racial inequities. With BLK RVA’s emphasis on Black culture and Black businesses, this initiative reflects the spirit of the True Reformers’ strategy of promoting Black economic enterprise with racial pride.

As in the past, Black donors’ personal networks and social organizations remain important vehicles for Black giving, as Black donors ranked their networks as top incentives for their discretionary giving.

The rise of internet-based giving has influenced the landscape of Black giving and bypassed traditional forms of giving, particularly among younger Black donors on newer platforms. Overall, mass online fundraising appeals raised $16.2 billion dollars in 2014, a 167% increase from 2013. Nearly half of Millennial donors supported or were likely to support a crowdfunding campaign, compared to one-third of Generation X, 13% of Baby Boomers and 4% of older voters. The new landscape of Black philanthropy is reflected by the presence of donor-advised funds and by the Black philanthropic tradition of giving circles, such as SisterFund and Ujima Legacy Fund. Black giving traditions of Greater Richmond reveal, as Black philanthropy expert Dr. Tyrone Freeman asserts, that “Blacks have been philanthropists from Day 1.” The region’s philanthropic past remains relevant for Greater Richmond’s current Black donors. First, Greater Richmond’s early Black philanthropists used multiple strategies, including Black giving, for individual and collective advancement of the entire Black community; second, Black Richmonders leveraged their networks for support and to accomplish goals; and third, Black Richmonders, enslaved and free, found and created opportunities for Black giving, despite considerable risks.

**Virginia’s ranking and score on the Generosity Index (2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Ranking* (out of 64 areas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of tax filers donating to charity</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of aggregate income donated to charity</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>#17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosity Index score</td>
<td>6.1 (on 10-pt scale)</td>
<td>#7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 64 areas include the 50 U.S. states, D.C. and 13 Canadian provinces (Source: Fraser Institute, 2019)*
Broader trends in charitable giving provide additional context for understanding contemporary Black giving. In the 2019 “Generosity Index” report, which ranks the generosity of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Canada’s 13 provinces, Virginia ranked 7th (out of 64 localities) and received a Generosity Index score of 6.1 (out of 10).\(^{29}\)

National studies of Black donors offer another touchpoint for understanding regional and local trends of Black giving. Because reliable information on Black donors’ views, motivations and giving practices is more elusive, the Giving Black®: Greater Richmond study takes on additional significance. Characteristics of Black donors at the national level are important because these features can serve as a benchmark for local and regional trends. The biennial 2018 Bank of America survey, in conjunction with the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, is a well-regarded study of high-net-worth household incomes (earning $200,000 or more) with Black donor respondents.

The Bank of America survey findings reveal at least half of the wealthy Black donors supported Black causes, compared to very few non-Black donors. Similarly, almost half of the wealthy Black donors contributed to groups with a focus on race relations, compared to 6% of other donors. National Black giving trends offer insight and a comparison point for Black giving at the local level.\(^{30}\)
GIVING BLACK®
IT’S WHO WE ARE
Black Americans commit a greater percentage of their wealth to charitable giving than any other racial groups, including Whites. Yet, many Black donors of Greater Richmond associate the practice of philanthropy with very wealthy and mostly White philanthropists. An interviewee shared, “The first thing that comes to mind is the Rockefellers, the big donors with thousands and millions of dollars.” Most Black donors described their philanthropy as “giving back” and “something that you just do,” whereas philanthropy is viewed as not “being tied to Black culture.” Black donors recognize the importance of their philanthropic efforts, even as other institutions and donors do not. As an interviewee explained, “I give all the time… and nobody would ever refer to me as a philanthropist.” Black donors recognized the importance of smaller “giving back” activities. An interviewee shared, “Some people think you got to give thousands of dollars a year and that’s not the case. If you give five bucks a month, that’s philanthropy.” Another added, “Don’t you know that a whole lot of small pods make a big pile.”

Other Black donors noted the undervaluing of Black giving, particularly for their non-financial philanthropic traditions, such as volunteering. An interviewee explained, “We get a receipt for our money, we don’t get a receipt or recognized for our hours. So that, to me, gives the value to the dollars, not to the time.” This undervaluing matters as nearly all Greater Richmond’s Black donors reported volunteering their time. Black donors who reported donations over the past 12 months had higher rates of volunteering. Younger Black donors, Black donors at the highest income level and those with a high school degree were slightly less likely to report volunteering their time, yet at least three-quarters of each group reported volunteering.

While Black donors recognized the shortcomings of traditional definitions of philanthropy, they differed on solutions. Some Black donors recommended that Black people should begin to view Black communities as a community of philanthropists.

At least one interviewee remained skeptical that changing Blacks’ perceptions of their own philanthropy would ultimately matter for improving Black lives in Greater Richmond, a region with significant assets.
Geographic location of survey respondents

Nearly half of Black donor survey respondents reported living in Richmond city proper, mostly in Southside.

In addition to Richmond, respondents were distributed across various localities in Greater Richmond:

- Ashburn
- Ashland
- Aylett
- Bumpass
- Chester
- Chesterfield
- Cleveland
- Colonial Heights
- Cullman
- Dinwiddie
- Disputanta
- Elkhorn
- Farmville
- Glen Allen
- Hanover
- Henrico
- Hopewell
- Mechanicsville
- Midlothian
- Moseley
- Norfolk
- Petersburg
- Providence Forge
- Quinton
- Sandston
- South Boston
- Winterpock

Four regions of Richmond city proper

Richmond city proper survey respondents by region

Nearly half of survey respondents residing in Richmond city proper live in Southside.
DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

In this survey, Black donor respondents were mostly comprised of well-educated, middle-aged Black women, who were employed full-time and living in middle to upper-middle class neighborhoods. Slightly over half (55%) of survey respondents resided in Richmond city proper, including 11% in East End, 32% in North Side, 45% in Southside and 12% in West End. The remaining survey respondents (45%) were from various localities across Greater Richmond. Nearly two-thirds of Black donor respondents report annual household incomes above $80,000. Nearly two-thirds of Black donor respondents reported annual household incomes above $80,000.


Most Black donor respondents identified as women. As to marital status, slightly over half of Black donor respondents were married or in a domestic partnership. More Black male donors reported being married, while more women reported being single, never married, or divorced.

Race

The overwhelming majority of respondents (93%) self-identified solely as Black and the remainder identified as biracial or multi-racial.

Most Black donor survey respondents reported annual incomes best described as middle to upper-income households. Two-thirds of respondents had self-reported annual household income above $80,000, and the other third below $80,000. One-fifth of Black donor respondents reported an annual household income of $200,000 or above.

Most Black donor respondents were employed full-time. Over one-quarter of respondents also reported being self-employed, part-time, and/or retired. Unemployed survey respondents (both those looking and not currently looking for work) were less than 2%, and homemakers and students together comprised nearly 1% of Black donor respondents.
### Education

**What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

Most Black donors were very well educated, as over 80% reported attaining a Bachelor’s or Advanced degree, with half of those respondents earning a Master’s or professional degree. No Black donor respondents reported earning less than a high school degree.

### Income

**In the past 12 months, your household’s income was within the following range:**

40% of Black donors reported annual household incomes of $120,000 or above, compared to Richmond’s 2018 median household income of $49,000.
Employment

What is your current employment status?

Most Black donors were employed full-time, while the unemployed represented less than 2%. Over one-quarter of donors reported being self-employed part-time, retired, and homemakers or students.
Religion

While the landscape of Black giving has significantly changed, the Black church remains an important driver for giving in Greater Richmond. Over three-quarters of Black donors reported attending religious services, mostly at predominantly Black churches. As an interviewee noted, “We give more than anybody because of the amount of money we give to our churches.” Black female donors were more likely to report attending church than males. Higher-income Black donors were slightly less likely than modest-income Black donors to report attending church.

“I grew up in a Baptist church. One of the Bible’s verses above my desk is, “To whom much is given, much is expected.” And, that is how I’ve tried to live my life.”

Do you attend religious services?

If you attend religious service, where do you attend?

Most of Greater Richmond’s survey respondents reported attending religious services, a testament to the central role of Black churches in Greater Richmond’s Black giving landscape.
CATALYZING COMMUNITY GIVING FOR CHANGE
The Greater Richmond region has tremendous assets, but many of its Black city residents face daunting economic hardships. Half of the city’s population earns less than $49,000 and the city’s income inequality ranks 28th in the nation. Given these realities, Black donors’ consensus on the most pressing issues of Greater Richmond’s Black community is important. Across the spectrum of income, education, age and gender, most Black donors ranked economic equity as the most important social issue, followed by educational equity and health equity. (It is worth mentioning that the Giving Black®: Greater Richmond survey was mostly completed before the height of the COVID-19 pandemic.) Economic equity was also ranked first by Black donors who reportedly gave money in two of the three highest donation categories (including $50,000 or more) in the past 12 months.

Ranking the most important social issues facing Black people

Nearly two-thirds of survey respondents ranked economic equity as the most important social issue.

- **ECONOMIC EQUITY – #1** 62%
- **EDUCATIONAL EQUITY – #2** 45%
- **HEALTH EQUITY – #3** 41%
A closer analysis reveals nuances between Black donors of different income levels. Only half of upper income Black donors (those with an annual income of $200,000 or more) ranked economic equity as the top issue, compared to two-thirds of Black donors in the lowest income bracket, a significant difference. Also, Black donors at other income levels mirror the highest-income Black donors’ results. Together, survey findings indicate Black donors’ widespread support for economic equity, but the intensity of that support varies widely with less affluent and younger Black givers more likely to prioritize economic equity based on age and income.

**Ranking the most important social issues facing Black people by income**

*Black donors agree that economic equity is a priority, but intensity of that support varies across income levels.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Economic Equity</th>
<th>Educational Equity</th>
<th>Health Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“When I think of well-being [for the] Black community, to me it means being able to provide the basic needs for your family. For example, Black women still make 64 cents for every dollar earned by White men.”
Most Black donors also ranked economic equity, educational equity and health equity as the most overlooked issues, a ranking that held across different education levels, gender and income classes, except for higher-income Black donors.

Unlike other higher-income Black donors, Black donors at the highest income level (annual household incomes of $250,000 or more) ranked economic equity third, while health and educational equity tied for their top ranking. As an interviewee offered, “I think we’ve got a couple of serious issues here...we got race, but I think we got economic class issues too.” An overwhelming majority of modest-income Black donors ranked economic equity as the top overlooked issue versus a slight majority of the highest income Black donors (58%).

Ranking the most important overlooked social issues facing Black people

*Black donors view economic equity as a priority.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Equity</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Equity</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Equity</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Equity</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Equity</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Equity</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranking the most important overlooked social issues facing Black people by income

Please indicate which critical issues you think are being overlooked or have gone unanswered.

Over 75% of modest income Black donors ranked economic equity as their top “overlooked” issue, compared to slightly over half of Black donors at the highest income level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Economic Equity</th>
<th>Educational Equity</th>
<th>Health Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Black donors believe economic equity is the most important and most overlooked issue. Given their view, do Black donors believe Richmond provides opportunity for economic mobility? Black donors are divided: some agreed, many more remain in the middle, while others disagreed. Black donors with a high school diploma or some higher education were more likely to agree, but Black donors with terminal degrees were less hopeful.

Economic opportunity

Do you think Richmond is a place of economic opportunity for Black people?

- YES: 33%
- MAYBE: 42%
- NO: 18%
- I DON’T KNOW: 7%
One-third of Black donor respondents report an annual household income of $40,000–$79,999. This cohort and the highest-income Black donors were the least likely across all other income groups to agree that Richmond was a place of economic opportunity. One unexpected finding was that Black donors with higher economic and educational success reported feeling less optimistic about Richmond’s prospects for economic opportunity than did younger Black donors.

Economic opportunity by income

**Do you think Richmond is a place of economic opportunity for Black people?**

*Lowest-income Black donors are among the most positive on Richmond as a place of economic opportunity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across city regions (East End, North Side, Southside and West End), Black donors were divided on Richmond’s prospects for economic opportunity, apart from East End Black donors who were more optimistic.

**Economic opportunity by region**

**Do you think Richmond is a place of economic opportunity for Black people?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If most Black donors believe the critical social issues remain unaddressed, particularly now when these issues are so prominent, then Black giving could be affected. Black donors who reported giving at the highest donation level ($50,000 or more) were more likely to donate if they believed their donations improved Black lives. This survey finding underscores the need to demonstrate connectivity between giving and progress, and aligns with an interviewee who believed Black giving was more likely when “there’s a certain confidence that the money is being stewarded to support and impact the lives of Brown and Black people.”

In addition to economic, educational and health equity, Black donors mentioned other overlooked issues of crime and public safety, police brutality, criminal justice reform and voting rights.

**Overlooked social issues facing Black people in the “other” category**

- Aging
- Crime/Public Safety
- Family Support
- Food Markets in Communities
- Girls’ Self-Esteem
- Gun Rights
- Housing
- Mental Health
- Police Brutality
- Prison Reform
- Real Estate
- Voting Rights
- Wealth Management
- Xenophobia
Importance of donations to exclusively Black organizations by income

How important is it to you that your donations go to nonprofit organizations that exclusively address the issues of Black people?

As income levels rise, level of support falls for the idea of donating to nonprofits that exclusively focus on Black issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most upper-income Black donors also supported donating to nonprofits that solely focus on Black needs, but they did so less enthusiastically than did modest-income Black donors.

Most Black donors believed nonprofit organizations and/or initiatives had improved Black lives in Greater Richmond. Forty-two percent of modest income Black donors and a slight majority of higher-income Black donors were also convinced. This is an opportunity to recruit new donors with specific examples of progress.

“...In Richmond there are different segments of the community. Oftentimes, you don’t know what the other is doing or to what extent the other is doing it. And so, if you’re not ‘in’ within certain circles, you don’t have an idea of what’s really going on here.”
Black donors by income on improving the quality of Black lives

Do you think there are specific organizations or initiatives that have improved the quality of life for Blacks in the Greater Richmond area?

Nearly half of all Black donors believe Greater Richmond’s nonprofits improve Black lives, but modest-income ($40,000-$79,000) Black donors were more likely to disagree.

What do you want to be when you grow up? I’ve always said [to my daughter], you want to be a philanthropist… We do this so you can take those next steps.
Views of improved quality of Black lives from those who recently gave money

At least two-thirds of Black donors who contributed between $10,000 and $50,000 believed Greater Richmond’s nonprofits were making a difference in improving Black lives. Eighty percent of Black donors who gave donations between $25,000 and $50,000 believed nonprofits made a difference in improving the quality of Black lives. These survey findings highlight the importance for nonprofits to demonstrate progress and impact for Black giving. An interviewee noted that Black organizations are “making a difference and they’re trying to get their story out on social media...but no one is listening.” Most Black donors believe information on Black-led organizations is accessible, but a significant number disagreed. One possibility, among many, could be these organizations are not telling the most compelling stories or not telling those stories in the right places.

Black organizations, like the Black church and the NAACP, had fallen behind on the art of storytelling during this era of social media, where visibility and accessibility count.

Accessibility of information

At least one-third of Black donors, at every education level and at the highest and lowest income ranges, believed information for Black-led groups was inaccessible. An interviewee suggested that “Black organizations, like the Black church and the NAACP, had fallen behind on the art of storytelling during this era of social media, where visibility and accessibility count.” While younger Black donors use social media, older Black donors rely on Black radio and other community sources for information, as well as mainstream newspapers and television.

The strong takeaway is in order to reach younger Black donors and potential donors, we need to talk to them where they are already listening on social media.
Sources of information

What sources of information do you use most frequently?

Radio, Community and Word of Mouth were Black donors’ top three Black-oriented sources of information.
OUR COMMUNITY: OUR PHILANTHROPY
DONOR DESTINATION AND PHILANTHROPIC GIVING

Most Black donors agreed on the Black community’s pressing and unaddressed needs, and the idea of supporting organizations exclusively focused on Black communities’ needs, and believed Greater Richmond’s nonprofits improved Black lives. But what were the donation destinations of Greater Richmond’s Black donors’ giving?

Unsurprisingly, higher-income Black donors gave higher donations, with $120,000 annual household income serving as an important marker. Below $120,000, donations between $1 and $1,000 were more common and, above $120,000, $1,000 to $5,000 donations. Many Black donors emphasized the importance of giving back to the Black community. As an interviewee noted, “We’ve been in a position where we had to look out for each other...we have to support each other, whether it be financially, whether it be watching each other’s kids or doing a task for the other.” Another interviewee added, “You need to support things that are important to you.” Black donors’ sentiments are reflected in their donation destinations.

Discretionary giving

In the past 12 months, how much did you give philanthropically?

One-quarter of Black donors’ reported donations were at least $5,000 or above.

- $1 – $1,000: 45%
- $1,001 – $5,000: 31%
- $5,001 – $10,000: 12%
- $10,001 – $25,000: 9%
- $25,001 – $50,000: 3%
- $50,001 or more: 1%

Most higher-income Black donors gave larger amounts, between $1,000 to $5,000, and the highest-income Black donors gave between $5,001-$10,000, and a quarter of donations of $25,000 or more. As an interviewee shared, “We’ve always decided that it’s a part of our annual giving. There are certain organizations and causes that we’re going to support and we just think it’s part of giving back.”

Black donors ranked the church as their top donation destination, followed by extended family and friends in need. Across income, gender and education, giving to the church ranked first and was based on longstanding family traditions and values. Greater Richmond’s Black donors had significantly higher rates of church attendance than previous Giving Black® studies in Boston and Cincinnati. Black donors also mentioned donation destinations of direct service agencies and educational institutions, both destinations placing a distant second and third. Several interviewees mentioned their alma maters, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and other educational institutions as donation destinations. An interviewee recalled some of the challenges of an alumni campaign experience. He noted how many assumed that Black alumni would not have discretionary funds and, as a result, they were not targeted. Perhaps in previous cases, Black alumni had chosen other destinations for their giving than their alma maters.
Interestingly, Black donors’ donation destinations did not primarily include Black Cornerstone institutions, which NEBiP defines as traditional civil rights and social justice organizations.

**This is a surprising finding for three reasons:**

1. Black donors strongly support donation destinations that solely focus on Black communities.

2. Most Black donors agree that the top pressing issues of economic, educational and health equity were overlooked and these issues are the focus of many Black Cornerstone organizations.

3. Most Black donors agree that nonprofits were improving Black lives in Greater Richmond.

In the past 12 months, how much did you give philanthropically?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Money Given</th>
<th>$1 – $1,000</th>
<th>$1,001 – $5,000</th>
<th>$5,001 – $10,000</th>
<th>$10,001 – $25,000</th>
<th>$25,001 – $50,000</th>
<th>$50,001 or more</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income</td>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 – $1,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,001 – $5,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,001 – $10,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 – $25,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 – $50,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 or more</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rank the following institutions/organizations/causes that you/your family give to in order of importance. (Organizations that did not rank in the “Top 3”: Advocacy, Arts & Culture, Elections & Other.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations/ Causes</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Direct services agencies</th>
<th>Extended family and friends</th>
<th>Educational institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Donors’ Reported Annual Household Income</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3 – Tied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3 – Tied</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3 – Tied</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil Rights and Social Justice organizations like the NAACP have historically been cornerstones of the Black community. Which organization have you donated money to in the past 12 months?

Over half of Black donors did not give to any of the listed survey choices of Black Cornerstone and other organizations (NAACP, Urban League, Black Lives Matter) nor any other group(s) in the past 12 months.

Donations to Black Cornerstone and other organizations

- NAACP: 19%
- Urban League: 7%
- Black Lives Matter: 6%
- Don’t know: 2%
- Other: 21%
- None: 58%

Donations to Black Cornerstone and other organizations by income

- Less than $40,000: NAACP 33%, Urban League 8%, Black Lives Matter 17%, Don’t know 8%
- $40,000 – $79,999: NAACP 16%, Urban League 6%, Black Lives Matter 5%, Don’t know 2%
- $80,000 – $119,999: NAACP 15%, Urban League 5%, Black Lives Matter 9%, Don’t know 0%
- $120,000 – $159,999: NAACP 25%, Urban League 11%, Black Lives Matter 5%, Don’t know 2%
- $160,000 – $199,999: NAACP 29%, Urban League 13%, Black Lives Matter 6%, Don’t know 3%
Disaggregated by income, nearly two-thirds of higher-income Black donors did not report any of the listed Black Cornerstone or other organizations as a donation destination. Modest-income Black donors were more likely than all other income classes to give to the NAACP in the past 12 months. Most of the older Black donors supported the NAACP, while younger ones did not. Unexpectedly, more millennial Black donors selected the Urban League as a donation destination. Some Black donors opted for different destination donations listed below, but most higher-income Black donors did not select any of the survey’s listing of Black Cornerstone organizations nor any other organization.

Black donors offered reasons for the lack of Black donor donations to Black Cornerstone organizations and other groups. Some Black donors noted they made significant contributions to their church and that programming addressed different Black community needs. An interviewee shared “the NAACP has lost the art of storytelling” and another added that the “NAACP is not as visible as other groups.” Other interviewees noted that with crowdsourcing, people could give directly to an organization instead of funneling monies through organizations like the church or the NAACP. One interviewee explained, “It was becoming more common to run across Black people who had money to donate, but just did not want to give.” Some Black donors mentioned their substantial contributions to their alma maters and to educational fundraisers, such as the United Negro College Fund. One focus group member recalled feeling proud of her ability to contribute a substantial donation to her alma mater, which indicates a level of philanthropic wealth planning and management.

Focus group members remarked that Greater Richmond’s Black donors were only recently at a point of intergenerational wealth transfer and could benefit from financial advisors. Most Black donors reported having a wealth transfer plan, and unsurprisingly, higher-income and older Black donor respondents were more likely to have a plan, although some higher-income Black donors did not. Also, many modest-income Black donors have not considered it, suggesting an opportunity for capacity building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>NAACP</th>
<th>Urban League</th>
<th>Black Lives Matter</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Black philanthropists’ additional donor destinations**

- Astoria Wives Club
- Black Pride RVA
- Church
- Civic Associations
- Community 50/50
- Food Pantries
- Fair Housing
- Fraternal Orders
- HBCUs
- Hospitals
- Minority Businesses
- Museum
- No Left Turn
- Political Campaigns
- Sororities
- UNCF
- Veterans Groups
Wealth transfer by income

Do you have a plan for wealth inheritance or wealth transfer?

As incomes rise, so rises Black donors’ likelihood of having a wealth inheritance plan. Also, one-third of Black donors earning between $80,000 and $249,999 do not have a wealth inheritance plan.

Wealth transfer by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>Never thought about it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z (1995 – 2015)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials (1981 – 1994)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (1965 – 1980)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (1946 – 1964)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad./Silent Gen (1927 – 1945)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.I. Gen (Before 1927)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Black donors expressed different interests in learning about wealth management. Most Black donors ranked the role of charity in wealth management as a top learning priority. The highest-income Black donors ranked learning about pressing social issues as a top priority. Altogether, this represents an opportunity for the philanthropic sector to engage Black donors and build their capacity in philanthropic wealth management.

When it comes to learning more about your discretionary giving, please rank the topic areas of information that interest you, with the most important listed first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Black Donors’ Reported Annual Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of charitable giving in wealth management</td>
<td>#1 – Tied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top social issues in need of funds</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of charitable giving opportunities</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategic family philanthropic plans</td>
<td>#1 – Tied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranking Black donors’ “Top 3” incentives for giving by income

When considering your philanthropic giving, which of the following are incentives to giving?

Please rank in order of importance. The following were not ranked in the “Top 3” giving incentives: Supporting leaders of color in predominantly White organizations; Expanding your social capital and professional network; Participating in corporate or organizational matched fund; Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>Less than $40,000</th>
<th>$40,000 – $79,999</th>
<th>$80,000 – $119,999</th>
<th>$120,000 – $159,999</th>
<th>$160,000 – $199,999</th>
<th>$200,000 – $249,999</th>
<th>$250,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social/family network’s giving patterns</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1 – Tied</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/family network’s personal issues</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1 – Tied</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational affiliation</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1 – Tied</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting leaders of color in organizations of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Black donors ranked the opposition to the Donors’ seeker, politics and giving patterns as top giving barriers.

Ranking Black donors’ “Top 3” barriers for giving by income

When considering your philanthropic giving, which of the following are barriers to giving?

Please rank in order of importance. The following were not ranked in the “Top 3” giving barriers: Not sure where or who to give to; Not asked to give; Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Less than $40,000</th>
<th>$40,000 – $79,999</th>
<th>$80,000 – $119,999</th>
<th>$120,000 – $159,999</th>
<th>$160,000 – $199,999</th>
<th>$200,000 – $249,999</th>
<th>$250,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inensitive to donor’s social viewpoint</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition to social/family network’s giving patterns</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#1 – Tied</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition to social/family network’s personal issues</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#2 – Tied</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of available funds</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#1 – Tied</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that your donation will not be large enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What motivates Black donors’ giving patterns?

A strong theme that emerged was a giver’s family values rooted in the Black church. As one interviewee noted, being philanthropic had to do with “how you were raised” and that people had “an obligation to give back and use the gifts God gave you to help others.” Other Black donors mentioned their parents, who served as their first role models of Black giving. “Following one’s passion” was a theme several interviewees mentioned. Black donors also ranked social and family networks as top influences for their giving. Both the modest and higher-income Black donors ranked social networks’ giving patterns as the top incentive.
TYPES OF BLACK DONORS

NEBiP developed a typology of Black donors to help understand their experiences. The three types of Black donors that emerged from NEBiP’s research include Cornerstone, Kinship and Sanctified.

NEBiP reported that its Black donor typology was useful in understanding its previous research on Black donors in Cincinnati. In the NEBiP Black donor typology, the criteria of donor motivation, giving to single or multiple sectors and the importance of time determines one’s donor types. NEBiP’s typology is useful in that it provides a framework and a benchmark to analyze Black donor behavior.

Which donor type(s) emerged from the Giving Black®: Greater Richmond research?

Survey findings suggest Greater Richmond’s Black donors are more aligned to the Sanctified and Kinship donor types. Their high rates of church attendance support a strong affinity for the Sanctified donor. The church ranked first as a donation destination of Black donors’ discretionary giving in the past 12 months. This finding was true for both women and men, although women gave a higher percentage to the church than men. Interviews and focus groups revealed that for many, giving to the church was motivated by “living out one’s faith.” However, a motivation by faith did not always serve as the primary driver for giving to the church. One interviewee noted that she and her parents regularly gave to a church that she and her family did not regularly attend.

Greater Richmond’s Black donors also fall under the Kinship donor type. Greater Richmond’s Black donors gave to the church and other organizations focusing on improving Black lives. Black donors reported they desired more information on Black-led organizations, preferred directing their donations to initiatives and/or programs that would improve the quality of Black lives in Greater Richmond, and prioritized learning more about top social issues in need of funding to solve pressing social problems. Altogether, the Greater Richmond research finds support for Kinship and Sanctified Black donor types.

Giving Black® donor typology

When considering your philanthropic giving, which of the following incentives motivate your decisions to donate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>Cornerstone</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Sanctified</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation. What motivates you to give money?</td>
<td>General betterment of society</td>
<td>Empowering the Black community (or a subset of the Black community)</td>
<td>Living out my faith</td>
<td>Creating a personal legacy; teaching my children is important, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single or multiple sectors. Would you prefer to develop expertise in a single sector (e.g., the arts or health) or would you prefer to give to multiple sectors?</td>
<td>One sector (two if part of a couple), multiple organizations in that sector</td>
<td>One community, multiple sectors to help that community</td>
<td>Give to a trusted religious institution for their use as they see fit</td>
<td>Children’s school or sports team fundraising; alma mater only, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of time. Is it important that donating your time gets factored into how much money you can give?</td>
<td>Yes – I am getting to the point where my time is more precious than my money.</td>
<td>My time and money are equally valuable. Whatever the community needs, I’m in.</td>
<td>I do what is asked of me by the guidelines of my faith and/or religious institutions.</td>
<td>My time is given instead of my money at this point of my life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEVERAGING OUR LINKAGE
Most Greater Richmond Black donor respondents perceive their well-being as linked to the well-being of other Black individuals, a concept known as “linked fate.” Linked fate is reflected in phrases like “we are in the same boat,” and if you are Black, “what’s good for Black people is good for me.” Higher-income donors perceive greater levels of linked fate than modest-income Black donors. The highest-income Black donors perceived the greatest levels of linked fate. Similarly, Black donors with more formal education perceive greater levels of linked fate.

The following tables reflect how different groupings of Greater Richmond’s Black donors perceive linked fate. In addition to higher income and education, older Black donors who attended church regularly perceive higher levels of linked fate. Among this group, women are more likely to perceive higher levels of linked fate than men. An interviewee explained, “Men were not showing up in the same way women were.” Linked fate could serve as one explanation for this perceived gender difference. Black donors who do not attend church regularly had slightly lower levels of linked fate. Proponents of linked fate would suggest that Blacks who attend church have greater opportunities through their faith to feel connected to others, which could explain higher levels of linked fate.

Linked fate is similar to the idea of group consciousness. This concept was developed by political scientist Michael Dawson to explain whether race or class was more important for understanding Black political behavior, like voting. For example, why do higher-income Blacks vote as Democrats rather than as Republicans – as other high-income voters tend to? Dawson argues race is more influential than class (income) in shaping Black individuals’ life chances and experiences. When a Black person who perceives linked fate votes for President, for example, they

### Linked fate by income

**How much does your overall well-being depend on Black people, as a whole, also doing well?**

*Over 75% of higher income Black donors perceived linked fate and reported perceiving it more intensely than other Black donors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Never thought about it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 – $249,999</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 – $199,999</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 – $159,999</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 – $119,999</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 – $79,999</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will consider whether their vote will help or hurt the Black community, rather than their own individual self-interest. This mental shortcut, considering Blacks’ group interest rather than one’s self-interest, is what Dawson calls a “black utility heuristic.”  

How does linked fate relate to Black giving? NEBiP builds upon Dawson’s linked fate concept and applies it to philanthropy through its Linked Philanthropic Equity (LPE) framework. The LPE framework is prescriptive – it suggests how Black philanthropists should give. The LPE framework posits that Black giving should be more intentional and strategically focused. The LPE framework assumes all system-wide policies and processes are far-reaching and impact all individuals. Because Black individuals are interconnected, and one’s well-being is affected by the well-being of others, Black giving, both individually and collectively, should reflect that reality. It argues that Black philanthropists should primarily support causes and organizations that positively affect the opportunities and outcomes of Black communities. The LPE framework suggests that Black giving should be extended beyond supporting one’s church, immediate family and friends, and one’s alma mater. As such, embracing the LPE framework is embracing a different type of intentionality regarding Black philanthropy.

The survey findings on Greater Richmond’s Black donors and linked fate are interesting. Higher-income Black donors show strong signs of racial solidarity. As previously mentioned, higher-income Black donors had the highest levels of linked fate across all income groups. This suggests that racial identity is more important to higher-income Black donors than their class identity. Higher-income Black donor

### Linked fate by education

*The most educated Black donors were more likely to perceive higher levels of linked fate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Never Thought About It</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Terminal</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school/GED</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The survey findings on Greater Richmond’s Black donors and linked fate are interesting. Higher-income Black donors show strong signs of racial solidarity. As previously mentioned, higher-income Black donors had the highest levels of linked fate across all income groups. This suggests that racial identity is more important to higher-income Black donors than their class identity. Higher-income Black donor...*
interviewees expressed their interconnectedness to modest-income Blacks through the lens of their faith, which for some bordered on charity. One higher-income Black donor framed his Black giving as essential to his upbringing and as an expression of his religious faith. An interviewee mentioned his motivation was based on a biblical proverb, which he kept near; “There, but for the grace of God, go I.” Other interviewees framed Black giving closer to a charity lens, adding their family donated food and clothes to families, particularly during the holiday season. Both perspectives suggest that race is a more prevalent driver for giving than class (income). Also, survey findings reveal that higher-income donors support issues and similar views of modest-income Black donors. For example, both higher- and modest-income Black donors ranked economic equity as the most important and most overlooked issues of Greater Richmond’s Black community. Both higher- and modest-income Black donors supported donating to nonprofits that exclusively focus on Black communities’ needs.

However, higher-income Black donors also show signs revealing increasing differences from modest-income Black donors. Higher-income Black donors ranked economic equity as the third issue priority, while other Black donors ranked economic equity as the top priority. Also, higher-income Black donors were less committed than their modest-income counterparts to donating to organizations that solely focused on Black communities. As to Black giving, higher-income donors were less likely than modest-income Black donors to donate to specific Black Cornerstone and other organizations listed on the survey. More often, interviewees mentioned supporting their alma mater, the United Negro College Fund and specific HBCUs as their donation destinations, rather than traditional civil rights organizations.

**Linked fate by Black donors who recently gave money**

**How much does your overall well-being depend on Black people, as a whole, also doing well?**

*Some Black respondents who donated at higher levels perceive higher levels of linked fate than Black donors who contributed at lower levels.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donated Range</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Never thought about it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 – $1,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,001 – $5,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,001 – $10,000</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 – $25,000</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 – $50,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 or more</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY DOES LINKAGE MATTER

The senseless and tragic murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor and other Black citizens as a result of police violence have catalyzed - both domestically and globally - a renewed activism and dialogue on racial equity, anti-Blackness and the prospects for racial justice. This mobilization, primarily led and sustained by younger generations of activists, has shifted conversations on the continued existence of racial disparities and its impact on the life chances and outcomes for communities of color.

Philanthropy has recalibrated and refocused its attention, conversations and programmatic dollars on racial equity, especially its impact on Black communities. In Greater Richmond, where White supremacy reigned unchecked, a new understanding has taken hold that at least for the moment the remaining vestiges and symbols of White supremacy will no longer be tolerated in public spaces.

Linked fate is relevant for Greater Richmond’s Black donors. As to philanthropy, a key question: Do Black donors use individual self-interest or a Black group-based perspective in their attitudes and behavior of Black giving? NEBiP’s Linked Philanthropic Equity (LPE) details the implications of a mindset whose foundation is undergirded by interconnectedness. It posits that if Black individuals are truly connected to one another and committed to actions that affect their community, then Black giving should reflect that interconnectedness. Embracing a linked fate in this context means that philanthropic giving decisions would be based on whether a decision serves the collective interest of the Black community as a whole, rather than a more narrow interest in one's immediate personal network of family and friends. LPE suggests that monies would be directed to nonprofits that could demonstrate progress and impact in changing the life chances and opportunities of Black communities. The LPE framework suggests disciplined, discretionary giving aimed at eradicating

Linked fate by gender

How much does your overall well-being depend on Black people, as a whole, also doing well?

Black female donors were slightly more likely than male donors to perceive higher levels of linked fate. However, more men reported perceiving linked fate at a higher intensity (“absolutely”) than women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Never thought about it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
systemic inequities in Black communities. This elimination would be more likely to occur if Black philanthropists leveraged a collectivist mindset in Black giving. In practical terms, donation destinations could be shifted beyond one’s alma mater. A key question emerges from the LPE framework for Greater Richmond’s philanthropists: Are the ties that bind the Black community (“linked fate”) strong enough to support a transformative and radical shift in Black discretionary giving? The research and findings in the Greater Richmond giving study strongly suggest that affinity and a sense of linked fate to one another is a critical driving force for Greater Richmond giving.

I’ve been helped by so many people. I can’t help but see the benefit of helping others.

Linked fate by age

How much does your overall well-being depend on Black people, as a whole, also doing well?

Most of the youngest Black donors (Generation Z) had weaker perceptions of linked fate than older donors, indicating some uncertainty exists as to whether the youngest donors believe their well-being is linked to the well-being of the Black community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Never thought about it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z (1995 – 2015)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials (1981 – 1994)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (1965 – 1980)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (1946 – 1964)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad./Silent Gen (1927 – 1945)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.I. Gen (Before 1927)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IT SEEMED LIKE REACHING FOR THE MOON.
BARBARA JOHNS
LINKED TO
OUR FUTURE
The Giving Black®, Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power report provides an in-depth examination of the attitudes, motivations, behaviors, practices and trends of Black philanthropy in Greater Richmond. Its intent is to serve as a resource for those seeking a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of Black giving and its implications for Greater Richmond. The study offers an opportunity to reflect more deeply upon the region’s extensive legacy of Black giving and how that legacy influences current Black philanthropic practices.

Greater Richmond offers an impressive history of Black ingenuity and collective power in the face of challenging circumstances. Even with that legacy, Richmond faces significant obstacles in its journey towards greater social justice and racial equity. In 2018, Richmond was one of only three cities in the state with a poverty rate exceeding 20%. In 2015, Blacks comprised nearly two-thirds of the city’s poor. Also, Richmond had the 28th highest ranking of income inequality in the nation and its median household income of $49,000 ranked below state and national averages. According to 2018 figures from the Economic Policy Institute, the median wealth was $17,000 for Richmond’s Black households and $171,000 for White households. Richmond’s redlining practices of the early to mid-20th century (now unlawful under federal fair lending laws) continue to undermine strategies to increase wealth associated with home ownership in the city’s Black communities.

However, Richmond offers several assets to leverage in moving forward. Its poverty rate and median household income are trending positively: The city’s poverty rate dropped while median household income increased in 2018. That same year, Forbes magazine ranked Richmond 10th among all U.S. cities as one of the best places for Blacks to live. Another asset is Richmond’s well-regarded universities and colleges, with the University of Richmond ranking #22 among national liberal arts colleges. Black Richmond’s personal and social networks can also serve as assets. NEBiP offers two frameworks - its Black Donor typology and the Linked Philanthropic Equity (LPE) framework - as tools to deepen the conversation, analysis and strategy surrounding Black philanthropic giving, as well as offering a pathway forward. The Black Donor typology offers a means to examine more systematically the commonalities and differences between Black donors, moving beyond anecdotal observations. Survey findings suggest the Sanctified donor typology captures the motivation and giving practices of many Greater Richmond Black donors, who were motivated by “living out their faith,” instilled from their upbringing and sustained throughout their lives. We also found support for a melding of the Sanctified and Kinship donors. These Black donors were motivated by their faith and empowering multiple subsets of the Black community, often relying on their personal and social networks.

Greater Richmond’s Black communities established a practice of helping those in need. Richmond, an upper South city, was “down where the South begins,” as minister Gordon Blaine Hancock of Virginia Union University brilliantly noted. Richmond’s Black communities faced racial oppression during slavery, Jim Crow and the pre-Civil Rights era, and the consequences of that longstanding legacy still impact Greater Richmond’s Black communities. Despite daunting circumstances, Black Richmonders leveraged opportunities for giving, relying upon their personal assets, ingenuity and use of their collective power to affect positive change. The legacy of Richmond’s traditions of Black giving were evident from the surveys, focus groups and one-on-one interviews, all of which served to reinforce the generosity of Black Richmonders who gave and continue to give their time, talent and treasure. NEBiP recommendations are offered in the spirit of aligning respondents’ expressed support for Black giving with a sense that their philanthropy is truly making a difference in the lives of the Black community of Richmond.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Giving Black®: Greater Richmond provides a historic framework for understanding The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power in Greater Richmond, but its relevance goes beyond communities of color to the Greater Richmond region overall. By engaging over 600 people in the initiative, we have hopefully identified a new path forward that will include a broader focus for Giving Black® that will include creatives, younger donors and people who give time, talent, ties and testimonies to improve equity in Greater Richmond. NEBiP’s recommendations are offered in the spirit of aligning the insight and wisdom of Black donors.

We offer the following recommendations:

1. Increase and raise the visibility and participation of Black donors in community philanthropy

Many Black donors were surprised by the study and had to pause to articulate the impact of Black philanthropy. Supporting the leadership and raising the visibility of Black philanthropists will help to improve the conditions and outcomes of Black communities. Interviews and focus group participants emphasized how some Black donors, despite engaging in philanthropic activities, refrain from the use of the term philanthropy, because it is misunderstood or a term not used as often in the Black community. Other Black donors noted the discounting and undervaluation of their philanthropic contributions and thereby do not feel as if they are truly integrated into the philanthropic community. Shifting the narrative to promote the reality of Greater Richmond’s community of philanthropists, particularly Black philanthropists, is an important step in moving from a mindset of charity to equity.

2. Build upon the momentum of Giving Black®: Greater Richmond to strengthen Black donor networks and connections

Greater Richmond’s Black philanthropists have long been engaged in promoting the legacy of Black giving, particularly during Black Philanthropy Month in August, but awareness of this legacy is only partly familiar to younger Black donors or Black donors who may not be in a preexisting affinity group. The legacy of Black donors of Greater Richmond needs to be more broadly embraced and promoted as fundamental to the Black experience throughout Greater Richmond’s history. The city and region host many excellent events and exhibits, including last year’s recognition of the 400th anniversary of slavery. Incorporating younger donors and potential donors into this legacy would be beneficial to the overall goal of recognizing and promoting Black philanthropy.

3. Engage, support, promote, and increase the leadership of younger Black philanthropists

Younger Black philanthropists are now driving renewed activism on racial equity and justice. Understanding their perspectives and interests is key to cultivating the region’s present and future generation of Black donors. During interviews and focus groups, Millennial donors expressed their feelings that older people were not taking them seriously. Survey findings revealed preliminary signs of disaffection from the youngest cohort of Black donors – Generation Z. They were less likely to believe in linked fate, less likely to support some of the Black Cornerstone groups and to believe that Greater Richmond’s nonprofits had improved Black lives. Their greater reliance on social media for information and fundraising represents a shift in the Black giving landscape. There should be an increase in supporting opportunities for promoting their leadership while appreciating their perspective on priorities and strategies Black communities should pursue in a non-patronizing manner. In addition, ensuring that their understanding and connection to the legacy of Black giving that their activism rests upon, is key to successfully cultivating them to build a future pipeline of Black donors and activists.

4. Offer tools, resources and capacity building opportunities to increase knowledge in philanthropic wealth management

Given the persistence of the racial economic, and wealth gap, in the Richmond region, it is important to offer and support
opportunities for learning and capacity building for Greater Richmond’s Black donors. The study has noted that Black donors could benefit from the services of a philanthropic wealth seminar that understands the nuances of Black culture and communities. All Black donors, even donors of modest incomes, were most interested in developing strategic family philanthropic plans, while higher-income donors were interested in the role of equity in wealth management. Tailoring learning opportunities towards different segments of the Black donor community could more effectively build capacity in these communities.

5 Build a cross-sector network of Black donors, thought leaders and nonprofits to embrace and promote the success of nonprofits that improve Black lives

While most Black donors believed Greater Richmond nonprofits improved Black lives, some were uncertain or disagreed. Recent studies and the Black donor interviewees reveal the challenges that Black-led organizations face, including increased scrutiny by funders about Black-led organizations’ financial competence. This network could prove useful in cultivating additional Black donors and other sources of support. As survey findings reveal, Black donors who reportedly gave at the highest levels were more likely to believe that organizations and initiatives had improved Black lives.

6 Increase, promote, and involve Black donors in increasing economic equity and well-being for Black communities and other issues that disproportionately affect Black communities

Black donors ranked economic equity as the top priority for Greater Richmond’s Black community. Economic equity serves as an overarching theme for several key economic issues and should be more fully examined and understood for its meaning and importance to specific groups within the Black community. Also, the study revealed that economic improvements prioritized by Black donors of different income levels should be considered. The region’s philanthropic community should sponsor opportunities for Black communities to operationalize their goals and priorities.

7 Amplify and map Black-led organizations and assist in building better bridges to Black communities to increase investments in racial and social justice work

A landscape analysis and mapping is important to establish a current understanding of the distribution of programming dollars dedicated towards racial equity and social justice in the region. A recent National Committee on Responsive Philanthropy study reported the underfunding of community foundations’ programmatic dollars targeted towards Black communities.

8 Set the narrative straight by articulating Greater Richmond’s Black philanthropy story

As this report amplifies, the history of Black philanthropy in Richmond is largely untold in part because that history is typically told by White witnesses, not Black ones. This is particularly true for Black women, who figure prominently in Richmond’s story about Black philanthropy. History is not just about what happened, but who stepped up and told the story about what happened. The opportunity to tell the modern version of this story has likely never been better timed. And these stories need to be told now as a rising generation of Black donors, particularly Black women, step into a new age of social and racial advocacy to confront injustice, police violence and a deepening racial divide in this country. Now is the time to tell this story, here in Greater Richmond and across the country, as more Americans step in and ask the question – What can I personally do to support justice?
The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power report provides an opportunity to elevate the rich historic tradition of Black giving in Greater Richmond, a legacy that is the foundation of current Black philanthropy. The study’s intent is to offer insight on the attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, practices and current trends of Greater Richmond’s Black philanthropic giving.

There are many voices that can tell the story about Black philanthropy in Greater Richmond, but many of those voices, now recorded in history, are those of Black women whose accomplishments during slavery and Jim Crow were extraordinary. The role that these women played was against every societal norm at the time. They were the Black women fighting oppression and pushing for equity on multiple fronts. But they were not to be denied and their struggle and determination may be the biggest story that has barely been told.

There is no shortage of misperceptions and myths that perpetuate a false narrative on the very existence, intent and capacity of Black philanthropists. Our remedy should be to counter false narratives and myths with data and evidence, including showcasing the very people who make up this cohort. In recent years, greater interest and attention has been focused on Black giving traditions, including Black donors and giving circles. Much of this attention was fueled by Black philanthropists in the giving circle community, as well as by the 2012 W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s study on Black giving circles. Recent articles in the Chronicle of Philanthropy stand as testament to a newfound and burgeoning interest in Black donors. Many of these pieces approach Black donors from the viewpoint of donor cultivation to identify and attract Black donors. Our task is different as we seek to offer insights on Black donor views and behaviors to identify prescriptive strategies for the Greater Richmond philanthropic community, with the objective of improving the opportunities and quality of life for its Black communities.

The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond study provides a crucial perspective in highlighting the important role that Black philanthropy plays in our region and illuminates the necessary conditions, contexts and capital investments for transforming philanthropy in Black communities. The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond study establishes a framework for broadening the appeal to Black donors and potential new donors. Additional interviews and focus groups will continue throughout 2021 to further inform this work.

NEBiP is dedicated to countering the discounting, devaluation and underappreciation of Black philanthropists. We offer tools, such as the Black Donor typology and Linked Philanthropic Equity framework, to guide conversations with deeper analysis on the current and future status of Black philanthropy. With appreciation, NEBiP trusts the Giving Black®: Greater Richmond, The Legacy of Black Ingenuity & Collective Power study will move the Greater Richmond community forward in its racial equity journey.
The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond survey represents the culmination of an 18-month collaborative process between NEBiP and three leading philanthropic entities of Greater Richmond: SisterFund, Ujima Legacy Fund and the Community Foundation for a greater Richmond. The purpose of Giving Black®: Greater Richmond is to offer an in-depth examination of the beliefs, motivations, behaviors and trends of a sub-sample of Greater Richmond’s Black philanthropic community.

This study offers baseline data and insight on Greater Richmond’s Black philanthropic community to inform conversations about its past legacy, current state and future. We trust this report will be useful to the survey’s sponsors, partners, advisors and the region’s broader philanthropic community and public.

METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW

The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond survey instrument was developed and administered by NEBiP only. The survey design built upon two previous NEBiP Giving Black surveys in Boston and Cincinnati. SisterFund, Ujima Legacy Fund and the Community Foundation for a greater Richmond disseminated the survey. Nearly 600 individuals from the Greater Richmond area accessed the survey online, with 356 completed survey responses. Survey respondents who self-reported a racial identification of African descent were included in the analysis. Survey data collection began in January 2020 and closed in April 2020.

The Giving Black®: Greater Richmond study used quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Quantitatively, findings rely on the 356 completed survey responses. Survey administration lasted approximately 30 minutes and consisted of 58 closed and open-ended questions. Qualitatively, the study used a snowball sampling of Black donors in the Greater Richmond region, including one-on-one interviews and focus groups.

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

Twenty-five, 90-minute one-on-one interviews and four focus groups involving a total of 28 people were conducted with Greater Richmond Black donors, including higher-income donors. These interviews began in March 2020 and concluded in late September 2020. Interviewees and focus group participants reflected a diversity in gender and age, ranging from Millennials to Baby Boomers. The majority had obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher, with reported annual household incomes above $100,000. NEBiP developed a semi-structured interview protocol for the focus groups and one-on-one interviews. Focus groups and interview topics varied depending on participants’ responses. Examples of common themes include definitions of philanthropy and motivations for Black giving. Participants were recruited with the assistance of SisterFund, Ujima Legacy Fund and the Community Foundation for a greater Richmond. Each interview or focus group was recorded after obtaining the participants’ consent, with each session lasting approximately 90 minutes. Participants were provided the option to participate anonymously or provide consent for self-identifying information included in the public report. Qualitative data was coded using HyperRESEARCH and Microsoft Excel software.

Survey respondents were mostly comprised of well-educated, Black women, who were employed full-time and living in middle to upper middle-class neighborhoods. Over half (55%) of survey respondents resided in Richmond city proper, with nearly half (45%) in the city’s Southside region. The remaining survey respondents lived in various localities of Greater Richmond. Nearly two-thirds of survey respondents reported annual household incomes above $80,000.

Survey findings are statistically significant at a 95% confidence level (meaning less than a 5% probability that the result was due to chance). Statistical significance is a term used to describe results that are unlikely to have occurred by chance and states the level of certainty that a different or important relationship exists.
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ENDNOTES


3 Alpine W. Jefferson, Foreword to Jack Trammell, Richmond Slave Trade, pp. 7-8; Lumpkin’s Jail, slave trader Robert Lumpkin’s notorious slave holding pen to confine enslaved Blacks until they were sold, was located only three blocks from the state’s capitol. Nicknamed “Devil’s Acre” for its horrific conditions, Lumpkin’s Jail is currently the site of Virginia Union University’s campus. Trammell, Richmond Slave Trade, 9.


6 Midori Takagi, Rearing Wolves To Our Own Destruction: Slavery in Richmond, Virginia, 1782-1865 (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 102.

7 The First African Baptist Church was originally organized in 1787 as the First Baptist Church, which had a biracial congregation. Free and enslaved Black Richmonders were drawn to its white ministers’ sermons on individual salvation. First African Baptist was established in 1841 after its White members left because its Black congregants greatly outnumbered them. Belsches, Richmond Virginia, 9.


9 Belsches, Richmond Virginia, 11.

10 Takagi, Rearing Wolves, 51.


12 Post-Civil War philanthropy is often associated with northern White philanthropic organizations, such as the American Missionary Society and other groups, who worked jointly with the Freedmen’s Bureau to assist the newly freed Black population. This perspective minimizes the early Black giving efforts of Black Richmonders to establish a public school system for Black children. Hilary Green, “Remaking the Former Confederate Capital: Black Richmonders and the Transition to Public Schools, 1865-1870,” In Educational Reconstruction: African American Schools in the Urban South, 1865-1890 (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016), 16.

13 Rachleff, Black Labor in Richmond, 25.


16 The True Reformers focused on “good morals, taking care of the sick, orphans and widows.” Browne abandoned this philanthropic origin, even though temperance societies were the most popular among Richmonders. His move served to alienate original members, even as True Reformers were adding tens of thousands of new members. Its evolution from a benevolent charitable group to an economic empire also revealed class tensions, as it moved further from its original charitable purpose. James D. Watkinson, “Washington Browne and the True Reformers of Richmond, Virginia,” The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 97, no. 3 (1989): 382.

19 Garrett-Scott, Banking on Freedom, 54-56.
20 In the decade before the Civil War, Greater Richmond’s Black businesses rapidly expanded, but only briefly, as their gains were eliminated by the Civil War. Black businesses in Petersburg and Richmond, which had 10% of the state’s free Black population, contained 22% of the state’s Black-owned businesses. Loren Schweninger, “The Roots of Enterprise: Black-Owned Businesses in Virginia, 1830-1880,” The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 100, no. 4 (1992): 522; Belsches, Richmond Virginia, 10.
21 Although the professional businesses were disappearing by the 1930s, Jackson Ward’s businesses in personal services still attracted Richmond’s Black residents. Belsches, Richmond Virginia, 2.
27 Blog, Posted by Abby Rolland, “African Americans have been philanthropists from day one,” August 27, 2018, www.blog.philanthropy.iupui.edu/2018/08/27/Blacks-have-been-philanthropists-from-day-one/
32 Dawson, Behind the Mule, 1994. Other races and ethnicities perceive linked fate, including individuals who share the same gender, religion and class. However, unlike Blacks, their perceptions of linked fate do not influence their attitudes or behavior.