Next Gen Donor Learning

Lessons for Effective Programs from Houston and the Field

GREATER HOUSTON COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

Dorothy A. Johnson Center FOR PHILANTHROPY

21/64

Report written by:

Michael Moody
Frey Foundation Chair for Family Philanthropy
Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy
Grand Valley State University

Robyn Schein
Senior Director
21/64, Inc

Holly Honig
Graduate Assistant
Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy
Grand Valley State University

Acknowledgments

This report was made possible through funding provided by Greater Houston Community Foundation and by Ben S. Brown, Ann and Peter Fluor, Jerry C. Dearing Family Foundation, Lacey and Matt Goossen, Kelly Hackett and Molly Hackett LaFauci, Maureen and Jim Hackett, Elise E. and Russell C. Joseph, Mandy and William Kao, Jennifer and Chris Laporte, Barry, Rosalyn, and Leslie Margolis, Caren and Rob Sweetland, Chris Weekley, and Randa and K.C. Weiner. We are also grateful for support from the Frey Foundation, Kate and Richard Wolters Foundation, Max M. and Marjorie S. Fisher Foundation, F. Martin and Dorothy A. Johnson Family Fund, Raikes Foundation, and Arts, Equity, and Education Fund. Special thanks to Jennifer Touchet, Annie Hurwitz, and Allison Hale at Greater Houston Community Foundation for invaluable assistance throughout the research process and detailed comments on this report. Thanks also to the next gen donors, youth, and families who participated in the research, and to other staff and leaders of the Foundation for supporting this work. The authors are grateful to Annie Hernandez for expert insight and research assistance, and to Sharna Goldseker for editorial suggestions.

Published April 2022

Designed by Laurie Fink

The Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy

The Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy at Grand Valley State University was established in 1992 with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. We put research to work with and for professionals across the country and the world. Through professional education offerings; research, evaluation, and consulting services; and bold thinking to advance the field, we support a philanthropic ecosystem defined by effective philanthropy, strong nonprofits, and informed community change.

Dorothy A. Johnson Center
FOR PHILANTHROPY

Contact

Michael Moody, Ph.D.
Frey Foundation Chair for Family Philanthropy
moodym@gvsu.edu
616-331-9032
johnsoncenter.org

Greater Houston Community Foundation

Since 1995, Greater Houston Community Foundation has helped Houston thrive by convening philanthropic resources and knowledge to drive philanthropy in our community, distributing over $1.73 billion in grants over the past 26 years. Through various charitable vehicles, including donor advised funds, the Foundation partners with donors to meet their objectives by supporting grant making, including providing programming, advising and educational opportunities for donors to maximize their philanthropic impact.

Greater Houston Community Foundation is widely considered to be the go-to partner for high-profile philanthropic partnerships in the Greater Houston area. The Foundation leads collaborations that support the wellbeing and vitality of Houston including Understanding Houston, a regional indicators partnership with the Kinder Institute for Urban Research that provides key data for philanthropists, business and nonprofit leaders, to drive decision-making in important areas of investment in Houston including economic opportunity, housing and education.

GREATER HOUSTON COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

Contact

Jennifer Touchet
Vice President of Personal & Family Philanthropy
jtouchet@ghcf.org
713-333-2228
ghcf.org

21/64

Established in 2002, 21/64 is an independent 501c3 nonprofit practice providing multigenerational advising, facilitation and training for next generation engagement, especially within family philanthropy and other family enterprises. We specialize in serving families with funds, foundations or other family enterprises as well as wealth and philanthropy advisors—so that multiple generations can work, give and serve together more effectively.

21/64

Contact

Robyn Schein
Senior Director
Sharna Goldseker
Founder & Vice President
info@2164.net
332-910-9146
2164.net

Executive Summary

The Future of Philanthropy – and Its Impact – Depends on Next Gen Donor Learning

It is not an overstatement to say that the future of philanthropy as a whole, let alone the future of most every nonprofit organization and cause, will be shaped in profound ways by the emerging group of "next gen donors." Major donors from Gen X and later generations will have an historic amount of resources to give, are eager to be active in giving throughout their lives, want to experiment, and are in the stage of life right now where they are crafting their philanthropic identities, discovering what kind of donors they want to be and trying to learn how to become those donors.

The developmental path that a donor takes has a huge influence on their subsequent giving, as well as on their family, and on every cause, organization, and community they partner with over a lifetime. The experiences that these next gen donors have on their learning journeys will have massive consequences for them ***and*** for all of us.

Everyone involved in philanthropy needs to do a better job of helping these rising, powerful major donors become the kind of informed, strategic, committed donors we all need them to be. This report seeks to help the field do better in guiding these essential next gen donor learning journeys by offering guidance on designing effective programs for them.

We identify here some core questions facing any next gen donor learning effort, and we offer "good practice" recommendations for tackling each question. Our assessments and recommendations are based in part on a review of other such programs as well as our experiences facilitating next gen donor learning. But the primary evidence comes from an in-depth case study we conducted of ten years of next gen donor engagement and learning at Greater Houston Community Foundation.

Greater Houston Community Foundation has worked to build learning programs to engage and advise next gen donors over many years, and their suite of programs are now one of the most comprehensive, intensive, and respected in the country. Their programs include a Next Gen Donor Institute, various giving circles including one involving and led by youth, multigenerational family engagements, and more. To evaluate the Foundation's years of next gen-focused work, the Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy, in close collaboration with 21/64, conducted an intensive evaluation, including surveys of program alumni, dozens of in-depth interviews and a focus group, and review of other data.

The experiences of this large community foundation in Houston, as well as examples from other institutions, are used here to identify the challenges facing any such program for next gen donor philanthropic development, and to offer practical guidance for addressing those challenges. We expect this to be broadly useful to other community foundations, multigenerational donor families, advisors, peer networks, nonprofits, and other organizations supporting and engaging next gen donors.

Six Big Questions When Designing a Next Gen Donor Learning Program

1. What Would "Success" Look Like and What Are the Intended Impacts?

It is not uncommon for the intended impacts of a program, or the ideal definition of "success," to be either undefined, vague, or assumed instead of explicitly stated. Yet there are several great reasons to be explicit about intended successes and impacts.

GOOD PRACTICES INCLUDE:

- Define success and intended impacts using an inclusive, transparent process involving diverse stakeholders.
- Address head-on the question of how to find the right mix of benefits for donors, causes, and community.
- Commit to measuring your defined goals and impacts and building feedback mechanisms.

2. Who Is the Audience and Where Are They in Their Journey?

Ask yourself, "What do we mean by 'next gen?'" Clearly age is one criterion, but other aspects of your ideal participants' identities should also be considered including level of experience and family situation. Specifying the audience also raises crucial questions of diversity and inclusion.

GOOD PRACTICES INCLUDE:

- Clarify your intended audience for the program, and answer "why them?"
- Design content and format, outreach and recruitment, with this specific audience in mind.
- Be explicit about which aspects of diversity you seek for the program's goal.
- If the program will involve youth, designate the youth space as distinct and meaningful.

3. What Do the Next Gen Donors Want or Need to Learn?

This might seem to some like the simplest aspect of creating a program, but the range of choices can be overwhelming. And the process of listening to feedback and adjusting to the changing landscape of philanthropy will complicate this even further.

GOOD PRACTICES INCLUDE:

- Separate different types of content into different programs or stages to meet the learning needs of both novice and experienced donors.
- Seek help in crafting the curriculum from myriad resources in the field on donor learning.
- Include identity development as part of the content, not just facts or technical knowledge.

4. How Do These Donors Learn Best?

Research has shown that, while traditional instruction has its place, next gen donors usually prefer experiential and peer learning the most. In fact, they are eager for the opportunity to learn in these ways. But facilitating this sort of learning presents distinct challenges.

GOOD PRACTICES INCLUDE:

- Ask and listen to next gen donor participants, then adapt.
- Proactively seek input from youth donors especially. They are particularly eager to be heard, to step into leadership roles, and have unique perspectives to share and learn from.
- Create a “brave space” for diverse peer learning, one that allows for candid dialogue and personal growth.

5. How Can the Donors Stay Engaged and Implement Their Philanthropic Plans Over Time?

Donor learning is indeed a “journey,” one that continues past a one-time program. Keeping next gen donors active in philanthropy and programming is a challenge, but is essential as they hone their skills, evolve and improve their approach, and deepen their sense of identity as a donor.

GOOD PRACTICES INCLUDE:

- Feature examples of donors who have stayed active, committed to advanced learning, and found ways to implement their giving plan.
- Find ways to keep next gen donors engaged with a peer cohort over time.
- Develop coaching/mentoring programs, and multigenerational family programs to keep donors engaged and on track with their philanthropic plans.

6. What Will This Cost and Who Will Pay?

The reality is that these sorts of programs can be quite expensive, especially in terms of staff time and other organizational resources. They usually end up costing more than people estimate when getting started.

GOOD PRACTICES INCLUDE:

- Estimate honestly the actual or "true" costs of the programs, including more intangible or unexpected costs such as the professional development for staff critical for success.
- Actively look for potential underwriting donors, especially among those who have seen first-hand the benefits of next gen donor learning in their family or community.

Creating and continually improving programs to inspire and guide the learning journeys of the emerging group of next gen donors is vital to the future of philanthropy. The case of Greater Houston Community Foundation's programming, as well as other examples, demonstrate how such programs can have tangible, cascading impacts. But any organization attempting a similar program – using the advice and good practices outlined here – must be willing to go on their own learning journey, to reflect and adapt over time. Doing so will benefit not just you, but all of us who need philanthropy to thrive.

The Future of Philanthropy – and Its Impact – Depends on Next Gen Donor Learning

In their book, *Generation Impact: How Next Gen Donors Are Revolutionizing Philanthropy*, Sharna Goldseker and Michael Moody make the somewhat grandiose claim that "next gen donors" are in the process of becoming the "most significant donors ever" (p.3). But there are a lot of reasons why this is the case. For one thing, major donors from Gen X and later generations will have an historic amount of resources to give – both because of the vast wealth transfer happening right now, and because of the continuing trend of considerable wealth creation at younger ages. Also, these rising donors are not content to wait until retirement to focus on philanthropy. They are eager to be active in giving throughout their lives, and will give more over time because of this. Finally, they are coming into philanthropy at a time of rapid innovation in the field, and they want to push that experimentation even further and faster if that will lead to more actual change on the issues they care about.

So it is not an overstatement to say that the future of philanthropy as a whole, let alone the future of most every nonprofit organization and cause, will be shaped in profound ways by this emerging group of next gen donors. And to make the situation even more urgent, these donors are in the stage of life right now where they are crafting their philanthropic identities, figuring out what kind of donors they want to be and trying to learn how to become those donors. In fact, they are impatient for opportunities to learn, and are looking for those who can help them in their crucial "becoming" stages.

The experiences that these next gen donors have on their learning journeys, then, will have massive consequences for them and for all of us. The developmental path that a donor takes has a huge influence on their subsequent giving. How and what they learn affects their issue choices, their giving strategies, their assessment skills, their decision-making process, their satisfaction from giving, and ultimately, their impact and effectiveness. Consider, for example, how some of those getting started in giving as youth or young adults grew up in a relative bubble, isolated from much contact with the very social problems that they will, as donors, look to solve. A learning path that gets them out of this bubble, meeting people and issues they haven't normally encountered, can influence a lifetime of subsequent giving.

A donor's journey can have a ripple effect on multiple generations of their family, on the organizations they partner with, and ultimately on every cause and community they support over a lifetime of giving.

A donor's journey affects more than just that individual donor, though. It can have a ripple effect on multiple generations of their family, on the organizations they partner with, and ultimately on every cause and community they support over a lifetime of giving. Indeed, in the end we can all benefit from having a group of thoughtful, informed, and activated next gen donors – especially given how much power we know they will have in the decades to come.

However, as these rising donors are looking for critical help and learning opportunities in this crucial stage of their development, they can become overwhelmed and frustrated. While there is no shortage of resources available – just a click away – telling donors how best to give, these resources do not give next gen donors what they need most at this stage. Next gen donors have told us repeatedly that they need guidance in helping sort through and curate such advice. They also crave peer interactions to learn what is working for others in the same position. They want to learn in ways that fit their generation and where they are on their own path. Yet despite how essential next gen learning journeys are, we don't always do a good job as a field enabling those journeys. And as a result, many next gen donors end up giving in ad hoc, disjointed ways that are both unsatisfying to them and unhelpful to causes and communities.

To do a better job, the philanthropic field needs to know much more than we do now about how next gen donors learn, the challenges they face and questions they have, and how best to assist them in this process. To be frank, the future of philanthropy depends on improving how we help these rising, powerful major donors become the kind of informed, strategic, committed donors we all need them to be, if they are to have the sort of social impact we all need them to have. That is our purpose in this report.

> The future of philanthropy depends on improving how we help these rising, powerful major donors become the kind of informed, strategic, committed donors we all need them to be, if they are to have the sort of social impact we all need them to have.

We identify here some core questions facing any effort to ignite and guide next gen donor learning, and we offer "good practice" recommendations for tackling each question. Our assessments and recommendations are based on an in-depth case study we conducted of ten years of next gen donor engagement and learning at Greater Houston Community Foundation, as well as a review of other such programs across the U.S. and Canada and our personal and organizational experiences facilitating next gen donor learning.

We expect that this information and these recommendations are broadly useful to anyone with an interest or stake in facilitating next gen donor learning and engagement, especially those assisting families giving together across generations. This includes:

- Community foundations engaging and serving new next gen donors as well as existing donor families.
- Donor families, and those who work with them, looking to bring the family's next gen into their giving, whatever the vehicle (i.e., foundation, donor-advised fund, or others).

- Advisors of all sorts helping donors and families with their giving, including philanthropic advisors, wealth and financial advisors, and others.

- Peer networks and other collaboratives involving next gen donors in a collective process of learning and/or giving together.

- Philanthropy support organizations and other membership groups, at both a local and national (or international) level, providing learning opportunities and resources to rising next gen donors.

- Community leadership programs looking to build a cohort of engaged next gen philanthropic leaders in their community for the long-term.

- Nonprofits and fundraisers seeking to help their donors, or potential donors, become more strategic, passionate, and reflective funders of their cause.

We believe helping all these groups, and other potential users of this material, is both important and feasible – in part because the next generations are keen to find opportunities for learning. They are enthusiastic about becoming better donors, and they are looking to do so right now. They carry a sense of urgency to make change, and seeking guidance at this crucial time. Again, it is not overly dramatic to say that the future of philanthropy hinges on the quality of the learning journeys of these emerging next gen donors.

Unique Insights From Houston and the Field

Greater Houston Community Foundation ("the Foundation") has diligently and intentionally worked to build learning programs to engage and advise next gen donors over many years, and their suite of programs are now one of the most comprehensive, intensive, and respected in the country. However, they started this work knowing that most of the benefits from it – for donors, for the Foundation, or for Houston – wouldn't be realized in the short-term, something likely true of most others who are starting or considering next gen education programs.

In response to suggestions and input from their donor families, Greater Houston Community Foundation began their next gen efforts in 2011 with the creation of an annual program now called the Next Gen Donor Institute (NGDI). NGDI brings together a peer cohort of young (mid-20s through early-40s) individuals, most of whom are just beginning to be more active in giving. Most participants are part of a multi-generational philanthropic family, but about a quarter have themselves created the wealth they are often just starting to give. The NGDI curriculum was designed after extensive research on field resources and consulting from national experts such as 21/64 and others. It involves a series of learning and reflection sessions in which donors explore their philanthropic identity, learn grantmaking basics such as how to read a 990, and develop a personalized giving plan. The program also includes individual philanthropic advising and mentoring provided by one of the Foundation's staff advisors.

After completing the NGDI, participants are invited to join a Next Gen Giving Circle to implement what they have learned with their peers, and to continue to hone their own philanthropic strategy. The giving circle also extends their education as donors, as they learn about their city and community, about social issues, about the local nonprofit ecosystem, and more. The idea is to welcome alumni into the Foundation's donor community and offer them a range of engagement opportunities – even if they do not have a fund housed at the community foundation. Some of the next gen donors become deeply involved over many years, and eventually become known in town for their local knowledge and grantmaking expertise.

> Efforts by Greater Houston Community Foundation focus not just on encouraging next gen donors and families to give, but also on enabling and guiding each donor's learning journey, and supporting peer networks of next gen donors to learn, grow, and give together.

Based on the success of NGDI and the giving circle, Greater Houston Community Foundation developed other next gen and family education and engagement programs and created a Center for Family Philanthropy to guide this work. Many of their programming choices have continued to be made using active input from Foundation donors, including many who sit on the Center's advisory board, and/or the Foundation's overall governing board. For example, at the urging of early Next Gen Donor Institute alumni, the Foundation created in 2019 another collaborative giving opportunity, the Gen Impact Fund, to allow more advanced next gen donors to give together at higher levels, over a longer period of time (multiple years), and with deeper learning focused on one issue area (e.g., childhood poverty).

To engage even younger members of donor families, the Foundation inaugurated in 2016 an annual Family Philanthropy Day for families to volunteer and learn together, and they devised a Family Giving Circle to be led by high-school-aged youth. These youth leaders of the Circle not only decide on their issue focus and grant decisions each year, but facilitate the Circle's activities themselves, with staff guidance.

Taken together, these efforts by Greater Houston Community Foundation focus not just on encouraging next gen donors and families to give, but also on enabling and guiding each donor's learning journey, and supporting peer networks of next gen donors to learn, grow, and give together.

To evaluate their ten years of next gen-focused work, and make recommendations for the future, the Foundation brought in the Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy (JCP) – a university-based center that seeks to understand, strengthen, and advance philanthropy through applied research, professional education, and thought leadership. JCP collaborated closely in this analysis with 21/64, a nonprofit practice providing multigenerational advising, facilitation, and training for next generation engagement – and a past partner with the Foundation in the initial

What Does "Next Gen" Mean?

The term "next gen" can mean different things for different audiences looking to help these next gen donors along their learning paths. We also know that each generation has distinctive features, including how they think about doing good in the world, how they prefer to be engaged with peers and organizations, where they go for information, and so on.

To be clear, the participants in Greater Houston Community Foundations main Next Gen Donor Institute are mostly Millennials (born between 1981-1996), though some would be considered young Gen Xers (born between 1965-1980). The youth involved in the Family Giving Circle are all from what is generally being called "Gen Z" (born between 1997-2012). While we are just starting to learn the generational personality of Gen Z, we know quite a bit about Millennials – e.g., they believe they can and should change the world, especially by trying out new ideas and working hands-on with peers.

Any effort to work closely with the "next gen" and facilitate their donor learning journeys needs to be aware of which "gen" is the focus of that effort, and needs to fit programming to the known preferences of that group as much as possible.

development of its programs. An expert on youth philanthropy who was also already familiar with the Foundation's work, Dr. Andrea Hernandez Rodriguez of Growing Giving LLC, advised the assessment and helped gather data and interpret findings.

This external evaluation was designed to assess the impacts of Greater Houston Community Foundation's next gen donor engagement activities, including the impacts on the donors themselves, on their families, on the Foundation, and the ripple effects on individual nonprofits and the community as a whole. Data came from extensive surveys of NGDI and Family Giving Circle alumni; 40 interviews with next gen donors, foundation staff and board members, youth and parents, and local nonprofit leaders; a focus group with youth; a review and analysis of over 150 documents and materials; and a field scan of similar efforts around the country offered by community foundations, philanthropy support organizations, donor networks, and others.

The analysis of this data, the conclusions and recommendations made in this in-depth evaluation, and our own combined experience in the field, informs the list of core questions and good practice recommendations here. The experiences of this large community foundation in Houston, as well as examples from other programs for next gen donor learning, are used both to identify the challenges facing any such programs and to offer practical guidance for addressing those challenges.

We should be clear that the intensive efforts of Greater Houston Community Foundation are presented here as one example, not an exact roadmap to follow. Like any program to help next gen donors in their learning journeys, the Foundation's program has faced struggles and necessary course corrections as they have figured out what works and what doesn't. But all aspects of their multi-year and multi-pronged programming are illustrative and instructive for a variety of audiences. And the Foundation should be commended not only for allowing their story to be analyzed and shared for the good of the field, but for helping to fund this broader dissemination. They did so because they agree that the future of philanthropy depends on the quality of the learning and development of these next generations of donors.

GHCF Programs

Next Gen Donor Institute (NGDI)
A year-long cohort learning program to help Next Gen Donors develop their values and philanthropic interests, build important skills for that work, learn about their community, and create a strategic giving plan as they launch their philanthropic journeys.

Next Gen Giving Circle
Alum of the NGDI participate in a giving circle to help them understand important issues facing their community.

Gen Impact Fund
Advancing their skills, Next Gen alum do strategic grantmaking over a 3-year period toward alleviating child poverty in Houston.

Family Giving Circle
For families with children in 7th – 12th grade and led by a Youth Leadership Team (YLT) of high school students, participants experience a full grant cycle from picking an issue area to selecting grantees to receive funds.

Family Philanthropy Day
For multigenerational donor families with children ages 5 and up. YLT members lead a learning and volunteer program for younger siblings and family members.

Six Big Questions When Designing a Next Gen Donor Learning Program

1

What Would "Success" Look Like and What Are the Intended Impacts?

It may seem obvious that having a clearly defined goal should be a prerequisite before initiating any program for next gen education and engagement. But it is not uncommon for the intended impacts of a program, or the ideal definition of "success," to be either undefined, overly vague, or implicit instead of explicit.

There are several great reasons to be explicit about intended successes and impacts. Most obvious is that decisions about any program – whether at the start or during mid-course adaptions – should ideally always be driven by the desired end goals and outcomes, just as mission and vision statements are meant to guide the work of a nonprofit. Identifying and communicating a clear idea of success and impacts will also help make the case for the usually substantial investments of time, money, reputation, and other assets into this intensive work. It will ensure everyone involved is "on the same page" and "shooting for the same goal," if you will, and this will help build support of all kinds, financial or otherwise.

In the Houston case, most of those advocating for, and/or doing the work to create their next gen programs had an idea of why such a program was needed, and what outcomes they hoped would result. Greater Houston Community Foundation's programs were very well received by participants – the average satisfaction rating in the survey of NGDI alumni was 4.4 out of 5 – and certainly had wide-ranging impacts that anyone would label as successful. But there wasn't a strong, shared understanding of priority goals and impacts to inform the work over a decade.

It is not uncommon for the intended impacts of a program, or the ideal definition of "success," to be either undefined, overly vague, or implicit instead of explicit.

The evaluation actually identified myriad different meanings of "success" held by various parties involved, including:

- Increased giving overall by donors and families
- Increased giving by donors to Houston organizations and causes

- Increased giving by donors through and to the Foundation (e.g., creating/expanding DAFs, more giving to special funds, etc.), and other growth in business relationships with donors
- More strategic and intentional giving by donors
- Greater and more productive engagement of donors with their broader family's giving
- Increased engagement of donors in other Foundation activities
- Better sense of value from Foundation involvement among donor families
- Enhanced long-term stewardship of donor families
- Creation of a cohort of informed and strategic young donors in the community
- Various other definitions related to community impact (e.g., nurturing more effective board members for local nonprofits, building a better local culture of philanthropy, etc.)
- Younger donors connected to community and giving earlier in life
- Growing the consciousness and awareness of Foundation donors, especially those that live and work in Houston
- And others…

Note how a central distinction in this list are those impacts which are primarily about benefits to the individual next gen donor, and those which are primarily about benefits to the community or the causes and organizations the donors support. Some element of both types of goals will very likely be part of every program's definition of success – whether the program is created by a family foundation, by an advisor, by a peer network or membership group, or whomever. But the mix and balance of the two will vary. The key is to be intentional and explicit about the balance or mix for one's particular program, and to be aware of how this then affects the program itself. Prioritizing individual impacts more will result in different program decisions than prioritizing community impacts.

This distinction is at the heart of the often fraught debate in the community foundation field over whether such foundations should lean more toward serving donors or more toward serving community. And indeed this tension is at the heart of the evolving story of Greater Houston Community Foundation, which started out with the explicit and nearly exclusive focus on serving donors but has moved in recent years to make "community impact" a co-equal strategic priority. This evolution in the Foundation's focus is likely a big reason for the range of ways different stakeholders see the intended goals of the Foundation's next gen and family programs.

Looking nationally, our field scan suggested that this community impact focus was in fact the most common goal of other next gen learning programs – especially those sponsored by community foundations. Many programs were explicit that their main goal was to help inspire and nurture a group of new donors and leaders to support local causes or to advance social justice in the region.

Another important dimension to consider in clarifying the definition of success for next gen education programs is how much to prioritize instrumental outcomes for the sponsor of the program such as increased giving by next gen donors to the sponsor (e.g., to a community foundation or a nonprofit or a giving circle), or new business development opportunities (e.g., for advisors working with new next gen clients or trying to build a relationship with the next generations of client families during the wealth transfer process). Are these benefits necessarily secondary and indirect goals? If they are stated as intended impacts alongside benefits for the public good, does this lead to difficult choices or tensions in the program? Addressing questions like this should be part of the process of defining ideal success.

Jennifer Touchet

Jennifer Touchet first joined Greater Houston Community Foundation staff in January of 2013, not long after the creation of the initial Next Gen Donor Institute and Next Gen Giving Circle. Now Vice President of Personal & Family Philanthropy at Greater Houston Community Foundation, she has led the evolution and expansion of the Foundation's next gen programming while working closely with many of the donors and families involved. Reflecting on how "success" has been defined over time, she notes:

"In retrospect, I am glad we didn't attempt to narrowly define what success would look like when we started. We did have goals, but it was a pilot program and we knew we would refine our approach along the way.

I am grateful our board and senior leadership allowed us space to evolve and experiment. Today, the list of 'what does success look like' is long because the program has been iterative and engaged with the learners, the philanthropic community around us, and within the field. Over time, we partnered with the beneficiaries of the program to help us define what success would look like for them. We have seen that our programs have helped develop their leadership skills in the community - on boards, in their places of work and in their family giving efforts - and they were looking for more training in those areas.

We discovered next gen donors while we were also discovering our own selves as an organization. A decade later, the practice and ethos of philanthropy has changed, so now, we must look ahead and redefine what success will look like next.

GOOD PRACTICES

- Do the work to discuss the key question of "what would success look like?" as early as possible – preferably in the initial planning stage before inaugurating a program. Then return to this question throughout the program evolution to consider how this success was achieved – or not. Discussing intended impacts early on does not mean you can't add or revise them later.
- Identify the intended impacts and ideal outcomes through an inclusive, transparent process involving input and discussion among diverse stakeholders with varying connections to the program, including those who could benefit from it. Expect there to be disagreement about goals and priorities and design a process to wrestle with this. Be open to the idea that what the hosting organization considers "success" might be different from what donor participants or other stakeholders do, and use the process to work through those differences.
- Be sure to address head-on the question of how to find the right mix of benefits for donors and benefits for causes or community. While these might appear at times to be conflicting priorities, look for ways to use individual and collective learning journeys to meet both goals – and to help donors see how their own improvement can also improve their impact.
- Consider both short-term and long-term impacts and definitions of success.
- Decide what sort of specific changes in donor learning or behavior are desired as outcomes.
- Clarify how important it is that the next gen program leads to benefits for the sponsor such as new giving or business development. Do not treat learning opportunities as simply a means to the end of more revenue.
- Communicate the chosen goals and intended impacts clearly and continuously – and internally as well as externally – as a way to build and maintain support, to guide the program's path, and to create a sense of shared purpose.
- Once priority goals and impacts are defined, commit to measuring those specific goals and impacts and create systems to track them over time. Use these measurements to further guide program choices and evolution. Be open to these and other adaptations as you find what works best.
- Remember that there is rarely a single definition of success or a lone impact goal. This process is about raising the conversation and talking about priorities.

2

Who Is the Audience and Where Are They in Their Journey?

Stating that the audience for a next gen education program is "next gen donors" is inadequate. Ask yourself, "What do we mean by 'next gen?' Does this include teens? Is there an age limit after which someone doesn't qualify even if they are new to giving? Does the amount of giving, or the vehicle used, matter for eligibility or suitability for the program?"

Just as clarifying the goals and intended impacts is an essential first – and continuing – step for a next gen donor education program, specifying the intended audience is something that should be done early and transparently. This will then help guide program decisions in a similar way. Becoming clear about the intended audience is a crucial step in best recruiting that particular audience and shaping program offerings for them.

Clearly age is one criterion to include in detailing the "next gen" audience, and it is particularly important to decide if youth under 18 are part of that audience, given the unique needs and interests of teens versus adults. For example, youth know they have a lot to learn, but they don't want to be passive recipients of information. They want to be at the table where important decisions are being made, and to ask questions about that process. They want to be given the chance for leadership.

Beyond age, other aspects of possible participants must also be considered, such as the level of experience of the typical participant. Perhaps there are more experienced but still next gen-aged donors who could benefit from one aspect of the programming but not from others. Also, should the intended audience include other generations in families that are looking to bring the next gen into their multi-generational giving? We know this is a common way in which next gen donors start their philanthropic journey.

Specifying the audience also raises crucial questions of diversity and inclusion. Any program has to decide if diversity of participants matters, and if so, which aspects of diversity matter. Programs serving next gen-aged donors who are all very similar in other ways will operate differently – and probably have a different mix of goals – than programs serving, say, next gen donors of many different races or ethnicities, gender identities or sexual orientations, religious or political leanings. Deciding if your program is meant to assist donors from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, or donors who are earners as well as inheritors, will determine a lot about the design of the program.

Just as clarifying the goals and intended impacts is an essential first – and continuing – step for a next gen donor education program, specifying the intended audience is something that should be done early and transparently.

Investigate the benefits of a more diverse and inclusive audience.

From the beginning, Greater Houston Community Foundation has had a fairly clear understanding of the core intended audience for its main next gen programming: emerging donors in their 20s, 30s, and early 40s who have the capacity (either earned or inherited) for significant giving and who are eager to find their identify and path as a donor and to meet peers doing the same. As the programs evolved and feedback came in from Houston families, however, they expanded their conception of their audience to include teens and to try to serve multi-generational families who want to give together more intentionally and to greater effect. This clarity about the core audience was a great help to staff and leaders evolving their next gen programs. For example, as they engaged more with youth, they saw the need for their engagement to be done in a dedicated youth space, one that was clearly valued and supported by the Foundation – rather than simply a place where “your parents want you to be.”

However, the Foundation did confront tough questions about the mix of participants they served, and/or intended to serve. For one thing, there were some subgroups that they didn’t engage as well – e.g., those still in college or in their first couple years out, those who were fairly experienced in giving and saw value in giving with next gen peers in a program setting but not in re-learning the basics. These sorts of challenges were common in other programs we analyzed in our field scan. Most prioritized recruiting individuals looking to play a role in social change or to effect social change, rather than making sure all kinds of individuals were represented.

Perhaps most significant for Greater Houston Community Foundation were these sorts of questions about the diversity of participants, especially in the flagship NGDI. (Interestingly, the youth in the Family Giving Circle have been more diverse from the start, and consider this an asset in their peer work.) Most NGDI participants were recruited through referrals and existing networks, which makes sense given that next gen are a highly networked demographic and often believe that their relationships to peers are a great asset for their work to better their community. However, this practice led to quite a bit of homogeneity. NGDI participants have been nearly all white and wealthy, cisgender and heterosexual – although there was some notable political diversity in the cohorts. And it is significant that this political diversity was seen as valuable by many of the participants. As one donor put it, “I don't like to be in groups with everybody who is like me. I don’t need to hear just from people like me.”

This general lack of diversity in participants was unintentional, but it had tremendous consequences for the program and how it was perceived. And it is of particular concern to the Foundation now as it is prioritizing community impact more as a primary goal. Doing so in what some identify as the most diverse city in the country, and doing so as a “community” foundation meant to serve that diverse city, is requiring the Foundation to think more intentionally about who their intended audience is, and to decide how this will and should affect their program content and structure.

GOOD PRACTICES

- Clarify as early as possible who the intended audience for the program is, and answer "why them?" Seek out input and data to inform this choice – e.g., data on who is not being served by other available programs.

- Design the program to fit this preferred audience. This includes content and format choices, as well as recruitment processes. Recruitment processes should maximize the chances of attracting the intended participants and will likely require deliberate outreach to subgroups that might not hear about the program through the usual networks.

- Be explicit about which aspects of diversity you seek for the program's goal. Investigate the benefits of a more diverse and inclusive audience and use this to reinforce any plan to serve a more diverse group of donors.

- Proactively design the programming to "meet donors where they are" in terms of life stage and identity. This includes accommodating the special needs of selected subgroups of participants – such as those with new families, or those in college, or those with more experience – perhaps by creating additional or alternative programming to best meet those needs.

- Design recruitment practices that utilize next gen networks in combination with strategic outreach to your target audience.

- If the program will involve youth, designate the youth space as distinct and meaningful. Make it clear to the youth that they have power in that space, illustrating that what they do in it can have a tangible impact.

3

What Do the Next Gen Donors Want or Need to Learn?

This might seem to some like the simplest aspect of creating a next gen learning and philanthropic development program, but the range of choices for the content of that learning can become overwhelming once you begin. Assuming most of the next gen participants are fairly new to giving – or at least new to giving in an intentional way and/or new to reflecting on how they prefer to give – the content can include:

- Guidance and resources to help develop one's personal philanthropic identity and giving approach, such as reflections on one's own journey and/or family legacy and values, guides for discussions with family members, etc.

- Technical know-how such as the range of giving vehicles and grant or organization types, jargon used in this field, details of tax forms such as the 990 and financial or budgetary norms for nonprofits, information about non-traditional investments beyond grants, etc.

- Skills such as doing due diligence, reviewing applications, making joint decisions with peers or family members, conducting and interpreting evaluations, etc.

- Factual information such as community data, the history and contours of specific issue areas and causes, the ecosystem of funders and nonprofits in an area, etc.

- "Good practice" knowledge such as how to be more strategic as a donor, how to be a good board member, providing support and capacity building "beyond the grant," effective communication and partnerships with grantees, how to bring an equity lens to giving, etc.

To complicate this even further, the content of any program will need to be revised and improved over time, with regular input from program evaluations and participant feedback. This sort of "co-creation" of the program was very common in the programs we researched in the field scan, and was sometimes done in a group setting, allowing participants to discover their shared interests and chart their collective learning journey. Also complicating the choice of content is the fact that philanthropy is changing so rapidly that a static curriculum or program can become stale quickly.

Building a core curriculum for the Next Gen Donor Institute was the first major task tackled by Greater Houston Community Foundation when they began, and they did so by looking for assistance from experts and by emphasizing professional development of the staff who would lead the Institute. Staff members immersed themselves in the field of donor development and education, gathered ideas from the other programs that existed, participated in trainings such as those offered by 21/64, and early on brought in national experts (including 21/64 and the National Center for Family Philanthropy) to help with both content and design. They also prioritized building other relevant skills among staff, such as facilitating adult learning, fostering peer networks and community, deep listening, and empowering emerging leaders.

From the beginning the Foundation included the full range of content options described above. But they also instituted regular feedback loops to ensure that each cohort of next gen donors gave detailed input on the experience and what they learned, and that this information was used to revise the curriculum and program plan. They normalized program adaptations, and these changes were identified in the evaluation as a chief cause of the program's success over time. They took this approach first with the NGDI but also later in other programs such as their work with youth or special learning events.

The Foundation's main challenges with the content of their programs were deciding how to streamline the content to fit the time constraints of the program, and the issue discussed earlier about the range of experience and expertise levels among participants. They have found it difficult to meet the learning needs of more advanced next gen donors in the primary program designed for novices. But they've begun to address this need through creative partnerships, such as piloting a "Philanthropy Accelerator" course with The Philanthropy Workshop, and digging into emerging trends and practices such as "trust-based philanthropy" in the learning modules for the more advanced Gen Impact Fund collaborative.

GOOD PRACTICES

- Include diverse types of content in the program(s) including the range of types listed above. Separate different types into different programs or stages if that helps, especially to meet the learning needs of both novice and experienced donors.
- Seek help in crafting the curriculum from the growing number of resources in the field on donor learning, and from experts who have built programs and delivered this content. Regularly track philanthropic trends and integrate these into the curriculum.
- Include identity development as part of the content, not just facts or technical knowledge. This is often the biggest struggle emerging next gen donors face, whether they are being brought into an existing giving family or finding their footing as a new donor without a family history of giving.
- Ask and listen to next gen donors about what they say they want or need to learn. Be open and prepared to revise and adapt the content, especially in light of this participant feedback.
- Remember to fit your content to your intended audience and to your intended impacts (e.g., the ways you hope your program will change next gen donor learning or giving behavior).

4

How Do These Donors Learn Best?

Closely interconnected with the question of ***what*** next gen donors want or need to learn is the question of ***how*** they prefer to learn – and how we know they learn best. There are many modes of learning for any sort of donor, and some good research that identifies which modes best fit next gen donors.

Donors can learn from traditional instruction methods, of course (e.g., readings, presentations, guest speakers, in-person or remote discussion, etc.). But there are many methods for experiential "learning-by-doing" or observing as well, such as practical giving or grantmaking exercises, giving circle processes, site visits, observing parents or mentors or others, volunteering and board service, meetings with community and grassroots leaders, and so on. And learning with and from peers is a potentially powerful mode as well, including co-learning as part of peer networks or giving circles, discussion and knowledge sharing among peers, and the like. To make this more complicated, individual donors have their own distinctive learning styles and preferences.

However, research such as that presented in Generation Impact, as well as our own experiences and our field scan findings, show that, while traditional instruction has its place and individuals do vary, next gen donors as a whole usually prefer experiential and peer learning the most. In fact, they are eager for the opportunity to learn in these ways, especially when they are just starting out, just starting to learn about giving, and just beginning to develop a philanthropic identity. As with the content of learning, the preferred method of learning might change as a donor becomes more experienced and savvy about giving, but this main preference for experiential and peer learning usually remains. And all signs point to the fact that this passion for hands-on engagement, especially with peers, will continue with Gen Z.

All signs point to the fact that this passion for hands-on engagement, especially with peers, will continue with Gen Z.

Designing ways to facilitate peer learning again raises tough challenges around diversity and inclusiveness. Having more diverse participants in a peer learning environment makes it even more essential for that environment to be deliberately inclusive of different voices and lived experiences. And learning in this sort of peer group can have tremendous benefits. And learning in this sort of peer group can have tremendous benefits, even if it is also more complicated than learning in a homogenous peer group.

While Greater Houston Community Foundation's next gen programming began with an "Institute" – one with a curriculum, speakers and presentations, etc. – they quickly realized the learning and growth opportunity presented by incorporating experiential learning. Within a year they had added the first giving circle opportunity for alumni of the Institute, and in subsequent years incorporated other learning methods such as the youth-led giving circle, family volunteering, special trainings, and so on. The Foundation also

Ben Brown

A fifth-generation Houstonian, Ben Brown has spent 15 years and counting in commercial real estate and retail development in the area. He took part in the Next Gen Donor Institute at the community foundation in 2013, when he was in his late 20s, and then referred his brother and sister-in-law to take the course the very next year. However, Ben says his greatest learning came from the experience of working alongside peers in the Next Gen Giving Circle, which he participated in annually for many years after the Institute:

"I had never gone through and evaluated grant proposals. Taking a deep dive through the proposals and then following that up with discussions with my peers was extremely valuable. But the most impactful for me was participating in the site visits with the people and organizations that we had selected. We were able to meet the dedicated professionals who have their boots on the ground, making the real impact. We got to hear their stories and see the results. This process opened my eyes and fueled my additional passion to get more involved in the community. The giving circle provided me with a foundation built on strategy, thoroughness, and discipline that I have been able to apply to my personal giving and community involvement."

Ben also credits his experiential learning through Greater Houston Community Foundation with helping him be selected as the board chair of Casa de Esperanza, a local nonprofit working to break the cycle of child abuse and neglect. And he notes that, because of his training and experience at the Foundation, he is now a source of philanthropic advice for other peers and his family.

prioritized place-based learning and giving throughout its programming, building on the strong local commitment that many participants felt, and helping make the learning relevant and accessible. This combination of learning opportunities was often praised by Foundation donors. One noted, "The combo [of NGDI and the Giving Circle] was meaningful in a way that, by themselves, may not have been."

Youth participants and leaders in the Family Giving Circle were particularly energized by the experiential learning activities such as site visits and volunteering, and by the chance to help lead the work of the circle (with staff guidance). They also described in a focus group how valuable it was to learn about their community alongside their peers, and to discuss and debate grant decisions with them.

Greater Houston Community Foundation has approached their next gen education programming with a peer and cohort model from the beginning – though they are still striving to find ways to keep the cohorts connected beyond their intensive time in the Institute and/or a giving circle. This peer focus was highlighted by many next gen donors as a positive of their Foundation involvement, especially as it provided what many called a "safe space" for them to have candid conversations with others facing the same choices and asking the same questions about their philanthropy – a space they couldn't find anywhere else.

However, for many, what made this peer learning space "safe" was that it included, as one donor put it, "people like me." The homogeneity of the group allowed for the candidness and the joint learning about shared experiences or similar challenges such as "what kind of donor should I become?" As noted, this means that increasing the diversity of the next gen participants in such a peer engagement space could be seen by some as a disruption or detriment to the learning – even when the participants who don't seem to be "like me" are in fact facing the same challenges as donors with the means to do significant giving. This perception is certainly an on-going challenge facing the Foundation's next gen programs, and would likely be for others who similarly value both diversity and peer learning.

GOOD PRACTICES

- Once again, ask and listen to next gen donors about how they prefer to learn and what methods are working best. Adapt the programs to fit this feedback.
- Prioritize experiential and peer learning for the next gen especially, but incorporate these as complements to traditional instruction methods rather than full substitutes. Dedicate the additional resources needed to do this beneficial combination of programming. Doing it all is terrific, but expensive.
- Proactively seek input from youth donors especially. They are particularly eager to be "heard" – as well as to have the chance to "learn by doing," to engage with peers, and to step into leadership roles. This means the quality of the adult staff leading a youth philanthropy engagement is incredibly important.
- Offer a range of learning mode options to donors, both to meet different learning styles and to allow donors who find a learning mode that fits where they are in their own philanthropic development.
- Ground learning opportunities in the local context, when possible – even if the program is not offered by a community foundation or other local anchor institution. All next gen donors are situated in some local context, and the vast majority give locally in some way. Place-based engagements in learning can also help build a peer cohort and sense of community among donors.
- Rethink what "safe space" means in this context, so that it is less dependent on the homogeneity of participants but still allows for candid dialogue and personal growth. Think about next gen donor peer learning more in terms of what inclusion advocates term "brave spaces." Brave spaces are ones where more diverse voices are intentionally included and heard, where the goal is courageous yet at times uncomfortable dialogue across differences, but where the highly valued close peer relationships and mutual learning can still result. Take the time to build the relationships and trust that this brave space requires.

5

How Can the Donors Stay Engaged and Implement Their Philanthropic Plans Over Time?

Talking about donor learning as a "journey" is an apt metaphor, as it is never – or at least should not be – a "one-off," single-step process. Ideally, learning should be continuous and long-term, especially the types of learning that are less about facts or basic techniques and more about skills and identity. As next gen donors become more experienced, they can still hone their skills, evolve and improve their philanthropic approach, and deepen their sense of identity as a donor.

The biggest long-term challenges in next gen donor learning, though, are about keeping the donors active in philanthropy and programming after their initial learning engagement, and about implementing the giving plans that they devise in that initial learning. This was certainly a difficulty identified by many programs we reviewed. A well-designed strategy for being a more intentional and impactful donor is no good if it isn't lived out in giving behavior, and if it isn't adapted and refined to meet new challenges or discoveries along the giving journey.

We daresay that most or all sponsors of a next gen learning program – the intended users of this document – will want long-term engagements with the participants in their programs. And this will in most cases be beneficial for the donors as well, allowing for continued learning as well as assistance with becoming the donors they want to be. In fact, many next gen donors identify this long-term engagement as their toughest challenge. For example, they get excited about all they've learned but then struggle to know how best to bring that back to their family's giving process or vehicle.

Many next gen donors identify this long-term engagement as their toughest challenge.

These were certainly some of the main challenges faced in the Houston case, and were identified in the evaluation as an **"Engagement Gap"** and an **"Aspiration Gap."** To be sure there are plenty of next gen donors who have remained deeply involved with Greater Houston Community Foundation following their initial learning program experience, including some who now help lead the Center for Family Philanthropy and who have served on the Foundation's governing board. However, the level of continued engagement among next gen program alumni has not been as high as foundation leaders – and often the donors themselves – would like. There are many reasons for this "Engagement Gap," including the many other life priorities facing busy next gen at this stage in their lives, as well as some uncertainty among donors about the best next steps and/or the value of taking those next steps for their learning and development.

More significant even was the so-called "Aspiration Gap," which refers to the disconnect between next gen donors' high level of satisfaction and excitement coming out of their initial learning program and how much their giving behaviors actually changed. Again, there are many examples of donors who fundamentally transformed their giving and are fully implementing the philanthropic plans they created. But there are also many who lament that they have not (yet) been able to live up to their high expectations and plans. Like for engagement, this "Aspiration Gap" among next gen donors in Houston seems to result from a number of causes, including many that are out of the Foundation's control. However, several donors noted how they wished they could get as much help in this stage of implementing what they learned as they did in the initial learning stage. And those who did get this continued help found it tremendously useful, with one donor noting, "The amount of individual attention and support that we continue to get from [Foundation staff] has been really, really helpful."

GOOD PRACTICES

- Do not limit the program to just the initial process of learning by novice next gen donors. Develop program opportunities for continuous and advanced learning, and for evolving and refining philanthropic identity. Give donors the chance to take leadership positions or become peer educators as they advance.
- Demonstrate the value and impact of continued engagement by donors over time. Show how this benefits the donors as well as the sponsors and the causes and communities that donors support.
- Show clearly what an ideal learning journey might look like. Feature examples of donors who have stayed active, committed to advanced learning, and found ways to implement their giving plan.
- Find ways to keep next gen donors engaged with their peers over time, including maintaining the peer ties built during a cohort learning program. Youth in particular will likely want to stay connected with a cohort that meant a lot to them in a formative time. Give them a platform to do so.
- Start a coaching or mentoring program to help keep next gen donors on track and learning when they are finished with a formal program and might not have regular peer interactions or networks. Engage professionals (on staff or as consultants) to help provide the collective and individual guidance that next gen donors crave.
- Develop multi-generational family programs that can help keep donors involved but expands their activities with their parents or their own children – something they usually want to do. Encourage program participants to bring their learning back to their families.
- Commit to walking alongside next gen donors for a long-time as their journeys continue, becoming a trusted partner as they implement their plans and discover new learning needs.

6

What Will This Cost and Who Will Pay?

Any potential sponsor of next gen donor learning programming will have to confront this question, even if it isn't fun to do so. The reality is that these sorts of programs can be quite expensive, especially in terms of staff time and other organizational resources beyond direct cash outlays. They usually end up costing more than people estimate when getting started. And we know that next gen donors are hungry for more learning programs, so they will usually be asking for more.

The need to determine the cost again shows how important all of the previous questions are. For instance, cost will be very sensitive to the defined goals of the program(s), to their intended impacts, to the scope of the ideal audience, to the type and modes of learning involved, and to planned efforts to keep donors engaged over the long-term.

Among the many expenses of next gen learning programs, the biggest is always personnel. This includes not just the cost of hiring staff to design and run the learning programs, but the cost of building the expertise of those staff through initial and on-going professional development – and/or hiring outside expertise as well.

Once the estimated cost is determined, though, the big question is who will pay these costs. Most programs in our field scan relied primarily on participant fees to cover costs, but others benefitted from some underwriting by donors or overhead and in-kind support from the host institution. In short, figuring out a sustainable business model for these next gen education and engagement programs is often the toughest challenge.

Greater Houston Community Foundation began this work without separate external funding or significant participant fees. They did so because they considered this programming essential to their organizational goals of donor development and stewardship, and utilizing that to improve the community impact of those donors. They still commit considerable organizational resources for this same reason. However, after a few years, they were very fortunate to identify several donors – sometimes called the "founding families" – who saw the potential benefits (for donors, for the foundation, and for the community) of building out next gen programs and who stepped up to help fund these initiatives. These families and other subsequent donors are now proud of the fact that the Foundation has become a national leader in next gen donor learning. The Foundation also began charging participant fees for many of the programs, which now help cover operational costs as well as contributing to the pooled funds for collective grantmaking. But they are still trying to find the right price point.

> Having dedicated staff was also a clear sign of commitment by the Foundation, showing this was essential work for the core team, not a side program.

The Foundation also came to recognize – especially after the first year or so – the need to hire adequate staff for these programs, and to support the training and development of those staff. In the evaluation, the quality of staff was identified across the board as a primary reason for the programs' success. The donors who participated become quite attached to the staff, and appreciated there was someone at Foundation committed to their growth and development. Having dedicated staff was also a clear sign of commitment by the Foundation, showing this was essential work for the core team, not a side program. However, these staff have found that they have to spend significant time outside of just "running the program" – e.g., meeting with individual donors, staying up on field knowledge and trends to update the content, etc. – in order to realize all of the benefits of their work with next gen donors. Obviously, this further adds to costs.

GOOD PRACTICES

- Always address cost in the context of addressing the other questions about the scope and elements of any proposed program.
- Estimate honestly the actual or "true" costs of the programs, including more intangible or unexpected costs such as professional development for staff.
- Track expenses closely from the start, and be prepared to cut back aspects of the programs if the costs way exceed the revenues and/or the "return on investment" from these programs. Tie this tracking to the measures of the intended impacts of the programs.
- Commit to intensive and on-going staff development, not just hiring. Encourage connections between dedicated staff and the donor participants.
- Actively look for potential underwriting donors, especially among those who have seen first-hand the benefits of next gen donor learning (e.g., for themselves, for their families, for local nonprofits, etc.). See if you can find older generations willing to endow the youth learning and giving program, if you have one.

Designing and Adapting Programs is a Learning Journey

Creating and continually improving programs to inspire and guide the learning journeys of the emerging group of next gen donors is vital. These donors are eager to learn and looking for guidance tailored to their generation. And organizations and communities that will rely on the support of these donors for decades to come will benefit from this cohort being more informed, strategic, and committed donors. The future of effective philanthropy depends on facilitating next gen donor education and engagement.

The case of Greater Houston Community Foundation's programming, as well as other examples, demonstrate how such programs can have tangible, cascading impacts and long-term ripple effects – on individuals, yes, but also on their families, and on the groups and places where these donors give, volunteer, and lead. However, programs that have these sorts of impacts do not happen overnight – nor cheaply and easily. In Houston, the community foundation has invested significant time, money, and passion over many years, and has had to evolve their programs and redirect or redouble their resources as they figured out what worked best and what next gen donors and families wanted.

We hope the analysis and the advice presented in this report will help a range of others who seek to create or expand next gen donor education programs to be successful, whether you be a community foundation, an advisor, a peer network, or any other entity. And we hope this material inspires and energizes as well as advises.

But perhaps the biggest lesson from the Houston case – our final "good practice" – is to see this work of designing and adapting such programs as part of your own learning journey. Doing this work with next gen donors well requires you to be a learning organization, to try new approaches, to gather feedback, to reflect on your priorities, and then to revise and adjust – all in close partnership with those you hope to benefit. You being willing to step onto this learning journey is something that will benefit not just you, but all of us who need philanthropy to thrive.

Doing this work with next gen donors well requires you to be a learning organization, to try new approaches, to gather feedback, to reflect on your priorities, and then to revise and adjust – all in close partnership with those you hope to benefit.

"

These rising donors take their identities and learning journeys seriously and are eager for help along the way... There are too few learning sources in this field geared to new and next gen donors; if you can be one of those sources, they will appreciate you even more.

Generation Impact: How Next Gen Donors Are Revolutionizing Giving
Sharna Goldseker and Michael Moody

We welcome your feedback and invite conversations about this work.
Please contact us for more details at **GenImpactTeam@2164.net**

GREATER HOUSTON COMMUNITY FOUNDATION | Dorothy A. Johnson Center FOR PHILANTHROPY | 21/64