

## LGBTQ Grantmaking by U.S. Foundations

## 283

Funders


## $\$ 252$ MILLION

Awarded


Foundation funding for LGBTQ Issues from U.S. foundations totaled $\$ 252$ million in 2021, a new high. Unfortunately, the most vulnerable members of the LGBTQ community did not necessarily see this benefit. Funding to transgender, gender nonconforming, and nonbinary communities, Black LGBTQ communities, and Southeastern LGBTQ communities in the U.S. has not increased commensurate with total LGBTQ funding.

Domestic Annual LGBTQ Grant Dollars, 2011-2021
Foundation funding for LGBTQ Issues from U.S. Foundations totaled \$252 million in 2021.

*This chart excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting, and does not include funds awarded for use outside of the United States. In previous tracking reports, this chart included global funding. Following the Pulse Nightclub massacre in 2016, funding to OneOrlando (which supported victims of the shooting) significantly drove LGBTQ philanthropic giving, which is why it is separated out from other funding. OneOrlando closed in 2017.
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| - Nominal dollars (not adjusted) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 dollars (adjusted for inflation) |  |  |
| Total without OneOrlando grantmaking (not adjust |  |  |
| Total without OneOrlando grantmaking (adjusted for inflation) |  |  |
| 2011 | \$95,000,000 | \$114,453,252 |
| 2012 | \$101,141,019 | \$119,381,238 |
| 2013 | \$104,462,244 | \$121,521,431 |
| 2014 | \$112,599,058 | \$128,896,090 |
| 2015 | \$129,120,635 | \$147,633,681 |
| 2016 | \$156,799,690 | \$177,047,082 |
| 2016 (without One-Orlando) |  |  |
|  | \$127,289,690 | \$143,726,485 |
| 2017 | \$137,194,461 | \$151,679,581 |
| 2017 (without One-Orlando) |  |  |
|  | \$135,087,935 | \$1 |
| 2018 | \$161,789,004 | \$174,610,992 |
| 2019 | \$151,892,857 | \$160,981,479 |
| 2020 | \$156,908,521 | \$164,305,291 |
| 2021 | \$251,942,571 | \$251,942,571 |

## Top 10 Funders of LGBTQ Issues, by Total Dollar Amount 2021

In 2021, the top ten funders of domestic LGBTQ communities and issues awarded \$169 million, accounting for nearly 60 percent of all funding for domestic LGBTQ communities and issues from U.S.-based foundations. This represents a $\$ 60$ million increase from the amount awarded by the top 10 domestic funders in $2020 .{ }^{1}$

Gilead Sciences
\$53.3M

*This graphic includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

## Local and State Funding of LGBTQ Issues, by State (2021)


*This graphic includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

As a new adaptation, the 2021 Resource Tracking Report only reports on funding to domestic LGBTQ communities and issues. For a detailed look at funding for LGBTQ communities outside of the United States, consult the Global Resources Report produced by the Global Philanthropy Project. The Global Resources Report offers a comprehensive analysis of grantmaking awarded by U.S. foundations for activities outside the United States alongside funding from international donors, governments, and multilateral agencies. Visit globalresourcesreport.org for more information.
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# We are pleased to share the 2021 Resource Tracking Report: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Grantmaking by U.S. Foundations. This 19th edition of our annual tracking report builds upon the new approach to reporting developed last year in partnership with Strength in Numbers, an LGBTQ-led research firm with expertise in philanthropic strategy and evaluation. This approach is guided by a commitment to sustainability, transparency, and durability to develop consistent systems and methodologies that can grow with Funders for LGBTQ Issues and respond to the changing needs of the philanthropic sector. 

The most notable difference from our previous 18 reports is that this edition of the Resource Tracking Report looks only at U.S. foundation funding to U.S. LGBTQ communities and issues.
Anyone interested in the global LGBTQ funding landscape should consult the Global Resources Report, a robust biennial report series produced by the Global Philanthropy Project.

For this report, we identified 6,633 grants for domestic LGBTQ communities and issues from 283 foundations in 2021, totaling a record high of $\$ 282.7$ million. ${ }^{2,3}$ While we are heartened to see this increase, the funding landscape for the most vulnerable members of our communities remains largely stagnant, uneven, and unstable. Black LGBTQ, Southeastern LGBTQ, and transgender, gender nonconforming and nonbinary communities and groups largely did not reap the benefits of this increase in funding. This rising tide has not lifted all boats.


#### Abstract

We interpret this to mean grantmakers have increasingly understood the importance of investing far more in LGBTQ communities, groups, and causes. However, the philanthropic sector must increase investment in intersectional work and the most vulnerable members of our communities.


Indeed, the trend of "top-heaviness" of foundation support-where a relatively small number of foundation sources provides a disproportionately large percentage of the funding for LGBTQ communities and causescontinues into foundation grantmaking for 2021. This leaves our communities and movements increasingly vulnerable to shifts in grantmaking trends, crises, and even to grantmakers' natural staff turnover.

We noted the following additional trends in 2021, which may offer guidance to grantmakers:
$\rightarrow$ Nominal giving to trans communities only slightly increased from 2020, and remains lower than the record high in 2019. Foundations allocated less

[^1]than 4 cents per $\$ 100$ of their total giving to U.S. trans communities and issues.
$\rightarrow$ Funding to Black LGBTQ communities slightly decreased from 2020 to 2021, both in terms of dollars and as a share of overall LGBTQ funding.
$\rightarrow$ The U.S. Territories and the Mountain and Midwest regions continue to lag far behind in receiving funding support compared to the U.S. mainland coastal areas. This is especially concerning given rising extremism and violence towards BIPOC LGBTQ communities, drag performers, trans and gender expansive communities and youth, families seeking affirming health care, and their intersections, in some of these regions. ${ }^{4}$
$\rightarrow$ Grantmakers appear to continue to deprioritize funding for capacity-building efforts by LGBTQ organizations across the U.S. Given the unprecedented challenges in recent years facing the LGBTQ community on multiple fronts, it is clear that winning and defending the rights of intersectional LGBTQ communities requires building long-term, sustainable movement organizations and coalitions. Funding for capacity-building is key to support these long-term strategies.
$\rightarrow$ The impact of the COVID-19 epidemic continues to be felt throughout LGBTQ communities, and grantmakers' support for COVID-19-related efforts represented nearly $14 \%$ of overall funding to LGBTQ communities in 2021.
$\rightarrow$ In 2021, the top twenty funders combined awarded \$204 million, accounting for $72 \%$ of the year's total. While funding for children and youth increased in 2021, still more than half of that funding comes from just five foundations. This means the lion's share of funding to LGBTQ communities continues to be provided by a small number of foundation sources. Any instability in this support would have seismic impact on the community and our political movements. We hope more grantmakers will increase their giving to diversify funding sources and help stabilize support over the long-term.

## LOOKING FORWARD

Our resource tracking work continues to evolve to more accurately capture the state of foundation funding for the U.S. LGBTQ community, and to offer analyses of trends that continue to be relevant to our community's and political movements' needs. As threats to our community increase, we look forward to offering more detailed reporting on foundation funding for strategies our communities are deploying to support ourselves, and fight back in this time of heightened crisis. Funding for safety and security (both physical and digital), rapid response funding, the role of local versus national-level funding, the impact of community-led intermediary funders, and the significance of shifting foundation priorities during election cycles are all areas we hope to explore further. We look forward to engaging with our members and the larger philanthropic community to investigate these questions more deeply in the future.

## Sincerely,

Alyssa Lawther
Senior Research Officer, Funders for LGBTQ Issues

Alexander Lee<br>Deputy Director, Funders for LGBTQ Issues
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## TOP GRANTMAKERS 2021


#### Abstract

The field of LGBTQ funding continues to be driven by a small group of leading funders. The leading grantmakers for calendar year 2021 are listed in the table here. ${ }^{5}$

In 2021, the top twenty funders combined awarded $\$ 204$ million, accounting for 72 percent of the year's total. Giving from the top twenty funders of 2021 is \$66


million higher than giving from the top twenty funders of 2020. Four of the top twenty foundations were LGBTQ-specific funders.

While overall grantmaking has increased, such continued "top-heaviness" means that LGBTQ communities and movements are increasingly vulnerable to shifts in grantmaking trends, crises, and even to grantmakers' natural staff turnover.

## Top 20 Funders of LGBTQ Communities \& Issues, by Total Dollar Amount (2021)



Gilead Sciences
Foster City, CA
\$53,318,417


Ford Foundation
New York, NY
\$37,076,375


The California Endowment
Los Angeles, CA
\$16,243,982


Wellspring Philanthropic
Fund
New York, NY
\$12,487,025


## Gill Foundation

Denver, CO
\$12,153,000


Robert Wood Johnson
Foundation
Princeton, NJ
\$9,753,858


Tides Foundation
San Francisco, CA
\$8,337,854


## Arcus Foundation

New York, NY
\$7,133,850


The Colorado Health
Foundation
Denver, CO
\$6,950,322


Borealis Philanthropy
Minneapolis, MN
\$5,341,900


Conrad N. Hilton
Foundation
Westlake Village, CA
\$5,275,500


## Horizons Foundation

San Francisco, CA
\$4,847,403


Groundswell Fund
Oakland, CA
\$3,571,000


Seattle Foundation
Seattle, WA
\$3,448,605


Pride Foundation
Seattle, WA
\$3,338,970


Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr.
Fund
San Francisco, CA
\$3,327,500


The JPB Foundation
New York, NY
\$3,250,000


John D. \& Catherine T.
MacArthur Foundation
Chicago, IL
\$2,935,000


Wells Fargo Foundation
San Francisco, CA
\$2,862,290


JP Morgan Chase
New York, NY
\$2,634,748
*This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.
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## Top Ten Funders By Total Dollar Amount (2021)



Top 10 Funders of LGBTQ Communities \& Issues by Number of Grants (2021)

*This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.


New York, NY
176
oster City, CA
170

## TOP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2021

In 2021, the top 20 recipients of LGBTQ funding received a total of $\$ 68$ million, accounting for 27 percent of all LGBTQ dollars reported in that calendar year.

Ten ${ }^{6}$ of the top 20 grantees were nonprofit organizations focused specifically on LGBTQ issues.

## Top 20 Grantees Receiving Foundation Support for LGBTQ Communities \& Issues (2021)7

## 1 Southerners On New Ground (SONG)

Atlanta, GA
\$8,407,750


Transgender Law Center
Oakland, CA
\$7,444,026


Los Angeles LGBT Center
Los Angeles, CA
\$6,881,590


GLAAD
New York, NY \$6,116,627


Abounding Prosperity
Dallas, TX
\$3,050,000
GLSEN
New York, NY \$3,003,705


Services \& Advocacy for GLBT Elders (SAGE)
New York, NY \$2,956,741


National LGBTQ Task Force
Washington, DC
\$2,921,950


BYP100 Education Fund
Chicago, IL
\$2,705,000


Freedom For All Americans
Education Fund
Washington, DC
\$2,632,500
Social Good Fund
Richmond, CA
\$2,563,500


San Francisco AIDS
Foundation
San Francisco, CA
\$2,267,450


Equality California
Los Angeles, CA
\$2,063,250


## Neo Philanthropy

New York, NY
\$1,950,000


Algorithmic Justice League
Washington, DC
\$1,900,000
Planned Parenthood Federation Of America
New York, NY
\$1,795,680


## Latino Commission

On AIDS
New York, NY \$1,750,000


Right To The City Alliance
New York, NY
\$1,595,000


## San Francisco Community <br> Health Center

San Francisco, CA
\$1,465,250
*This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.
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## The field of LGBTQ foundation support in the United States is growing increasingly top-heavy, led by a small group of leading funders.

In 2021, a single foundation, Gilead Sciences, accounted for 19 percent of total foundation support for U.S. LGBTQ communities. The top ten largest funders (including Gilead Sciences) are responsible for 60 percent of funding, and the top 20 funders accounted for 72 percent of all U.S. foundation support for LGBTQ communities and issues in the United States.

Funding By Relative Amount of Domestic LGBTQ Funding (2021)

*This analysis includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

## SOURGES OF LCBTQ FUNDING 2021

Consistent with established trends, funding from private foundations accounted for the largest share of U.S. foundation support for LGBTQ communities and issues in 2021. Support from private foundations accounted for more than half of all funding for LGBTQ communities. Corporate foundation giving overtook that of public foundations, becoming the second largest source of funding for LGBTQ communities,
accounting for 22 percent of all funding in 2021. Community foundation giving also increased slightly as a share of total giving, from 5 percent in 2020 to 7 percent in 2021.

New to our taxonomy this year is the "Other" category, which data-submitting funders could select as their foundation type if they did not fit into the preestablished categories of public, private, corporate, or community foundation. This category, which encompasses eight funders, accounts for 2 percent of total foundation giving to LGBTQ communities.

## Sources of LGBTQ Funding by Funder Type (2021)



| Private Foundation | $\$ 161,549,813$ | $57 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Corporate Funder | $\$ 62,790,455$ | $22 \%$ |
| Public Foundation | $\$ 32,972,759$ | $12 \%$ |
| Community <br> Foundation | $\$ 20,909,962$ | $7 \%$ |
| Other | $\$, 522,906$ | $2 \%$ |
| Total | $\$ 282,745,896$ |  |
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## POPULATION FOCUS 2021

## Distribution of Domestic Grant Dollars by Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Sex Characteristics

In 2021, \$204 million, or 81 percent of all U.S.-based foundation support for LGBTQ communities and issues, was allocated to the general LGBTQ community. Historically, the majority of funding has been allocated to the LGBTQ community broadly; however, this still represents a significant increase from 2020, when grantmaking to the LGBTQ community broadly accounted for 68 percent of U.S.-based foundation support for LGBTQ communities and issues.

This report captures a $\$ 95$ million (61 percent) increase in giving to LGBTQ communities and issues from what was reported in 2020. While we are heartened to see this increase, the funding landscape for the most vulnerable members of our communities remains uneven and unstable. Black LGBTQ, Southeastern LGBTQ, and transgender, gender nonconforming and nonbinary communities and groups largely did not reap the benefits of this increase in funding. This rising tide has not lifted all boats.

## Distribution of Domestic Grant Dollars by Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Sex Characteristics (2021)



| TGNCNBi $^{\mathbf{8}}$ | $\$ 36,006,256$ | $14 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Gay Men/Queer Men/MSM | $\$ 7,607,786$ | $3 \%$ |
| Lesbians/Queer Women | $\$ 1,586,739$ | $1 \%$ |
| Intersex People | $\$ 1,541,650$ | $1 \%$ |
| Bisexual People | $\$ 1,199,183$ | $<1 \%$ |
| Asexual People | $\$ 0$ | $0 \%$ |

*This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^6]While total foundation giving to LGBTQ communities in the United States has greatly increased, nominal giving to transgender communities has only slightly increased from 2020, and is still lower than the record high of $\$ 36.1$ million in 2019. Funding to transgender communities still accounts for a very small amount of
total foundation giving. For every \$100 awarded by U.S. foundations, less than 4 cents supported transgender communities in 2021.

Trans Funding Over Time (2012-2021)

*Inflation numbers are based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index. This figure excludes funds awarded for the purpose of rearanting.

|  | NOMINAL DOLLARS | 2021 DOLLARS |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2012 | $\$ 3,624,394$ | $\$ 4,278,033$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 6,448,133$ | $\$ 7,501,144$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 9,806,873$ | $\$ 11,226,271$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 13,246,083$ | $\$ 15,145,279$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 16,976,892$ | $\$ 19,169,102$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 22,564,755$ | $\$ 24,947,163$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 28,604,972$ | $\$ 30,871,953$ |
| 2019 | $\$ 36,121,652$ | $\$ 38,283,018$ |
| 2020 | $\$ 30,996,642$ | $\$ 32,457,844$ |
| 2021 | $\$ 36,006,256$ | $\$ 36,006,256$ |

## 142021 RESOURCE TRACKING REPORT

## Distribution of Domestic Grant Dollars Among People of Color

Consistent with historical trends, the majority of U.S. foundation funding to LGBTQ communities of color in the United States went not to a specific group, but to communities of color broadly. In 2021, \$78.4 million, 31 percent of overall LGBTQ funding, was allocated to LGBTQ communities of color broadly.

Despite the massive increase in LGBTQ funding from 2020, funding to Black LGBTQ communities specifically has slightly decreased, from $\$ 18.7$ million (12 percent of LGBTQ funding) in 2020 to $\$ 18.4$ million ( 7 percent of LGBTQ funding) in 2021. This is especially troubling
in the wake of racial justice uprisings following the murders of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor by law enforcement in 2020, and the seeming groundswell of foundation pledges made in response. While disappointing, this stagnation in funding matches similar philanthropic trends observed elsewhere. ${ }^{9}$

Funding for all other specific LGBTQ communities of color slightly increased from 2020 to 2021, but in total represents only 5 percent of overall LGBTQ funding.

## Distribution of Domestic Grant Dollars Among LGBTQ People of Color [POC] (2021)



| Poc (General) | $\$ 78,396,616$ | $31 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Black | $\$ 18,385,080$ | $7 \%$ |
| Latinx | $\$ 8,262,384$ | $3 \%$ |
| AAPI | $\$ 2,145,735$ | $1 \%$ |
| Indigenous | $\$ 1,694,837$ | $1 \%$ |
| Middle Eastern | $\$ 155,000$ | $<1 \%$ |

[^7][^8]
## Distribution of Domestic Grant Dollars Among Other Populations

Funding for LGBTQ children and youth, historically the most funded subpopulation, reached a new record high of $\$ 63.4$ million in 2021, accounting for 25 percent of total funding to LGBTQ communities and issues.

Funding to homeless and marginally housed LGBTQ communities, LGBTQ immigrants and refugees, and LGBTQ older adults also increased from 2020 to 2021. However, funding specifically to LGBTQ people of faith and LGBTQ sex workers decreased from 2020 to 2021.

As with overall funding, funding to these specific LGBTQ populations is very dependent on a few top funders. Gilead Sciences, the top funder of LGBTQ sex workers, homeless and marginally housed LGBTQ communities, LGBTQ people of faith, and LGBTQ older adults, accounted for a disproportionate share of funding specifically aimed at these communities (ranging from 45 percent of the funding for LGBTQ sex workers to 83 percent of funding to LGBTQ older adults).


| Children and Youth | $\$ 63,420,436$ | $25 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Homeless and Marginally Housed People | $\$ 45,251,592$ | $18 \%$ |
| Immigrants and Refugees | $\$ 35,402,812$ | $14 \%$ |
| Older Adults | $\$ 22,535,492$ | $9 \%$ |
| People of Faith | $\$ 3,954,165$ | $2 \%$ |
| Sex Workers | $\$ 2,300,321$ | $1 \%$ |

[^9]
# LOCAL, STATE, AND RECIONAL FUNDING OFLCBTQ ISSUES 

## Geographic Level of Domestic Funding

Funds awarded for work inside the United States were almost evenly allocated between the local and national level. National level funding accounted for 26 percent of support for LGBTQ communities and issues in 2021, while local level funding accounted for 25 percent. This is a shift in share from 2020, when national level funding accounted for 42 percent of support for LGBTQ communities and issues in the United States. However, the dollar amount allocated at the national level has remained similar: $\$ 66.3$ million in 2020, and \$66.7 million in 2021.

Percentages reported here are reflective of the total grant dollars awarded in the U.S., including those for which geographic focus was anonymous or could not be ascertained. In reports prior to 2019, we found a higher percentage of grants focused on work at the local level. For this report, we only coded grants as local in focus if the geographic target was specified in the grant.

## Distribution of Domestic Funding for LGBTQ Communities \& Issues, by Geographic Level (2021) ${ }^{10}$



| Local | $\$ 63,071,620$ | $25 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| State | $\$ 48,299,953$ | $19 \%$ |
| Regional | $\$ 31,566,692$ | $13 \%$ |
| National | $\$ 66,721,549$ | $26 \%$ |

*This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.
NATIONAL

[^10] work would both be counted as Local.

## Focus of Local, State, and Regional Funding

In 2021, the Pacific region received the largest share of local, state, and regional LGBTQ funding, accounting for 19 percent of all funding to LGBTQ communities and issues. This was largely driven by funding to California, which was the most highly funded state in the nation for LGBTQ communities and issues (\$39.5 million).

New York was the second most highly funded state, with $\$ 12.3$ million of LGBTQ funding. No other state received more than $\$ 10$ million of LGBTQ state and local funding.

The Southeast was the second most funded region, accounting for 13 percent ( $\$ 32.2$ million) of all funding to LGBTQ communities and issues. However, the increase
in overall funding in 2021 did not seem to benefit the region-the nominal dollar amount of foundation funding for the Southeastern U.S. appears to have remained the same from 2018 levels, ${ }^{11}$ despite the escalating rightwing attacks targeting LGBTQ community members there and the surge in community-led organizing and activism. Furthermore, funding for the Southeast appears to be disproportionately awarded to only a few states (Texas, Florida, North Carolina, and Georgia), while half of the states in the region received less than \$1 million in 2021.

No other region received more than 10 percent of total LGBTQ funding.

## Local, State, and Regional LGBTQ Funding, By Region (2021)

| Territories |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \%$ |

[^11]
## Local and State Funding of LGBTQ Communities \& Issues, by State (2021)


*This graphic excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

| Alabama | $\$ 1,552,020$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Alaska | $\$ 545,000$ |
| American <br> Samoa | $\$ 2,500$ |
| Arizona | $\$ 3,131,591$ |
| Arkansas | $\$ 133,000$ |
| California | $\$ 39,492,946$ |
| Colorado | $\$ 8,483,701$ |
| Connecticut | $\$ 43,000$ |
| DC | $\$ 1,966,750$ |
| Delaware | $\$ 58,560$ |
| Florida | $\$ 3,525,112$ |
| Georgia | $\$ 3,061,350$ <br> Hawai <br> Idaho <br> $\$ 90,500$ |


| Illinois | \$3,755,326 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Indiana | $\$ 318,919$ |
| Iowa | $\$ 35,500$ |
| Kansas | $\$ 7,000$ |
| Kentucky | $\$ 397,653$ |
| Louisiana | $\$ 1,482,500$ |
| Maine | $\$ 183,640$ |
| Maryland | $\$ 1,663,116$ |
| Massachusetts | $\$ 1,167,450$ |
| Mighican | $\$ 2,915,062$ |
| Minnesota | $\$ 1,708,778$ |
| Mississippi | $\$ 166,500$ |
| Missouri | $\$ 231,005$ |
| Northern <br> Mariana <br> Islands | \$5,000 |


| Montana | $\$ 408,900$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Nebraska | $\$ 82,500$ |
| Nevada | $\$ 88,800$ |
| New <br> Hampshire | $\$ 75,000$ |
| New Jersey | $\$ 249,554$ |
| New Mexico | $\$ 926,500$ |
| New York | $\$ 12,282,561$ |
| North <br> Carolina | $\$ 3,040,002$ |
| North <br> Dakota | $\$ 2,500$ |
| Ohio | $\$ 1,512,675$ |
| Oklahoma | $\$ 47,004$ |
| Oregon | $\$ 3,600,025$ |
| Pennsylvania | $\$ 737,360$ |
| Puerto Rico | $\$ 1,978,300$ |


| Rhode <br> Island | $\$ 110,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| South <br> Carolina | $\$ 299,700$ |
| South <br> Dakota | $\$ 15,500$ |
| Tennessee | $\$ 532,400$ |
| Texas | $\$ 6,516,445$ |
| Utah | $\$ 551,713$ |
| Vermont | $\$ 25,000$ |
| Virgin <br> Islands | $\$ 1,215,361$ |
| Virginia | $\$ 3,271,770$ |
| Washington | $\$ 81,500$ |
| West <br> Virginia | Wisconsin |
| Wyoming | 500 |

# FUNDING FOR U.S. LGBTQ COMMUNITIES \& ISSUFS BY TYPE OF SUPPORTO 

Consistent with established trends, funding for program or project-specific support continued to be the most common type of support type among grants for U.S. LGBTQ communities and issues in 2021, accounting for 51 percent of all domestic support awarded by U.S. foundations. General operating support accounted for 38 percent of all funding.

While capacity building grants increased as a share of grantmaking from 2020 to 2021 (from 4 percent to 7 percent), the small share of these types of
grants threatens the future of our movements and communities. Given the unprecedented challenges in recent years facing the LGBTQ community on multiple fronts, it has become more and more clear that winning and defending the rights supporting intersectional LGBTQ communities will require building long-term, sustainable movement organizations and coalitions. Such long-term movement and institution building requires capacity-building support.

Distribution of Funding for U.S. LGBTQ Communities \& Issues by Type of Support (2021)


| Program Support | $\$ 128,780,180$ | $51 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| General Operating <br> Support | $\$ 95,058,148$ | $38 \%$ |
| Capacity Building | $\$ 17,883,963$ | $7 \%$ |
| Membership/ <br> Sponsorship | $\$ 5,779,395$ | $2 \%$ |
| Scholarship, Fellowship, <br> Award To Individual | $\$ 4,440,885$ | $2 \%$ |

[^12]
# ISSUES ADDRESSED IN DOMESTIC FUNDING 

Funding for civil and human rights continued to garner the largest share of funding in 2021, accounting for 27 percent of all grant dollars from U.S.-based foundations in support of LGBTQ communities and issues. Funding to support strengthening communities, families, and visibility was the next most funded category. This issue area, encompassing a broad range of activities including community-building programs, pride celebrations,
and visibility initiatives, accounted for 24 percent of all funding. Support for health and wellbeing closely followed, accounting for 24 percent of all domestic funding in 2021, up slightly from the 21 percent reported in 2020. Economic issues doubled as a share of funding, from 6 percent of total LGBTQ funding in 2020 to 12 percent of total LGBTQ funding in 2021.

## Distribution of Funding for U.S. LGBTQ Communities \& Issues, by Issues Addressed (2021) ${ }^{12}$

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l} & 27 \% \\ \text { CIVIL\& \& } \\ \text { HUMAN RIGHTS }\end{array}\right\}$

| Civil and Human Rights | $\$ 68,411,880$ | $27 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Strengthening Communities, <br> Families, and Visibility | $\$ 61,183,388$ | $24 \%$ |
| Health and Wellbeing | $\$ 59,542,724$ | $24 \%$ |
| Economic Issues | $\$ 30,590,138$ | $12 \%$ |
| Education and Safe Schools | $\$ 15,072,265$ | $6 \%$ |
| Unspecified | $\$ 17,142,180$ | $7 \%$ |
| Total | $\$ 251,942,571$ |  |

*This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

## Funding for COVID-19 in 2021

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on every aspect of society. Our analysis of U.S. foundation funding for LGTBQ communities and issues in 2021 found $\$ 34.5$ million in grantmaking-14 percent of all reported grantmaking in our dataset-was related to COVID-19.

14\%
Of 2021
Grantmakin was COVID-19

Related

## STRATEGIES FUNDED IN DOMESTIC FUNDING

In 2021, funding for advocacy in support of LGBTQ communities and issues garnered the largest share of funding, accounting for 37 percent of all U.S. foundation support for LGBTQ communities and issues. This support strategy includes funding for governmental advocacy, community organizing, public education efforts, and/or litigation to influence policy
and/or the allocation of resources in support of LGBTQ communities.

Following advocacy, support for direct services and health care received 18 percent of all support. The remaining funds were distributed for capacity building, culture and media, philanthropy and fundraising, and research.

## Distribution of Funding for U.S. LGBTQ Communities \& Issues, by Strategy (2021) ${ }^{13}$



| Advocacy | $\$ 92,944,224$ | $37 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Direct Service and <br> Health Care | $\$ 45,476,848$ | $18 \%$ |
| Capacity Building | $\$ 38,032,932$ | $15 \%$ |
| Culture and Media | $\$ 34,755,284$ | $14 \%$ |
| Philanthropy and <br> Fundraising | $\$ 15,629,801$ | $6 \%$ |
| Research | $\$ 9,982,107$ | $4 \%$ |
| Unspecified | $\$ 251,942,571$ | $6 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |

*This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^13]
## COMMUNITY FOUNDATION GRANTMAKING FOR U.S. LGBTQ COMMUNITIES \& ISSUES

In 2021, community foundations awarded \$20.9 million (7 percent) to LGBTQ communities and issues (or $\$ 18.9$ million, 8 percent, after funds awarded for the purpose of regranting are excluded).

## Top Community Foundation Funders 2021

Seattle Foundation
Seattle, WA
\$3,448,605
2
Pride Foundation
Seattle, WA
\$3,338,970
(3)

Silicon Valley Community Foundation
Mountain View, CA
\$2,555,531


New York Community Trust
New York, NY
\$1,204,450


Cleveland Foundation
Cleveland, OH
\$1,125,550


Brooklyn Community Foundation
New York, NY
\$1,073,500


The Community Foundation for Northeast
Florida
Jacksonville, FL
\$1,027,333


Stonewall Community Foundation
New York, NY
\$942,344


San Francisco Foundation
San Francisco, CA
\$711,500


East Bay Community Foundation
Oakland, CA
\$629,223

[^14]Top Community Foundation Grantees $2021{ }^{14}$

(1)FTYTNI Howe Productions
Seattle, WA
\$800,804
2 Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender
2 Community Center
Cleveland, OH
\$629,500


Jacksonville Area Sexual Minority Youth
Network
Jacksonville, FL
\$595,833
4 The Trevor Project
West Hollywood, CA
\$456,690


Liberty Hill Foundation
Los Angeles, CA
\$400,000


Planned Parenthood Federation Of America New York, NY
\$359,130


Chicago Community Foundation
Chicago, IL
\$300,000
Groundswell Fund
Oakland, CA
\$270,000


Westside Community Mental Health Center
San Francisco, CA
\$250,000


Services \& Advocacy for GLBT Elders (SAGE)
New York, NY
\$243,800

[^15][^16]
## GORPORATIE FOUNDATION GRANTMAKING FOR U.S. LGBTQ COMMUNITIES \& ISSUES

In 2021, corporate foundations awarded $\$ 62.8$ million (22 percent) to LGBTQ communities and issues (or $\$ 59.6$ million, 24 percent, after funds awarded for the purpose of regranting are excluded).

## Top Corporate Funders 2021

Gilead Sciences
Foster City, CA
\$53,318,417
2 JP Morgan Chase
New York, NY
\$2,634,748


MAC Viva Glam Fund
New York, NY
\$1,911,986


T-Mobile
Bellevue, Washington
\$1,250,000


StartSmall LLC
San Francisco, CA
\$1,190,080


Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas Corporate
Giving Program
Dallas, TX
\$750,000
Citi Foundation
Long Island City, NY
\$750,000


Bristol Myers Squibb
New York, NY
\$494,074
Jim Moran Foundation, Inc.
Deerfield Beach, FL
\$260,000
9
Target Foundation
Minneapolis, MN
\$83,000
*This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

## Top Corporate Funder Grantees 2021

1 GLAAD
New York, NY
\$5,010,300
2 Los Angeles LGBTQ Center
Los Angeles, CA
\$4,441,840


Abounding Prosperity
Dallas, TX
\$3,050,000
4
San Francisco AIDS Foundation
San Francisco, CA
\$2,200,000


Services \& Advocacy for GLBT Elders (SAGE)
New York, NY
\$1,805,000


Latino Commission On AIDS
New York, NY
\$1,750,000
7 San Francisco Community Health Center
San Francisco, CA
\$1,450,000
Postgraduate Institute For Medicine
Englewood, CO
\$1,275,775
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, NC
\$1,254,698


Us Helping Us, People Into Living
Washington, DC
\$1,210,000

[^17]
## PRIVATE FOUNDATION GRANTMAKING FOR U.S. LGBTQ COMMUNITIES \& ISSUES

In 2021, private foundations awarded \$161.5 million ( 57 percent) to LGBTQ communities and issues (or $\$ 138.1$ million, 55 percent, after funds awarded for the purpose of regranting are excluded).

| Top Private Foundation Funders 2021 |
| :---: |
| 1 <br> Ford Foundation New York, NY \$37,076,375 |
| 2 The California Endowment Los Angeles, CA \$16,243,982 |
| 3 Wellspring Philanthropic Fund New York, NY \$12,487,025 |
| 4 Gill Foundation Denver, CO \$12,153,000 |
| Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Princeton, NJ \$9,753,858 |
| 6 Arcus Foundation New York, NY \$7,133,850 |
| 7 The Colorado Health Foundation Denver, CO \$6,950,322 |
| 8 Conrad N. Hilton Foundation Westlake Village, CA \$5,275,500 |
| 9 <br> Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund San Francisco, CA \$3,327,500 |
| The JPB Foundation New York, NY \$3,250,000 |
| *This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting. |

## Top Private Funder Grantees 202115

1 Southerners On New Ground (SONG)
1 Atlanta, GA
\$8,230,000
2 Transgender Law Center
2 Oakland, CA
\$6,469,500
3
National LGBTQ Task Force
Washington, DC
\$2,705,000

4
BYP100 Education Fund
Chicago, IL
\$2,605,000
5
Los Angeles LGBT Center
Los Angeles, CA
\$2,319,500
(6) GLSEN

New York, NY
\$2,209,000
Freedom For All Americans Education Fund
Washington, DC
\$2,110,500
Neo Philanthropy
New York, NY
\$1,950,000
Algorithmic Justice League
Washington, DC
\$1,900,000


Funders for LGBTQ Issues
New York, NY
\$1,851,800

[^18]
## PUBLIC FOUNDATION GRANTMAKING FOR U.S. LGBTQ COMMUNITIES \& ISSUES

In 2021, public foundations awarded $\$ 33.0$ million ( 12 percent) to LGBTQ communities and issues (or $\$ 30.8$ million, 12 percent, after funds awarded for the purpose of regranting are excluded).

| Top Public Foundation Funders 2021 |
| :---: |
| 1 Tides Foundation San Francisco, CA \$8,337,854 |
| Borealis Philanthropy Minneapolis, MN \$5,341,900 |
| (3) <br> Horizons Foundation San Francisco, CA \$4,847,403 |
| (4) Groundswell Fund Oakland, CA \$3,571,000 |
| 5 Our Fund Foundation Wilton Manors, FL \$2,240,853 |
| 6 Third Wave Fund New York, NY \$1,690,500 |
| 7 Black Tie Dinner Dallas, TX \$1,449,999 |
| 8 New York Women's Foundation New York, NY \$1,407,500 |
| (9) Astraea Lesbian Foundation For Justice New York, NY \$941,000 |
| 10 <br> Women's Foundation of California San Francisco, CA \$565,000 |
| *This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting. |

## Top Public Funder Grantees 2021

1
The Future Perfect Project
Kingston, NY
\$1,050,000
2 Transgender Law Center
2
Oakland, CA
\$596,826
(3) The Trevor Project
\$530,230
4 Pride Live
New York, NY
\$500,000


All Out Action Fund
New York, NY
\$461,500


Funders For LGBTQ Issues
New York, NY
\$431,500
7 The Translatin@ Coalition
Los Angeles, CA
\$419,000
8
Kaleidoscope Youth Center
Columbus, OH
$\$ 400,000$
Transtech Social Enterprises
Culver City, CA
\$350,000
Women With A Vision
New Orleans, LA
\$310,000

[^19]
# OTHER FOUNDATION GRANTMAKING FOR U.S. LGBTQ COMMUNTIES \& ISSUES 

In 2021, foundations that self-identified as not falling into one of the previous categories awarded $\$ 4.5$ million ( 2 percent) to LGBTQ communities and issues (or $\$ 4.5$ million, 2 percent, after funds awarded for the purpose of regranting are excluded).

## Top Other Funders 2021

Elton John AIDS Foundation
New York, NY
\$1,413,206


Trans Justice Funding Project
New York, NY
\$1,272,500


Trinity Church Wall Street
New York, NY
\$810,000


AIDS United
Washington, DC
\$614,700


Transgender Strategy Center (TSC)
Richmond, CA
\$175,000


Outright Action International
New York, NY
\$110,000
Advocates for Youth
Washington, DC
\$110,000


Frameline, Inc.
San Francisco, CA
\$17,500
*This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

## Top Other Funder Grantees 2021

1 Transgender Law Center
Oakland, CA
\$1,323,500
2
Normal Anomaly
Houston, TX
\$180,000
Us Helping Us, People Into Living
Washington, DC
\$180,000
TruEvolution
Riverside, CA
\$180,000
In The Meantime Men's Group
Los Angeles, CA
\$180,000
The Bros In Convo Initiative
Orlando, FL
\$179,386
4 S.O.U.L Sisters Leadership Collective
Miami, FL
\$150,000
5
THRIVE Support Services
Atlanta, GA
\$144,000


Girls for Gender Equity (GGE)
New York, NY
\$125,000
7
Trinity Community Connection
New York, NY
\$100,000
Hetrick-Martin Institute
New York, NY
\$100,000
Princess Janae Place
New York, NY
\$100,000
Girl Vow, Inc
New York, NY
\$100,000
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## METHODOLOGY

This report describes the amount and type of giving by U.S. foundations for LGBTQ communities and issues, including subsets of the community (e.g. transgender women, LGBTQ youth). The report does not include grants to organizations or projects that are generally inclusive of LGBTQ people. Major individual donors (i.e. MacKenzie Scott) were also not included in our reporting, as we focus on foundation funding.

We collected data in three ways: foundations could submit grant-level information for each year using a template provided by Funders for LGBTQ Issues, IRS Form 990 data could be provided from the Candid database, or grants could be identified using published annual reports. The dataset was deduplicated by funder name; in other words, if funders submitted directly, their grants as reported by Candid or online annual reports were not included.

Multi-year grants are counted in-full in the year they were awarded. This method best reflects a foundation's priorities in the year of reporting, though does contribute to fluctuations from year to year.

In order to be considered for inclusion in the dataset, grants had to include the following minimum information: grantee name, funder name, amount of funding, and support type (e.g. general operating, program). Grants were included if there was sufficient evidence that $50 \%$ or more of the support provided was for LGBTQ+ issues and people. Any one or more of the following was considered sufficient evidence that the grant was for LGBTQ+ issues and communities: if the submitting foundation indicated that all their grantmaking was LGBTQ-specific, or
if the individual grant entry indicated that it was awarded for the specific purpose of supporting LGBTQ communities or issues (through the grant description or the selection of LGBTQ population categories in the direct submission template). Grants that lacked specificity in their grant description could also be included in the dataset if they were awarded to an organization whose mission was solely focused on LGBTQ communities or issues.

Grants were assigned to LGBTQ populations (e.g. asexual, lesbian), other populations (e.g. Black, youth), issues, and strategies using keyword searches of grant descriptions and grantee missions. Where keywords indicated that grants had multiple LGBTQ populations, multiple other populations, multiple issues, or multiple strategies, grant amounts were weighted by the inverse of the number of populations (or issues or strategies) the grant addressed. For details on how population, issue, and strategy weights were created, please contact the authors of the report.

Estimating change over time in the funding to LGBTQ communities and issues is an important goal of this report; however, there are significant limitations in comparability across years. Funder willingness and capacity to provide grantmaking data, COVID-19related delays in data collection and submission (in the form of online reporting, IRS data, and direct submission to Funders to LGBTQ Issues), and the discovery of new funding organizations all impact the data available for inclusion in our reporting. This year saw a particularly robust outreach and data collection period compared to the previous two years, which were affected by a number of factors that limited these processes.
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[^0]:    (1) Alyssa Lawther, et. al., 2019-2020 Resource Tracking Report: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Grantmaking by U.S. Foundations, p.15, Funders for LGBTQ Issues (2022).

[^1]:    (2) This is an increase of over 60\% since 2020. This increase may be partially attributed to an actual increase in giving, and partially attributed to improvements in our data collection and analysis methodology: this year we were able to collect more funding information from more funders than in years past. This included a deeper dive into publicly-available IRS data than we have been able to do in past years. Additionally, in recognition of the complexities facing grantmakers in different regions supporting an extremely diverse array of LGBTQ communities and issues, we allowed grantmakers to characterize their grantmaking in our reporting as entirely for LGBTQ communities if that was their intent in making those grants.
    (3) This $\$ 282.7$ million includes $\$ 251.9$ million in direct funds and $\$ 30.8$ million in dollars awarded for re-granting.

[^2]:    (4) While this report focuses on 2021 grantmaking, the Club Q mass shooting in Colorado Springs in November of 2022 and its aftermath offers many lessons for grantmakers about how funders can support the healing and recovery of LGBTQ communities in the Mountain region. Please contact Funders for LGBTQ Issues if you are interested in learning more.

[^3]:    (5) In contrast to other sections of this report, these lists of top funders - and all subsequent top funder lists - include dollars awarded for re-granting, so as to capture the full amount of funding flowing from (or through) each funder.

[^4]:    (6) This was determined based on reviews of these organizations' websites as they appeared in May of 2023.
    (7) In 2021, multiple anonymous grantees received a total of $\$ 3.9$ million benefitting LGBTQ communities. If we combined anonymous grantees, they would be \#5 on this list.

[^5]:    *This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^6]:    (8) Transgender, gender nonconforming, and nonbinary community members

[^7]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^8]:    (9) Malkia Devich Cyril, et. al. Mismatched: Philanthropy's Response to the Call for Racial Justice, Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity (September 2021).

[^9]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^10]:    (10) This table captures the geographic level of the funded work, not necessarily the level of the funded organizations. So, e.g., a national group and a local group doing local

[^11]:    (11) It is possible that grantmaking classified as "multi-region/cross-region" also included specific Southern states or regions, and thus would not be captured in the "Southeast" category.

[^12]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting

[^13]:    (13) For 6 percent of grants, we were not able to identify a strategy through automated coding or manual review. Grants coded to multiple strategies were weighted with the inverse of the number of strategies to which they were coded; for example, if a grant was coded to advocacy and to capacity building ( 2 issues), each category included $1 / 2$ (50\%) of the funding for that grant.

[^14]:    *This table includes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting

[^15]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^16]:    (14) Student scholarships accounted for a total of $\$ 601,000$ from community foundations. If we combined these, they would be \#3 on this list.

[^17]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^18]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^19]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

[^20]:    *This table excludes funds awarded for the purpose of regranting.

