



Pangea

Giving for Global Change

WHERE DOES PANGEA LIE?

An Analysis of Pangea Giving & Giving Circle Landscape

Abstract

Research designed to provide insight into the landscape of giving circles and conceptualize where Pangea Giving lies based on an objective internal analysis of the group. .

Timothy Constien
Intern July – November 2018
Constiet@gmail.com

Executive Summary

The study took place between July 2018 – November 2018 and the supervision of Nick Dreher, Communications and Operations Coordinator. The research proposal was shared with the Pangea Giving's Fund Development Committee and Board and was opened to suggestions and questions toward the research. Existing literature was drawn from philanthropic professionals, studies, and similar organizations as Pangea. Interviews were conducted with seven varying members of Pangea. The report provides a comprehensive insight into the world of giving circles complimented with a direct analysis of Pangea Giving aimed at conceptualizing where the organization lies within this context. The suggestions included in this report are designed to spark a conversation. They are not intended to suggest the best or most appropriate way forward for Pangea. Ultimately, any changes should be collectively decided upon by Pangea's leadership and members.

Research Objectives

To narrow the focus of this rather broad subject, I have worked with Pangea staff in identifying a set of objectives that this research aims to achieve.

- Clarify Pangea's organizational and member identity and values
- Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Pangea's current membership model.
- Specific short and long-term suggestions and findings Pangea could adopt or learn from

1. Literature Review

1.1. Identities (REF: *Identity Types* pg. 8)

Identities are an external representation of a group's collective values, beliefs, and/or mission that the public can recognize or identify with, regardless of the members unique personal identities. Giving circles and other collective giving groups proactively showcase their identity to fundraise, seek charitable donations, or to request the support of larger foundations. The three common types of identities present within this landscape; a group's members, the issues supported by the group, or the group's unique giving style.

1.1.1. Members

The identity of some groups is formed around the members themselves. Groups are organized to improve the social or personal wellbeing of those directly involved. In many cases, the group is created to provide a social outlet for the members to support causes, educate themselves, or network where otherwise they would not have an appropriate method of doing so. The members will all have some shared personal identity, whether it be race, religion, age, gender, social position, geographical region, or other unique commonality. Membership identity types are simple enough to communicate as the members themselves can speak to the benefits the group and any external support has provided.

1.1.2. Issues Supported

The issues come in all varieties, but many issue-focused giving circles are formed around a belief that their particular issue is underserved by traditional philanthropy. These causes include social justice, women's rights, and local community development. International and religion-based issues are the lesser common identity types (7% and 11% respectively according to the Collective Giving Research Group's findings). Issues that are too ambitious or systematic are difficult to form an identity around as they require substantial amounts of resources to achieve any influence.

1.1.3. Giving Style

The "giving style" identity type can prove to be the most difficult to communicate. It requires deeper engagement and content for external to grasp the nature of why the organization's approach is unique. A giving style identity is that their membership and support can come from anyone with whom the style of giving resonates. This model also requires commitment from those who want to become more involved.

1.1. Membership Compositions

The membership composition is what the group structures their organization around. Successful giving circles are the ones who understand who their members are and are strategically structured to best serve the needs of these members. It is crucial for a giving circle to recognize their membership composition as distinct from their identity.

1.1.1. Demographic

I refer to demographic as any trait, characteristic, or personal background shared by group members irrespective of their involvement with the group. Within the giving circle landscape, some of the more recognizable demographic types shared amongst members is gender, sexual preference, race, religion, age, profession, and social class.

1.1.2. Commitment

Commitment is a composition made up of those that share an intrinsic desire that comes into fruition with the emergence of the group that acts upon it. Commitment, whether it be how much a person is willing to contribute or what they are committed to, can be shared amongst members regardless of their demographic or personal background. The reason why I make commitment a distinct type of membership composition is because it is essential that the members are comprised mostly of people who are committed to the same cause or are able to commit a certain level of personal time and energy.

1.1.3. Strategic

This refers to groups who build their membership based on needs, set standards, or special invitation. Membership composition is rarely based solely on a systematic need, but it can still prove useful to strategically approach reaching out to new members. Everyone can donate money. A certain level of personal satisfaction arises from helping out in other ways.

1.2. Funding Structures

The funding structures of giving circles seem to be designed based on organizational aspirations and membership intentions. The priority of any funding structure is to understand these

aspirations and intentions, then structure the funding to serve these functions - essentially, to understand where the money should come from, why it should come from that source, and what the funds will be used for. The three main funding sources I have seen giving circles and other groups utilize into Membership Contributions, ongoing charity, and institutional.

1.2.1. Membership Contribution

Funding structures based around membership contributions is at the foundation of giving circles. Members contribute their own funds to a pool. The members then collectively decide how the pool will be allocated.

1.2.2. Charity / Donations

Most philanthropic groups utilize some sort of donation or charity funding source. Groups leveraging donations to fund their organization or grant pool can be seen as brokers for individual giving. The success and reliance of a charity funding structure relies on the reputation of the organization and the simplicity of donating from the donor's perspective.

1.2.3. Institutional

Collective giving groups can also play the brokerage function for foundation and corporate giving. Groups will consolidate financials acquired from foundations or businesses into their own grant pool and operations. Foundations, especially community foundations, and businesses financially support giving circles and other giving groups for a variety of reasons.

1.3. Types of Giving Circles (REF: *Types of Giving Circles* pg.20)

1.3.1. Grassroots / Member

Grassroots or Member groups are the most common formation of a giving circles (GC). These GCs are often comprised of a small group of friends or peers who use the group as a social and educational platform to support local or grassroots efforts with which they all affiliated.

1.3.2. Established

Established giving circles can be more plainly explained as collective giving groups. Established giving circles have typically reached the point where they have begun to veer from the customary aspects of giving circles and have begun to incorporate professional and strategic practices.

1.3.3. Network / Catalyst

GCs join networks to share resources and knowledge, provide members with greater networks and social opportunities, replicate operations, acquire financing, or seek administrative support. The organizations behind these networks can be seen as the catalyst behind amplifying giving while operating as a collective giving group themselves. These platforms organizations focus on amplifying their unique approach as an effective means of alleviating that issue by supporting others to take part.

2. Findings

The findings presented in this section are based off the applying the knowledge I acquired from researching the giving circle landscape into context with what I learned from interviews with seven Pangea Giving members and various interactions with the group. Based off shared visions and motivations amongst the Pangea Giving members I have interacted with, these findings help showcase what Pangea's identity is, what an ideal membership composition looks like, and any potential funding structure.

2.1. Where does Pangea Lie

2.1.1. *Pangea's Identity*

Pangea empowers members to directly support and connect with international grassroots organizations. The notion of regaining control of personal charity in the form of collective giving seems to be the essence of what initially attracts Pangea members. Members who join tend to have a past connection with or desire to engage with the international community. These reasons alone are not what keeps members engaged in the long term.

The style of giving seems to be what keeps donors engaged and what makes Pangea Giving distinct. Pangea Giving acts as an outlet to a greater community beyond the veil that traditional philanthropy outlets allows. Pangea Giving members are in a position to build mutual and trusting relationships with their partners. Pangea's "relational philanthropy" giving style is one to be admired even within philanthropy. There is a feeling among some members that it has become more complex or cumbersome to fully embellish this unique identity as it requires significant amount of time and energy to enthusiastically be involved.

2.1.2. *Pangea's Membership Composition & Membership Acquisition*

A decisive membership composition appears to be where the most variance lies amongst Pangea Giving members. Pangea Giving may be at an inflection point as members express that it is time for change. Collectively, the group feels it is necessary to strategize around this change and for the future. I found considerable differences in opinions around what the ideal size of the membership is and if it is necessary for the group to diversify for the "health" of the organization. There is a desire for members less engaged to become more involved in the steering of day-to-day operations. Leadership is experiencing "founder fatigue," while the lesser involved members are out of the loop but remain members for altruistic satisfaction. Some members believe Pangea should narrow in on potential members that understand and have the time to be an active member. Others view is that Pangea needs to diversify or grow the membership base to bring in new energy.

2.1.3. *Funding*

Being accountable of individual spending is one of the most appealing aspects to Pangea members. However, there seems to be interest in exploring other funding outlets and what additional funds potentially represent. Members are concerned about being accountable for other's money and that external support could lead to being required to adhere to external standards. Nonetheless, additional funds will be needed to pursue any of Pangea's aspirations. In the context of this report, there is some variance around the desire to pursue alternative funding sources. In general, there seems to be an overarching ambiguity toward how and why Pangea Giving should pursue external funding.

3. Conclusion / Suggestions

3.1. Revealed Identity

I would suggest that Pangea's most appealing identity lies within Pangea's unique position to offer anyone willing to engage in this "global relational philanthropy" giving style with an "experiential learning" experience that members can carry with them throughout their professional and social lives.

3.2. Suggested Membership Composition

My suggestion would be to focus the energy, time, and resources that would otherwise be spent on attracting new members toward re-engaging the current membership base. The focus should be re-establishing the personal relationships between members and their connection to Pangea Giving. Pangea should take a personal approach toward any recruiting, focus on audiences who have both the time and desire to take part in Pangea's giving circle, ensure prospects know what they are getting into, and that new members are not left to fend for themselves once they do join.

3.2.1. Networks

I truly believe that Pangea can stand to gain from joining an existing network or establishing a solid "network" of their own with like organizations. I would suggest this approach for Pangea as establishing a network with a diverse, but like-minded organizations, set of organizations. A diverse network sets the groups involved with the most opportunity to learn and collaborate together with each group bring in its own specializations and unique connections.

3.2.2. Membership Experience and Engagement

A common theme displayed among Pangea and the individuals I have interviewed is the difficulty level it is to become an active member. It is important that Pangea makes it as simple and as welcoming as possible for members to become active and discover ways in which they can chip in. Pangea stands to benefit most from creating more opportunities for social and educational gatherings. Joining or creating a network would help alleviate some of the work to do so.

3.3. Funding & Capacity Needs

I trust that with a membership base of around 70 and a Circle of Friends base of around 30-50 should be sufficient enough to keep Pangea operations *as is*. However, it is evident that Pangea is in a transition period with some much-needed change. My suggestion would be to establish both on-going charity and institutional funding sources to support this change. To do so, Pangea will need to invest in creating a more effective digital presence and building more awareness philanthropic community. This means Pangea will need generate a short-term financial source to help fund this additional work. My suggestion would be taking an alternative route from traditional fundraising campaigns and achieve short-term financial stability from institutional funding.

3.3.1. Conclusion

Ultimately, any changes should be collectively decided upon by Pangea's leadership and members. Making any organizational changes in the same democratic and inclusive process in which Pangea goes about making philanthropic decisions will be an important aspect for maintaining Pangea's integrity and reassuring members' trust of the giving circle concept. Ideally, this report is shared amongst decision makers and stored for future reference.

Table of Contents

1. Intro	8
1.1. Scope of Work	8
1.2. Research Methods	8
1.3. Objectives	9
2. Literature Review	10
2.1. Identities	10
2.1.1. Members	11
2.1.2. Issues Supported	12
2.1.3. Giving Style	12
2.1. Membership Compositions	15
2.1.1. Demographic	15
2.1.2. Commitment	16
2.1.3. Strategic	17
2.2. Funding Structures	18
2.2.1. Membership Contribution	19
2.2.2. Charity / Donations	20
2.2.3. Institutional	21
2.3. Types of Giving Circles	24
2.3.1. Grassroot / Member	24
2.3.2. Established	24
2.3.3. Network / Catalyst	25
3. Findings	27
3.1. Where does Pangea Lie	27
3.1.1. Pangea's Identity	27
3.1.2. Pangea's Membership Composition & Membership Acquisition	28
3.1.3. Funding	30
4. Conclusion / Suggestions	33
4.1. Revealed Identity	33
4.1.1. Utilization	33
4.2. Suggested Membership Composition	34
4.2.1. Networks	37
4.2.2. Membership Experience and Engagement	38
4.3. Funding & Capacity Needs	39
4.3.1. Digital Presence	39
4.3.2. Funding Sources	40
4.3.3. Conclusion	42

4. Intro

4.1. Scope of Work

The study took place between July 2018 – November 2018. All research and reporting was under the supervision of Nick Dreher, Communications and Operations Coordinator. The research proposal was shared with the Pangea Giving's Fund Development Committee and Board and was opened to suggestions and questions toward the research.

4.2. Research Methods

This is an exploratory study to provide a comprehensive insight into the world of giving circles complimented with a direct analysis of Pangea Giving aimed at conceptualizing where the organization lies within this context. The exploratory nature of this study leverages a partially integrated mixed-methods research approach with findings gathered from within the literature, data, existing organizations, and from direct interviews with Pangea Giving stakeholders. Literature was provided by philanthropic researchers and nonprofit professional dedicated to providing insight and knowledge in these subjects. The information provided by relatable organizations as Pangea was found through examining their websites, case-studies, and educational articles they published. Interviews were done with various members of Pangea. The research was done systematically beginning with acquiring a comprehensive understanding of the general philanthropic and collective giving landscape. Then narrowing the focus of study specifically toward giving circles and the landscape of philanthropy in the Seattle Area. The approaches to this study was

The primary qualitative data sources included seven semi-structured interviews with interviewees each of which are Pangea members with a distinctive history and level of involvement with the group. The sample of interviews included four in-depth interviews with current Pangea Leadership and three shorter interviews with other members. The interviews were initially structured off a list of topics and open questions designed to lead the discussion down a similar path as the evolution path of the literature review and research question development. The conversational landscape is set to organically produced valuable contribution toward answering the research question and achieving the study's objectives

4.3. Objectives

To narrow the focus of this rather broad subject, I have worked with Pangea staff in identifying a set of objectives that this research aims to achieve. These objectives were based off some of the more notable needs and aspirations in relation to the current state of Pangea's membership and organizational structure. Similar to broad nature of this research's subjects, achieving the below objectives will help provide a comprehensive look into the organization.

Research Objectives

1. Clarify Pangea's organizational and member identity and values
2. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Pangea's current membership model.
3. Specific short and long-term suggestions and findings Pangea could adopt or learn from
 - a. How to grow and diversify membership base
 - b. Alternative funding sources
 - c. Methods of adding capacity within current context
 - d. List of specific foundations and resources to learn from and potential collaboration

5. Literature Review

5.1. Identities

Identities are an external representation of a group's collective values, beliefs, and/or mission that the public can recognize or identify with, regardless of the members unique personal identities. According to the Collective Giving Research Group, around 60% of giving circles are formed around an identity. A quick scan of the shared giving landscape will show that forming around a particular identity is not unique to giving circles (GC) alone within philanthropy. Though the members of these giving circles consist of individuals who associate with the group's identity in some fashion, the identity is also the public representation of a group. The identity may not be an exact image of a group's members, but it reflects how the group is perceived by outsiders. These outsiders may include other philanthropic organizations, individuals who do not fit the group identity but support the cause, or corporations who feel compelled to fund the well-being of this identity type.

Giving circles and other collective giving groups proactively showcase their identity to fundraise, seek charitable donations, or to request the support of larger foundations. The outside evidence that backs the notion that a group's portrayed identity is what draws in external support is from the various foundations, corporations, and individuals who make it known that they actively support any given identity type. For example, foundations will provide grants for certain social or demographic organizations. Businesses will financially sponsor these groups and their events. Individuals make it know by becoming members themselves or by becoming recurring donors.

The more notable GCs and collective giving groups do an excellent job in leveraging their identity in marketing and outreach efforts. It is evident in the content they publish on their websites, during their events, and through the grants they provide. Black Benefactors (www.blackbenefactors.org/) is one of the more prominent GCs here in the US. They excel at promoting their identity which makes it easy for anyone interested in or considering supporting to know what exactly they will be helping. Their identity is can be summed up by a Washington DC group that is supporting the well-being of "black children, youth, and families." Anyone who is directly concerned with the success of this mission, regardless if they are direct beneficiary or

in their region, is more likely to support the organization because of this clarity. Supporters know that their support, financial or otherwise, is going the cause they care about.

There are a plethora of identities and issues that giving circles and philanthropic groups form around, but there are three common *types* of identities present within this landscape; a group's members, the issues supported by the group, or the group's unique giving style. These categorizations are not entirely distinct from one another. There are many groups that form around some combination of the three. However, separating the various identity types in three types can assist members of GCs to come to terms with their own identity and then leverage this awareness. An organization's identity plays a role in their funding model and organizational structure. The three identity types I have termed are covered below.

5.1.1. Members

The identity of some groups is formed around the members themselves. Groups are organized to improve the social or personal wellbeing of those directly involved. In many cases, the group is created to provide a social outlet for the members to support causes, educate themselves, or network where otherwise they would not have an appropriate method of doing so. The members will all have some shared personal identity, whether it be race, religion, age, gender, social position, geographical region, or other unique commonality. Membership identity types are simple enough to communicate as the members themselves can speak to the benefits the group and any external support has provided.

An excellent example of a giving circle with a member-based identity is the Washington Womenade group (washingtonwomenade.org). As they put it, "Our mission is simple - to enjoy our women friends in wonderful, warm and lively parties, while bringing money from those who have, to some who have not." The group donates to all sorts of local causes and doesn't adopt a noticeably strategic form of giving. Rather, their identity is formed around the members themselves. Their mission is to provide a social and charitable outlet for women in the Washington D.C. area.

The Red Umbrella Fund (redumbrellafund.org) is a nationally recognized group formed around its members across the country. The GC is made up of women who have been directly affected by sex trafficking. They pool together their resources to address this crisis that has personally affected each of them. Red Umbrella Fund does focus on a particular issue, but the substance of their identity stems from the experience which connects all of their members.

5.1.2. Issues Supported

Another identity type which is often easier to communicate and for outsiders to connect with are the giving circles that form around a certain issue. The issues come in all varieties, but many issue-focused giving circles are formed around a belief that their particular issue is underserved by traditional philanthropy. These causes include social justice, women's rights, and local community development. International and religion-based issues are the lesser common identity types (7% and 11% respectively according to the Collective Giving Research Group's findings).

Issues that are too ambitious or systematic are difficult to form an identity around as they require substantial amounts of resources to achieve any influence. Giving circles tend to lack these necessities, unless tied to a stronger network, and let traditional philanthropic outlets approach these more complex issues. Groups that form their identity around specific issues they support focus their efforts on ensuring they are truly making a noticeable impact on the issues they support. External support stems from those who want to see these issues approached or want to be connected to the cause whether or not they directly take part in the efforts.

5.1.3. Giving Style

The "giving style" identity type can prove to be the most difficult to communicate or reflect. As with the group's method of actual giving, it requires deeper engagement and detailed content for external support or potential members to grasp the nature of why the organization's approach is unique.

Agents of good in the forms of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and charities are sprouting up to tackle issues abound with an organized force. Still, amongst all of this social activity, the world is facing some of the most prevalent societal and environmental problems.

This discrepancy begs one to challenge the effectiveness of philanthropy and social investment. We see the challenge in the form of Strategic Giving and the rise of calculated models, theories, and strategies all with the hopes to be more effective and efficient with the funds and resources donated. Subject matter experts like Paul Brest, John Kania, and Mark Kramer associate strategic giving with outcome-oriented, result-driven, and effective philanthropy. Brest puts it, “philanthropy remains an underperformer in achieving social outcomes. One cause of this may be that philanthropists are essentially unaccountable.” The growing demand for accountability and results in philanthropy help explain the rise of giving circles. Individuals who want to bypass traditional philanthropy outlets to institute change. The giving style can be to donate organization’s or individuals who would otherwise not have the reach or legitimacy to receive support from traditional outlets. Giving circles also arise to create a value on either end. In the process of giving, the group effectively educates and connects a community of like-minded individuals and organizations to create intangible and altruistic value for those involved.

The Awesome Foundation gives with “no strings attached.” Their model is to bring individuals together to collaborate with one another to decide how to donate their funds. And in the process, inspire and create awareness to those involved in the actual giving.

What makes giving circles and collective giving organizations embody a giving style identity is that their membership and support can come from anyone with whom the style of giving resonates. As the creators of Social Justice Fund put it, “[regardless of their demographic makeup], Don’t underestimate your members.” Motivated people can achieve a lot, they just need an opportunity to do so. The idea of creating two-way value for the community and the members is a central message of this types of organizations. This model also requires commitment from those who want to become more involved.

The level of commitment and detail it takes to fully communicate a giving style identity takes a personal approach whether from individual education or through building a network. A great example of a group who fully exemplifies a giving style identity type is the Giving Project Learning Community (givingprojects.org). The group goes as far as providing a step-by-step process on

how to give and why it's important. They do have a general area of concern where they focus their efforts, but they more so promote the two-way value created from such an approach.

The aforementioned identity types are summed up in the table below:

<u>Identity Types</u>			
Identity Types	Members	Issues Supported	Giving Style
Formation	Around the members themselves	Around a specific issues or subject	Around a unique giving process
Structure	The wellbeing of members	Improving an issue or subject manner	Supporting the integrity of the giving style
Support Source	The members and their networks	Those who want to see change or be associated with it	Those who trust the giving style and see its benefits
Examples	Washington Womenade , Bread for Journey , Impact 100 of Sonoma	Agroecology Fund , Wild Foundation , One World Child Fund	BeMore , Giving Project Learning Community , Amplifier , Raise Your Hands

5.1. Membership Compositions

The membership composition of a GC is the people who become members of the group based on their connection with the group's identity. The identity is what draws in external support and recognition, while the membership composition is what the group structures their organization around. Successful giving circles are the ones who understand who their members are and are strategically structured to best serve the needs of these members. Because of this, it is crucial for a giving circle to recognize their membership composition as distinct from their identity. To be effective at whatever the identity projects a group does, the group needs to cater to their members specific goals and needs. Too much confusion or conflicting objectives within a membership base will lead to wasted effort and resources trying to meet a variety of needs. These instances will eventually lose the member's interest and make it less likely for members to endorse their group to others. It takes fully committed and engaged members to achieve the group's purpose.

Referring back to the Social Justice Fund, "if you want members to engage, give them the opportunity to do." I take it one step further and add, "give them the opportunity do so *in the way they want to.*" As with identities, I have recognized three general membership compositions for giving circles or other collective giving groups. Also, like identities, these are not entirely independent from one another. Many giving circles will reflect traits from more than one membership composition type. The idea behind classifying them in three unique types is to provide a framework in which to develop or assess any given group's individual membership composition type.

5.1.1. Demographic

The first membership type consists of groups made up of members of a certain demographic. In this case, I refer to demographic as any trait, characteristic, or personal background shared by group members irrespective of their involvement with the group. Within the giving circle landscape, some of the more recognizable demographic types shared amongst members is gender, sexual preference, race, religion, age, profession, and social class. A group needs to ensure that it accommodates to their member's motives behind why they believed a group of the given demographic would benefit from organizing in the first place. Each group may have

different needs, capacities, or desires. If a giving circle is based around empowering women to take philanthropy in their own hands, then it makes sense for leaders or board members to be women as well. If a group organizes around members who belong to a certain community, then it would behoove the group to select leaders who belong to that community as well.

Groups who organize to serve a certain demographic type will need to be sure the group offers ways to be engaged that are preferred by that specific group. For example, a study on UK millennials commissioned by [City Philanthropy](#) found that there is strong desire to connect and together commit to social change. Involvement in giving brings mutual value to work, social, and personal life. Most

Approaches for Encouraging the Younger Generations to Take Part

What approaches would encourage others to get involved? - % choosing each option	Highly effective	Quite effective	Not very/not effective
Learning by getting more involved in charity/philanthropy	56	32	12
Talks with like-minded peers on experiences of charity/philanthropy	55	39	5
Maximising effectiveness of charitable and philanthropic involvement	51	36	12
Occasional expert workshops on aspects of charity/philanthropy	47	41	12
A personal mentor to support/advise on my charity/philanthropy	42	40	18
Talks by prominent business people/celebrities involved in giving	39	51	10
Social investment approaches	32	31	38
Face-to-face training and courses	28	43	28
Information about mission, finances, activities of charities	25	56	19
Giving options-foundations, donor-advised funds, pooled giving	24	45	31
Tax-efficiency, methods and vehicles	14	46	39
An online group to access wherever convenient	14	47	39
General information about the charitable sector	11	41	48
Self-directed online courses with materials to use as convenient	8	20	72
Self-directed online courses with printed materials to use as convenient	7	19	74

young professionals are busy and, therefore, look for short-term opportunities to engage in philanthropy. Table 2.1 show the top approaches to get younger people involved. If a group's membership composition goal is to be made up of younger participants, then the group needs to structure themselves to be in a position to provide for the needs presented in Table 2.1. Again, the key is to understand who you members are, or which type of members your group would like to attract, then focus efforts on serving their particular wishes and catering to their practicalities.

5.1.2. Commitment

Commitment is a composition defined by people who share an intrinsic desire that comes into fruition with the emergence of the group that acts upon it. Commitment, whether it be how much a person is willing to contribute or what they are committed to, can be shared amongst members regardless of their demographic or personal background.

The committed type of composition can be incorporated along with any other identity, composition, or organizational structures. Irrespective of the group's identity or emphasized membership composition, every person joins a group because they are committed to the cause in some way or has some level of commitment they are able to contribute to the group's efforts. All philanthropic groups need to be cognizant of and respect the level and type of commitment of their members can make.

The reason why I make commitment a distinct type of membership composition is because it is essential that the members are comprised mostly, if not all, of people who are committed to the same cause or are able to commit a certain level of personal time and energy. When a group recognizes this, they then can ensure any potential members understand what they are getting into before they join, and then structure the organization in a way that permits them to engage in the manners they originally sought out to.

Take for instance, BeMore (bemore.co.uk), a UK-based network designed for young professionals. They understand their members are young professionals and organize the group around adhering to their specific member's commitment capacity. Their members are committed to creating social change in general but want to contribute beyond financial resources and seek a social connection in the process. They also understand that young professionals do not have the time or the experience necessary to take part in long-term commitments but are willing to fully engage for a shorter period. Before members join, they are educated on the process, so they understand what the commitment entails. They are then placed into groups and assigned a mentor. Over a set number of weeks, the group will select a cause to financially support as well as apply their professional skills. This initial project takes time and commitment, but once complete, members are free to move on or start a new project. Since BeMore organize their group around their members commitment, they get members to fully engage and leave the program excited, which helps spread the word to potential new members.

5.1.3. Strategic

The final membership composition type is when groups take a "strategic" approach. This refers to groups who build their membership based on needs, set standards, or special invitation.

Membership composition is rarely based solely on a systematic need, but it can still prove useful to strategically approach reaching out to new members. A group of members with a diverse set of backgrounds and skills can lead to more thoughtful conversations as well as maximizing impact. If a certain technical or professional need arises, it is useful to be able to pull from your membership group to help out. As findings in the general philanthropic landscape, there also come an altruistic return when someone is able to apply the skills and knowledge they've acquired in their professional and personal lives towards creating social change. When structuring a giving circle's membership composition, organizing it in a way that encourages members to contribute their unique set of skills helps keep members engaged and gives them a sense of pride that they are able to help out where others might not be able to. Everyone can donate money. A certain level of personal satisfaction arises from helping out in other ways.

An example of where a strategic approach was taken here in the Northwest when other organizations found ways to collaborate after the circle. Viva Farms, a bilingual farm incubator, and Community Action of Skagit County, a social services provider, found that by joining forces, they could improve access to healthy food for low-income residents while providing more customers for new farmers. They partnered to create the Fresh Fridays Farm Stand, where Viva farmers sold produce and Community Action provided information on resources available to pay for local food and how to learn how to prepare fresh produce. This came after the founders of these nonprofits were supported by a group of nonprofit leaders who joined together to create their own giving circle. Each one of the members collected grants from their resources and pooled the money together to fund the beginnings of Viva Farms. Viva Farms then followed this same strategic approach but contributed skills and knowledge rather than grants and financials.

5.2. Funding Structures

The funding structures of giving circles and other collective giving groups seem to be designed based on organizational aspirations and membership intentions. Aspirations include the size, reach, and mission of the group. Membership intentions can vary from active engagement, level of independence, or philanthropic motives. The priority of any funding structure is to understand these aspirations and intentions, then structure the funding to serve these functions - essentially, to understand where the money should come from, why it should come from that source, and

what the funds will be used for. Funding can come from a variety of different sources, evolve, or complement each other. However, I have separated the three main funding sources I have seen giving circles and other groups utilize into Membership Contributions, ongoing charity, and institutional. These of course are not isolated. It is still important to understand them as separate entities as each funding source can serve specific aspirations and intentions in some combination. The three funding sources that groups utilize are (1) membership contribution, (2) on-going charity and donations, and (3) institutional resources.

5.2.1. Membership Contribution

Funding structures based around membership contributions is at the foundation of giving circles. Members contribute their own funds to a pool. The members then collectively decide how the pool will be allocated. Earlier findings uncovered by Jessica Bearman (a member of the Collective Giving Research Group) suggest that the average membership fee was \$1,312 while the most frequent amount was \$400. However, according to The Collective Giving Research Group's recent survey, they found that these amounts may be decreasing, reflecting the fact that GCs continue to engage donors over a wide range of income and asset levels, from everyday givers to wealthy philanthropists. Some giving circles have taken a different approach to the traditional membership funding structure where contributions came from members' own assets. These giving circles stick to the membership revenue model, but each member actively fundraises their individual contribution.

Fundraising efforts are designed to build comradery amongst members while keeping them socially active and engaged. These are typically grassroots efforts stemming from small fundraising events and reaching out to friends or family. Giving circles have also started to utilize crowdfunding platforms as a means of amplifying their fundraising efforts at low to no additional cost or effort. These platforms have provided grassroots giving groups a method of reaching out to their network without obligatory pressure placed on the member or their network.

Groups who fundraise traditionally direct these funds to their grantees or the issues they support. This provides assurance to the donors as to where their donations are going. Directing fundraised cash to the overriding social issue should be more commonly practiced when reaching out to

friends and family as there may be a sense of uneasiness felt by donors who might be under the impression that they are simply giving money to a person to take part in a social organization. Both [The Giving Project Community](#) and Angela M. Eikenberry, an expert on collective giving and giving circles, stress the idea that regardless of where membership contributions originate from, they should not be diverted elsewhere. Members need to collectively agree on where their funds will go and inform any potential donor of how exactly their donations will be spent.

5.2.2. Charity / Donations

Most philanthropic groups utilize some sort of donation or charity funding source. These can either be used to supplement funds coming from other sources (i.e. membership contribution or institutional) or can be the lone source of funding. Groups leveraging donations to fund their organization or grant pool can be seen as brokers for individual giving. The success and reliance of a charity funding structure relies on the reputation of the organization and the simplicity of donating from the donor's perspective. Individuals give money to the group because they have come to trust that group will make a positive social use of the donation regardless of exactly how their funds are dispersed. Donations and charity are intriguing to nonprofits and giving groups because they are a source of funds that is typically not earmarked. These funds can be utilized by the group in the way that suits them best. Funds can be used to build organizational capacity or towards the grant pool. This is because the individual has put trust in the organization to do what is best with their money. because the group has proven to be successful in making an impact or the individual is compelled by the group's identity.

Groups that are able to take full advantage are those who do an excellent job communicating their identity or sharing their successes. In order to effectively do so, they build a strong digital and social presence targeting their intended audience. A strong digital presence means that the group can stand out from the rest through a compelling message and website, strong SEO, and personalized communication through direct mailing or social media outlets. The latter entails that the organization establishes a following beyond its members by building their reputation through traditional media outlets, word of mouth, social events, or community support.

For example, One World Children’s Fund (oneworldchildrensfund.org), is a collective giving group supporting grassroots organizations around the world that support the well-being of children. They have around 40 “Founding Members” who have pledged to give between \$1,500 to \$25,000 a year for three years. However, they have also created a “network of volunteers, donors, and supporters that are partnering with these organizations to raise almost \$3 million each year. One World provides bookkeeping, accounting, fundraising support, online donation platforms, and direct grantmaking of funds to our partners with a lean staff and minimal overhead.” They have made it as simple as possible for their network to donate to their partners or to their foundation by utilizing an online fundraising platform (Classy.org) and putting on annual events to educate their network and raise administrative funds. They hired staff to manage donations and on-going stewardship. Their network can vet through their individual partners to see who they want to give to or they set up recurring donations to support their group’s work. One World acts as the brokerage for their network’s philanthropy. They have proven successful at what they do and have built a positive enough reputation to not rely on fundraising appeals aside from emergency or crises situations. They have established themselves as a giving circle and still “continue to rely on the generosity and love of a caring community.”

5.2.3. Institutional

Collective giving groups can also play the brokerage function for foundation and corporate giving. Groups will consolidate financials acquired from foundations or businesses into their own grant pool and operations. Foundations, especially community foundations, and businesses financially support giving circles and other giving groups for a variety of reasons. Angela Eikenberry explains, “Community foundations and other philanthropic institutions increasingly devote staff and resources to start and support giving circles with the assumption that these groups will leverage, improve and increase giving and its impact.” Foundations will have an allotted amount of grants to share with such giving groups or take on more of a partnership role by providing the resources or space that the group needs to maximize their impact.

Businesses will support giving circles as a way to generate shared value with the communities in which they operate or as a way to deliver on their Corporate Social Responsibilities, or as the World Bank puts it, “commitment of business to contribute to sustainable economic

development, working with employees, their families, the local community and society at large to improve quality of life, in ways that are both good for business and good for development". This can be in terms of simple financial contributions similar to grants, event sponsorships, resource and space sharing, or volunteering special skills. Michael Porter and Mark Kramer conceptualized this idea of businesses creating "Shared Value." They explain that businesses invest in their community's and customer's well-being as a way of "creating economic value that also creates value for societal needs and challenges. Businesses look to reconnect company success with social progress." Hence, many local businesses invest in local giving groups as a means of empowering their community and workforce. Those businesses after CSR opportunities are willing to invest financially as a way of strengthening their reputation or from sheer altruistic values shared within the business culture.

From the standpoint of the giving circle or collective giving group, the most important aspect is to not take acquiring institutional support lightly. It is a two-way relationship. Just as foundations and business will vet organizations they will support, giving groups need to vet who they seek support from. As Eikenberry states, "It is not uncommon where we've had various kinds of fundraising funds, or thematic funds, or collective funds, for there at some point to be some kind of falling out argument about who's in control... it may not be as conducive to invest in a new method of giving that may not realize sufficient return until the medium- to long-term." Therefore, it is important that the giving group pursues support from organizations that understand and value the identity and mission of their group. The giving group needs to be able to clarify why they are deserving of the support and what any investments will be geared towards. Patricia Patriz, and independent academic and principal and director of the Evaluation Roundtable at Public/Private Ventures, says "foundations [and businesses] fall short of being effective because they seek to change what they do without considering how they do it." It is the role of the group seeking support to explain it. Referring back to the The Giving Project Learning Community (GPLC). They originally hired staff solely with membership contributions, but as they grew, they realized they needed more support. They sought grants from partners who valued their style of philanthropy and where after to support philanthropy within their community as opposed to directly supporting the issues The GPLC supported. With these grants, they were able to hire full time staff and, in the process, ensure member donations were not spent elsewhere. Institutional funding needs to be

strategic. The foundation (normally community foundation) needs to understand the identity and goals of the GC. It's a two-way relationship.

5.3. Types of Giving Circles

I have summed up the types of giving circles and collective giving groups into three classifications. These three classifications are generalizations and are not entirely independent from one another. Many groups incorporate aspects from two or three of these classifications, especially those belonging to a greater network. In theme with the rest of this report, I present types of giving circles this way to provide context that can be utilized when assessing or forming any given group. The three that have been classified, Grassroot/Members, Established, and Network/Catalyst are summed up in the table *Types of Circles* (pg. 20).

5.3.1. Grassroot / Member

Grassroot or Member groups are the most common formation of a giving circles (GC). These GCs are often comprised of a small group of friends or peers who use the group as a social and educational platform to support local or grassroots efforts with which they all affiliated. Grassroot and member GCs will put together relatively small grants and gift them to organizations, most commonly local, that typically do not receive significant institutional support. These GCs can operate entirely on their own or join a larger network that provides a framework and support. Membership fees are generally funded either through members' own financial means, small fundraising events, or peer-to-peer fundraising. All funds are put towards one or two grants and do not need to be directed elsewhere based on the low overhead and administrative needs.

5.3.2. Established

Established giving circles can be more plainly explained as collective giving groups. Established giving circles have typically reached the point where they have begun to veer from the customary aspects of giving circles and have begun to incorporate professional and strategic practices. Membership has grown beyond the core group requiring these groups to acquire a more systematic approach to decision-making and additional support structures. These larger groups establish networks within the general philanthropic landscape or begin to collaborate with traditional foundations. All of these new additions require additional funding sources and increased administrative support. Established groups can leverage their increased presence to acquire external support, additional funding sources, and/or hire staff to manage the day-to-day operations. The Collective Giving Research Group found that about 70% of GCs have a host

organization that provides at least a basic level of service while around half of GCs have paid staff. Established groups begin to act as a broker for both external individual and institutional giving as their reputation and credibility strengthens.

5.3.3. Network / Catalyst

Giving circle and general collective giving networks have proliferated in the past 10 years. The Collective Giving Research Group found around 25 established networks of various sizes and structures operating around the country. GCs are more tied into networks, more connected with institutional philanthropy than ever. Nearly all the groups identified by the Collective Giving Research Group are in a GC network or alliance that helps to initiate GCs and support their efforts in some fashion. GCs join networks to share resources and knowledge, provide members with greater networks and social opportunities, replicate operations, acquire financing, or seek administrative support. The organizations behind these networks can be seen as the catalyst behind amplifying giving while operating as a collective giving group themselves.

Larger networks or catalyst like organization classically begin as a single collective giving group dedicated to a certain style of giving to achieve a particular purpose. They then recognize the potential their style of philanthropy can have toward a greater purpose, so focus their efforts outward to help others do the same. Administrative and operational focus moves toward empowering other organizations or smaller groups instead of growing internally. Efforts include creating shared educational resources, network opportunities, larger events, and expanding digital presence. These platform organizations focus on amplifying their unique approach as an effective means of alleviating that issue by supporting others to take part. Public support or funding stems from those who believe in their methods and want to see the group expanded. These organizations become a broker that empowers and amplifies both individual and institutional philanthropy. They tend to heavily rely on institutional giving as the operations require significant administrative support in order to ensure their member groups do not have to take on this additional work.

Types of Giving Circles

Types	Grassroot / Member	Established	Network / Catalyst
Identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members • Issue Supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving Style • Issues Supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving style • Members (which are other groups)
Membership Composition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic based • Committed to group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committed to the giving style as a way to support their committed cause • Cross-Demographic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committed to the giving style in two ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to help a certain issue - to provide a certain experience to members
Funding Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership fees • Collective Fundraising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual/ instructional giving • Membership Fees with less direct control of spending 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional • Membership (coming from groups) • Individuals who trust their style
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to manage, low overhead • Social experience • Multiple of networks to join or structures to replicate • Self-governed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient and organized • Expanded reach and greater impact • Greater capacity and more resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massive reach • Widespread anteriority • Systematic • Aggregated impacts
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited reach / Low impact • Dependent on member commitment and engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased Accountability • Difficult to manage / increased overhead • Higher risk • Finically dependent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting needs • Inconsistent • Reputation dependent • High administration
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WomenAde, • Impact 100 • Awesome Foundation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WILD Foundation • Agroecology Fund • Grassroots International • One World Child Fund • Raise Your Hand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Venture Partners • Amplifier • Dinning for Women • BeyondMe • Edge Fund • Youth Philanthropy Connect

6. Findings

The findings presented in this section are based off the applying the knowledge I acquired from researching the giving circle landscape into context with what I learned from interviews with seven Pangea Giving members and various interactions with the group. Based off shared visions and motivations amongst the Pangea Giving members I have interacted with, these findings help showcase what Pangea's identity is, what an ideal membership composition looks like, and any potential funding structure. These findings adhere to Pangea Giving's current organizational and resource capacity.

6.1. Where does Pangea Lie

6.1.1. Pangea's Identity

In terms of giving circles, Pangea Giving is quite unique in many aspects. The most impressive aspect of Pangea is the history of the organization itself. Pangea Giving was a pioneer among giving circles and embraces the idea of bypassing traditional philanthropy in the form of collective giving. Supporting international grassroots issues is not a novel concept in the broad philanthropic landscape. However, empowering Seattle community members to directly support and connect with international grassroots organizations is. The notion of regaining control of personal charity in the form of collective and strategic giving seems to be the essence of what initially attracts Pangea members.

One commonality that motivates members to actually join was a past connection with or desire to engage with the international community. Members may have been involved in international development or relations in their earlier career, volunteered or studied abroad, or simply enjoyed travelling the world. want to contribute beyond finances and engage in the process by contributing the knowledge and skills they have acquired through a lifetime of experiences and education. However, the desires to contribute beyond simple financial donations and to connect with the international community are not entirely unique within the giving circle landscape. These reasons alone are not what keeps members engaged in the long term.

The style of giving seems to be what keeps donors engaged and what makes Pangea Giving distinct. The personal connection with global giving partners is something that very few people

get to experience. Pangea Giving acts as an outlet to a greater community beyond the veil that traditional philanthropy outlets allows. Pangea not only acts as a way to interact with international grassroots organizations, but it is a source of education and networking that provides an intrinsic understanding of what is at the core of these international issues. This understanding helps establish a more profound relationship with these partners and like-minded individuals throughout the Seattle region. Members have enjoyed the various educational and social events in the past for these reasons. Some members expressed a desire to see more such events but also expressed concern about the amount of work coordinating these events takes.

Beyond the educational value, Pangea Giving members are in a position to build mutual and trusting relationships with their partners. According to members, Pangea and its partners respect one another's work and do not try to impede in the other's business. These connections go beyond the traditional give-and-receive model and eventually evolve into mature and significant relationships. They see each other as peers rather than granter and grantee. Pangea's "relational philanthropy" giving style is not only unique in the realm of philanthropy, but it is one to be admired even within the giving circle and collective giving community.

There is a feeling among some members that it has become more complex or cumbersome to fully embellish this unique identity as it requires unabsorbent amount of time and energy to enthusiastically be involved. There is confusion around the future of Pangea's membership composition and structure. Over time, the member's passion and attraction to what first drew them in begins to dwindle. The members attempting to lead Pangea on this seemingly undirected path are becoming exhausted and many have expressed a desire to pass along these duties. Here is where uncovering an ideal membership composition comes into play.

6.1.2. Pangea's Membership Composition & Membership Acquisition

A decisive membership composition appears to be where the most variance lies amongst Pangea Giving members. From what can be drawn from the in-depth interviews and some of the group discussions I participated in, Pangea Giving may be at an inflection point. Pangea has been operating in the same way for so long that some members expressed that it is time for change. It is evident that Pangea members, being experienced in such fields as organizational and

business management, understand that change cannot be taken lightly or done suddenly. Collectively, the group feels it is necessary to strategize around this change and for the future.

In speaking with members, I found considerable differences in opinion around what the ideal size of the membership is and if it is necessary for the group to diversify for the “health” of the organization. The most evident theme in regard to a collective impression of Pangea’s current membership base is that there is a desire and need for members less engaged to become more involved in the steering of day-to-day operations. There is a feeling of “founder fatigue” coming from the inordinate length of time a limited number of members have taken on core responsibilities of running the organization. Those who have taken on these responsibilities feel that is time for a renewed sense of energy to get in the mix. As a result of this situation, it appears that the lesser involved members feel out of the loop of the organizational activities and are not motivated to put in the extra effort. They witness the level of work current leadership takes on and wanted to help in limited fashion, yet the process of getting involved is difficult enough so many do not view it worth the effort.

As mentioned above, many Pangea Giving members were initially attracted to the organization by a notion of taking philanthropy into their own hands and connecting with the international community. From who I spoke with and what I could gather from the group meetings, most members were “recruited” by existing members or learned about Pangea through a social event. This personal approach was a valuable aspect to the joining process. It provided an opportunity for individuals to fully learn what it meant to be a Pangea Giving member, how exactly the giving circle operated, and provided a sense of gratitude that they were recognized as a person who could fit in. The style of giving was novel to many but ended up being the deciding factor to keep them involved.

The personalized recruitment approach spoke to the nature of the engagement that being a member presented. This excitement eventually subsided when members began to realize it was more difficult than imagined to fully take part in this giving style. These new members expectations of joining a personal and active membership set during their individual onboarding experience subsided as time passed without realizing these benefits. Members start to not feel

as socially connected with their fellow members as they originally expected, creating a bit of hesitation towards reaching out or making suggestions. Despite this frustration, these members are happy to remain a member because they hear stories of success from their partners. For those less involved, the altruistic satisfaction of being a member seems to be the greatest aspect keeping them around. They value the opportunity to hear directly from partners even if they were not involved in the grantmaking or administrative process.

For both the lesser involved and actively engaged, the direct connection to the partners and knowing that they actually have a chance to make a recognizable impact is why many would like to see Pangea thrive. However, in conversations it became evident that it requires commitment and patience to be a part of the giving process. All the stories shared have a back story of the administrative work, decisions, and time that it took to make these stories into a reality. The lesser involved are extremely appreciative of this work but are hesitant to take it on either because personal schedules, lack of knowledge on the subject, or the fact that they see the amount of work the most involved have to contribute. Some thought it should be necessary that potential members understand and have the time and energy to take part in this process if Pangea is going to be able to deliver.

The opposing view is that Pangea needs new members regardless to bring in new energy. A common theme that Pangea needs to get “younger” was brought up to bring this renewed energy. A younger membership base could provide an innovative and technically savvy perspective which may alleviate some of the burdensome processes in Pangea’s current membership model. A mutual feeling of too many processes, decisions, and stagnant decision making is evident for some members. This stagnation leads to the belief that attracting new people and adopting new systems is key to the health of the organization. Again, the question that most members want to resolve is who do we want to join and how many members should we need to continue the great work we do?

6.1.3. Funding

Pangea Giving’s funding structure has been based almost entirely off membership contributions. After listening to Pangea members, it became clear that it has been kept this way intentionally.

Members are proud that they have maintained full control and accountability for their own funds and giving. Fundraising efforts in the past reflect this as the additional funds to hire staff were provided by existing members. There has been a definite structure in place of where the finances come from and how they is spent. Being accountable of individual spending is one of the most appealing aspects to giving circles. Pangea members have cherished this accountability. However, at this point of organizational inflection, there seems to be interest in not only exploring other funding outlets, but a question around what additional funds potentially represent. Members did not hesitate to express their concerns around the trouble that external funding sources carry. One concern was that members do not feel as comfortable being accountable for other's money as do their own. The other concern is that any external support could lead to being required to adhere to external standards which would diminish the integrity and autonomy of the organization.

Pangea Giving appears to be open about revisiting their funding structure and exploring different options of the major sources (members, donations/charity, and institutional). It is now apparent, based the recent decision by the board to pursue online fundraising, that Pangea will, indeed, explore other options and is also willing to invest in it. A mutual feeling persists that additional funds will be needed to pursue any of Pangea's aspirations whether it is to grow, hire full-time staff to take away some of administrative duties, or provide more engagement opportunities for members. Though, some expressed concerns that with any sort of growth or external support comes added work which has already become difficult to manage.

There are two concerns regarding continuing to rely on member fees as the single source of funding. The first revolves around an understanding that members will naturally move-on from Pangea. Membership attrition in itself does not concern the group, it is the lack of a pipeline of potential new members that would replace these members that is worrisome. Based on Pangea's current funding structure, not having steady inflow of new members puts Pangea's financial health in a predicament if Pangea is to continue to operate as has. Some members mentioned the idea that a smaller membership base would not be a negative. The grant pool would shrink, yes, but this would mean deeper engagement with a smaller group of partners and less administration needed.

In the context of this report, there is some variance around the desire to pursue alternative funding sources. There is some hesitancy around fundraising from peers as many Pangea members have already exhausted their network or do not want to pressure these people. The proponents of peer fundraising suggest that member's networks present the simplest opportunity to acquire additional funds.

There also seem to be some misperceptions between fundraising and putting more efforts toward donation or charity. Fundraising is typically done in campaign cycles for certain causes. These instances do require immediate attention and an increase in social outreach for a short period of time. Most of the push against fundraising is around this idea of a sporadic social campaigning. Several members said they are for the idea of this type of fundraising as long as they do not need to be the ones taking part. Increasing donation and charity efforts can be seen as steady fundraising. Any increased effort is generally focused around increasing the awareness of the organization and then setting up a simple and effective means of donation. Increasing awareness is not an "ask" as it is in fundraising. It is merely shedding positive light in the group's work which will encourage support. When awareness is increased, it is then important that potential donors are directed to supporting the cause. As opposed to fundraising, this process takes quite a bit longer and more strategy.

I get the impression that there is a sense of urgency in pursuing alternative funding sources which is why the notion of campaign fundraising, where it takes effort but over a shorter period of time, is appealing. As far as pursuing institutional funding goes, the most pressing concern is losing autonomy around Pangea's current giving method and operational management. Pangea's core membership is quite familiar with the structure within the formal philanthropic landscape which is why the apprehension exists. Members have operated in these formal structures or are aware of the limitations that come with it. This core group is also aware of the amount of work it takes to write grants or acquire corporate funding from experience or from already having a full plate of work. The members that are involved for more altruistic reasons are not quite as aware of the process of acquiring institutional funding so do not believe they are fully capable in taking part in these efforts.

In general, there seems to be an overarching ambiguity toward how and why Pangea Giving should pursue external funding. As most Pangea members have acquired enough related professional or personal experience in traditional funding operations, most of the trepidation is around why Pangea would require additional funding and why a particular source of funds is more suitable than another. These decisions have been difficult to nail down from the lacking diversity in opinions. Most of the core members understand that they have been primarily responsible for steering the direction of Pangea and when it comes to these sorts of decisions. As many see the need of some sort of succession plan in place, there is a desire to hear the opinions from the greater membership or external sources.

7. Conclusion / Suggestions

7.1. Revealed Identity

7.1.1. Utilization

As Pangea Giving explores new ways to draw outside financial support or attract new members, Pangea could benefit from collectively formalizing an identity type to showcase. The Collective Giving Network found that around 50 percent of GCs do receive outside funding and support from a variety of sources. If Pangea decides to seek external support or reach new members, a primary consideration should be determining and recognizing an organizational identity.

Pangea could stand to benefit from leveraging its thought-leadership and experience within the field of international development and philanthropy as part of its identity. Specifically, Pangea's unique ability to empower individuals who are interested in international development and collaboration to involve themselves directly in the process. International development, philanthropy, and even collective giving are all prominent in the Seattle area. However, there are a limited number of outlets that allow individuals to bypass traditional philanthropy and involve themselves directly in a global community.

For most donors in the region, the primary option is to passively donate to larger charities and foundations who use donations to fund their private operations. The other primary option is to bypass the traditional system and become directly involved with collective giving groups focusing

on local or national issues. Pangea Giving is Seattle's outlet for both personalized and international giving. The experience and history of success that Pangea has developed over the years also positions itself as an outlet for all those willing to engage themselves regardless of their experience within the fields of international development, general philanthropic knowledge, or demographic. Anyone committed to Pangea's giving style has the chance to learn the heart of change management from fellow members and educate themselves on the issues by collaborating directly with the partners.

The aforementioned giving style is what truly makes Pangea Giving unique and is at the heart of Pangea's identity. Pangea creates symbiotic and personal relationships with its partners. Pangea develops relationships with a variety of smart and capable organizations who are seeking to create change in their communities. This allows Pangea to invest in these individuals and organizations by providing them with the financial resources they would otherwise not have access to. Pangea trusts its partners to make the best use of the support and attempts to provide the blue print for how change should happen. Pangea trusts that its partners know what is best for them and their community. All members have the opportunity to build direct relationships with the people and organizations they fund. The relationships continue to build and develop overtime, surpassing the traditional grantor and grantee relationship. Sometimes these partnerships prove to be so successful over time that the partner no longer needs assistance. Other times, there is little social return that comes from a grant. Hence, why the idea behind Pangea's partners is so fitting.

Taking all the above into consideration, I would suggest that Pangea's most appealing identity lies within Pangea's unique position to offer anyone willing to engage in this "global relational philanthropy" giving style with an "experiential learning" experience that members can carry with them throughout their professional and social lives.

7.2. Suggested Membership Composition

The ideal size and composition of Pangea's membership base appears to be a highly contested and uncertain question among current members. The most common positions were: (1) those who believe Pangea could benefit from diversifying (specifically to get younger) and growing its

membership base; and (2) those who believe that Pangea's size is already sufficient. This second group includes the caveat of ensuring there are new members to replace those who wish to leave, and that Pangea is not set up to cater to a younger generation. Based on my time with Pangea and placing the group into context within the giving circle landscape, my suggestion would be more in line with the later.

According to one board member, Pangea's peak membership base comprised of around 80 individuals at the current membership rates. During this time, Pangea also initiated the "Circle of Friends" program. Right now, the membership is around 60 with roughly 30 Circle of Friends. I would suggest that 80 full members should be a target number of fulltime members, especially if Pangea is to keep its democratic and engaging model. There is already a significant amount of administrative and operational work that comes with managing the current membership base. Secondly, the more members, the more complex the giving process becomes from the resulting dispersion of equity. In all, it becomes more difficult trying to keep the increased and diversifying number of members engaged.

My suggestion would be to focus the energy, time, and resources that would otherwise be spent on attracting new members toward re-engaging the current membership base. The focus should be re-establishing the personal relationships between members and their connection to Pangea Giving. Many members initially joined based on some personal connection and invitation to the group. The first step would be to create a more inclusive and personalized centralized communication system. For example, Pangea can create more compelling content to send out to current members describing the work that is being done, and more importantly, how/why they should get more involved. Of course, Pangea would need to put more effort into justifying any new member's involvement. Another way would be to encourage members to interact and communicate with one another. Pangea could build a forum, share contact information, or just generally request more meaningful dialogue between its members. A newly inspired membership will help inspire others to take on more leadership and volunteer roles, while it also encourages them to spread the word to recruit new members to fill any void left by membership attrition. Any heavy expansion should be more geared toward attracting more "Friends" as Pangea will stand to receive the additional revenue without diluting the membership

engagement. If Pangea improves on the membership experience, then Friends will stand to benefit from all these changes without the voting rights. Friends who enjoy their time are more likely to make the move into an official member once they are confident Pangea is the place for them.

My thoughts on diversifying Pangea members are in line with the identity I conceptualized previously. What makes Pangea truly unique is its “global relational philanthropy” giving style and “experiential learning” experience. Taking this into account requires members who are both willing to put in more effort and have the time.

Instead of simply attempting to attract a younger or larger membership base, Pangea could take a more strategic and focused approach when attracting new members. As stated before, the most success Pangea has experienced in the past when recruiting new members is when it was done in a personal manner, usually with an individual championing the efforts of acting as the prospective members tie to group. Pangea should replicate this but target specific audiences who have both the time and desire to take part in Pangea’s giving circle. For example, Pangea could target ex-Peace Corps members, people who have already involved in philanthropy, non-profit employees and those looking to make a career in the NGO field, people who have lived or worked abroad, or simply friends and family looking for a meaningful social connection. Ideally, the prospective member has the time which typically are those in career and life transitions. Pangea should focus on the “quality” of its members rather than the “quantity” regardless of a person’s background or demographic: a simple re-engagement campaign ran by Pangea staff and leadership could go a long way.

The way Pangea can find these people is to join greater philanthropic networks, attend or host more open social gatherings, and expand its digital presence (both will be covered in more detail). All of these are not only ways to set up a personalized approach to recruiting but also create a more enjoyable experience for existing members. However, Pangea needs to not stop with the simple invite. Pangea could utilize a formal “on-boarding” process which encourages a prospective member to “move along the pipeline” to become a member and eventually an active part of the group. A committee chair, group, or staff member should ultimately champion this

process as it is important that prospective members have direct access to Pangea to answer any questions, they may have along the way. A simple documented process or media sheet could also prove useful if capacity is tight. One idea would be to have different members assigned to prospects or new members to ensure they understand what they are getting into and how to make the most of the Pangea experience. Regardless of how Pangea decides to go about recruiting new members, my key takeaways would be to keep it personal, ensure prospects know what they are getting into, and that they are not left to fend for themselves once they do join. Keep the momentum going!

7.2.1. Networks

As mentioned earlier, giving circles are increasingly joining or affiliating themselves with philanthropic networks. Some of these networks are giving circle specific designed to provide groups a framework in which they can replicate their own giving circle as well as having access to educational material and hosted events. However, networks are not secluded to the giving circle landscape and stretch across the philanthropy and charity space. There are also many informal networks in which groups and organizations work with one another to share resources, host events together, and create network opportunities for their respective members.

I truly believe that Pangea can stand to gain from joining an existing network or establishing a solid “network” of their own with like organizations. Pangea has evolved over the years to not necessarily need to rely on the classic giving circle network. However, there are plenty of collective giving, philanthropic memberships, and other professionalized networks designed to help groups maximize their impact and connect with other groups. Pangea has even established itself to the point where any number of NGOs, foundations, international relations, and universities could benefit from connecting and building more formal relationships with Pangea. I would suggest this approach for Pangea as establishing a network with a diverse, but like-minded organizations. A diverse network sets the groups involved with the most opportunity to learn and collaborate together with each group bring in its own specializations and unique connections. For Pangea, establishing a relationship between 2-5 other larger groups would prove extremely fruitful over time. There would be more opportunities to share the operational work to put on events, groups could cross-share stories of success to keep members engaged, provide opportunities for members to meet new people, and even recruit these people who want to belong to multiple groups. I would suggest connecting with some of the larger international development NGOs in Seattle as well as connecting with prominent shared giving groups like [Social Justice Fund NW](#) (creators of the Collective

Giving Group). I also think it would not hurt to formally join one of the more prominent national networks such as [Edge Funders Alliance](#) or [The Funders Networks](#) so that leadership can learn best practices on how Pangea can continue to evolve with the times.

7.2.2. Membership Experience and Engagement

A common theme displayed among Pangea and the individuals I have interviewed is the difficulty level it is to become an active member. The onus is on the individual members to make the extra effort to figure out what is going on, where and how they can exactly get involved, travel some distances to attend sporadic events, or free up some of their own time during unconventional work hours. Those who do become active become slightly overwhelmed which gives more caution to those who might be curious. It is important that Pangea makes it as simple and as welcoming as possible for members to become active and discover ways in which they can chip in. Though the leg work will require commitment from the member, the initial steps to getting involved should be apparent and enjoyable. Pangea can create this situation while also improving the overall membership experience for everyone. A few suggestions have already been shared (i.e. centralized communication, joining a network, personalized on-boarding) but it is important to continuously encourage and inform members through these outlets on how to get involved.

A practical suggestion that I believe Pangea stands to benefit most from (albeit, it is time consuming) is to create more opportunities for social and educational gatherings. Joining or creating a network would help alleviate some of the stress involved with putting on events by collaborating together, taking turns, or cherry-picking events from each group's respective networks to promote to each membership base. Having people from outside Pangea's membership also sets up valuable educational and networking opportunities for its members.

I additionally suggest organizing scheduled strictly social gatherings (monthly, bi-monthly) hosted by Pangea but open for all to attend to home in building awareness of Pangea while providing Pangea members with a social outlet. It makes sense to keep these events as simple and turn key as possible - for example, a happy hour or a book club at rotating breweries, restaurants, or coffee shops. This way would remove any pressure from members needing to take on hosting duties, members will know when to expect it so as to put it in their calendars in advance, and the off chance that the venue can offer specials to provide some financial return to Pangea. It is important that members have a chance to socialize and build rapport with one another without any need to take part in Pangea focused conversations. Increasing the number of events, reengaging existing members, and putting more effort in to personalized

onboarding will require more internal structure and organizations. One way to go about managing all of these duties would be to reorganize Pangea's current operational structure and create committees revolved around these exact activities. Such an organization structure could be a leadership board that oversees an events and education, external membership and network outreach, and membership engagement/communications. These three encompassing fields of work allow for a diverse set of members and prospects to contribute their skill beyond financials as well as helping Pangea narrow their strategic focus.

7.3. Funding & Capacity Needs

In accordance with the rest of my suggestions, I trust that with a membership base of around 70 and a Circle of Friends base of around 30-50 with the current membership fees should be sufficient enough to keep Pangea operations *as is*. However, it is evident that Pangea is in a transition period with some much-needed change. Change in terms of simply approaching the group in a new way as opposed to simple growth. That being said, the major prerequisite changes for Pangea would be to remove some of the burden from the long-time leadership and re-invigorating Pangea's greater membership base to get a diverse set of people involved in Pangea's operations. To see these changes come to fruition without any drastic changes to the membership fees or size Pangea will need acquire additional revenue sources to support these efforts without diminishing the integrity of the giving circle. As there were conflicting opinions when it comes to social fundraising, my suggestion would be to focus most attention on securing on-going individual level charity complemented with a calculated attempt at institutional funding which would help secure the desired funds while avoiding putting any pressure on members to fundraise. Establishing on-going charity and institutional funding sources require strategic actions and changed aimed at becoming more effective at reaching these audiences.

7.3.1. Digital Presence

The first step in generating a stable flow of individual level support for people outside of the membership base, Pangea would need to place emphasis on creating a more effective and widespread digital presence. The first benefit that stems from an increased digital presence in the form of an appealing and user-friendly website and increased media coverage is the potential to attract new members and build recognition from within larger populations. Pangea needs to become easier to find by those who are interested in the field (regardless of their direct interest

into Pangea). When someone comes across Pangea, this initial experience needs to leave an impression on the visitor and empower them to learn more and even take action. Having an appealing website and increased presence also complements the aforementioned personalized approach to recruitment. When someone is told about Pangea or learns about it from a networking event, an effective digital presence will leave a lasting and confident impression when the individuals research the group on their own.

Pangea's current website is outdated and a difficult to navigate. It is difficult to uncover what the Giving Circle is all about and has little engagement or actionable functionalities. A site visitor is left to navigate their own way throughout the site rather than being guided in an intentional user experience. The theme and design do not initially provide the site visitor the confidence in Pangea's legitimacy and history of success. As many content management systems (CMS) have been continuously evolving to favor easy and effective content strategies and design, it would be worthwhile for Pangea to explore options on overhauling their site.

A new site that would allow staff and leadership quickly update content, build compelling stories, and empower the site visitor to quickly donate and learn more. The easier it becomes for visitors to donate or communicate with Pangea, the more likely they are to become recurring donors or future members which would complement any other funding resources and individualized recruiting efforts. An effective website, though initially requiring an increased level of work, will eventually remove some of the administrative and outreach responsibility currently burdening some of the leadership. A site overhaul is a long-term investment as any returns will not be recognized until further down the road, but the financial and exposure returns should prove to deliver on the initial investment. It is important that multiple Pangea stakeholders are involved with any site redevelopment process even if they are not directing responsible for building the site. That way, these stakeholders will be able to communicate what their goals are for the site and understand the site's backend for future updates.

7.3.2. Funding Sources

Funding is one of the more noteworthy topics across Pangea. The prospects of securing a larger funding pool are both exciting and daunting. More funds potentially represent a larger grant pool,

additional staff time, new technologies and communication platforms. However, Pangea members understand that added work and complexity comes with any sort of growth. It had been voted upon to explore new funding resources, so my primary suggestion is to determine how any additional funds will be allocated and why a specific source is chosen.

In accordance with the previously covered common funding sources, I would suggest that Pangea adopt a primary source of funds outside of the membership fee by establishing a stable inflow of individual and charitable support. As with building a strong and effective digital presence, establishing a steady stream of financial support will take time to come into full fruition. Pangea will need to initially invest in building awareness and credibility within the Seattle and larger philanthropic community in order to realize any compounding returns. Investing in a website overhaul and increasing Pangea's media presence both supports building this recognition. One aspect of support comes from the resulting SEO improvements and name recognition from each activity. The other support aspect will stem from those who become specifically intrigued with Pangea via some form of personal introduction to the group. These individuals may want to support Pangea but do not have the capacity to be a member at the time.

Pangea cannot simply invest in digital connections with the community and perspective members. The true value comes when this investment is complemented with joining or constructing a network of like organizations and creating more social engagement opportunities. A strong digital presence and increased personal connections go hand in hand. Those who learn about Pangea through a network or event will now have the chance to learn of and connect with Pangea after the fact. Those who first come across Pangea through one of the digital platforms, will become more intrigued in an improved membership experience and have the chance to personally attend one of many social events.

All of the mentioned suggestions of reengaging existing members, personalized onboarding, joining networks, strengthening Pangea's digital presence, and generating steady financial donations will initially require added administrative and operational effort. As Pangea's leadership is already stretched thin, this means Pangea will need generate a short-term financial source to help fund this additional work. Fundraising in the classic sense is a perfect way to go

about achieving this one-time cash flow but should not be relied upon. Fundraising is meant to be run in campaigns as to not exhaust social networks and put pressure on potential funders. Knowing that fundraising is onetime thing, Pangea will be able to develop a strategy on how to best communicate to potential funders why and what their donations will be geared to.

My suggestion would be taking an alternative route to achieving short-term financial stability and seek institutional funding in the form of a grant. With a game plan in place, Pangea can communicate to any larger foundations on what the grant will be used for (i.e. hire a full-time staff), why Pangea is deserving of it (i.e. Pangea's experiential learning and relational philanthropy identity), and how the funds will help Pangea achieve long term success and not require additional funds (i.e. establishing a strong digital presence and ongoing charitable support).

With the uniqueness of Pangea's "selling point" and desire to uphold the Pangea giving circle's integrity, Pangea needs to be strategic in who they seek funds from. Foundations that support the international development community in Seattle, the idea behind collective giving, and take a hands-off approach to grant gifting are all potential avenues to explore. There are a variety of avenues of support Pangea can explore from large corporations, internationally recognized foundations, or Northwest specific community foundations. These supporters can be found in philanthropy directors such as the [members of Philanthropy Northwest](#), the [Grantsmanship Center](#), or [Global Washington's membership forum](#). A simpler approach would be to "cherry pick" supporters from similar organizations and nonprofits where such information is often made public on their websites or in their financials. The key is to come up with an appealing story explaining how Pangea's work correlates with the values and mission of the supporting organization. Ultimately, being able to explain why Pangea is seeking support from a specific foundation can help sway the foundation to deliver the grant.

7.3.3. Conclusion

The suggestions included in this report are designed to spark a conversation. They are not intended to suggest the best or most appropriate way forward for Pangea. Ultimately, any changes should be collectively decided upon by Pangea's leadership and members. Making any

organizational changes in the same democratic and inclusive process in which Pangea goes about making philanthropic decisions will be an important aspect for maintaining Pangea's integrity and reassuring members' trust of the giving circle concept. This report was put together to provide Pangea stakeholders with a wide-ranging view into the organization and the philanthropic landscape. This awareness is crucial towards any organizational success. Pangea members and leadership are all volunteer and have been stretched thin over the years, hence, the idea behind having an outsider contribute this knowledge. Ideally, this report is shared amongst decision makers and stored for future reference.