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Charitable behaviour in Canada is declining. This document argues that this is an important problem requiring a social initiative focused on Canadians’ values, attitudes, and motivations. It is intended to engage like-minded people to solicit input and (financial) support.

The Growing Canadian Charity Gap

The Non-Profit Sector represents 7% of our GDP, employs over 2 million Canadians, and has a significant social impact to our communities, and quality of life. It needs to be strong.

Over 80+% of Canadians donate, annually, but the median gift is low at about $180.

Less than 22% of Tax Returns claim a charity credit. This has been declining for 25 years.
- The average donation per Tax Filer has been declining over the past ten years.
- The average donation by age group indicates younger adults are declining the most.

Our governments have budget deficits and significant debt. They cannot just spend more. They need to be fiscally responsible. We need the private sector to be more charitable.

The Principal Issues are Not Based on Economic Factors nor our Charitable Tax Credits

- Canadians have experienced real growth in wealth (in constant equivalent dollars) over the past twenty years, and especially among the top twenty percent of Canadians. Our capacity to give is strong, but we are choosing not to be so charitable as in the past.
- Our charity tax incentives are some of the highest in the world. These do not explain the problem nor the differences in charitable behaviour between communities. Instead, our problems are due to declines in social values and familiarity with our social responsibilities to our communities. In short, we are losing a sensitivity to be charitable, and are unaware of the right social norms. The vast majority of Canadians are not aware of how much they should be giving.

The Solution:

For those familiar with ParticipACTION, the public effort to encourage greater health as a public good, Canada needs a similar initiative to encourage more charity. This is the necessary remedy to deal with the real issue at hand.

Approach to the Solution:

- To ensure maximum efficiency, with minimal duplication, one overall integrated, coordinated, and focused initiative would likely be best.
- The initiative would focus on education, encouragement, facilitation, and reminding the Canadian public. The solution should define the social norm, constantly teach and remind the benefits of charity, address any negative perceptions of charities, reduce barriers to giving, facilitate the ease of giving and volunteering, and ‘sell’ the positive feeling of giving back.

The Billion Dollar Opportunity:

If the national average of giving can be increased from .75% of income to 1.0%, it will generate $2 billion more for the non-profit sector, annually. This is a significant return which compels us to try. If we do not, we run the risk of looking back and wondering why we allowed the core of our values to wane and diminish our quality of life.

Please consider how you can address this significant social problem. Helping this movement is helping all charities.

John.hallward@GIV3.ca
Action Plan for the “Billion Dollar Opportunity”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Need to Act: Less than 1 in 4 T1 tax returns claim a charity credit. This has been declining for 20+ years. The average level of giving has declined to about 0.75% of income.

Mission: Support a single-minded focus on promoting a greater culture of charitable giving among individual Canadians... to encourage more Canadians to be more giving.

• To increase the incidence of Canadians claiming a charitable tax credit in their annual tax return.
• To increase the average and median amounts of donations claimed in annual tax returns.
• To engage more people as volunteers in the charitable sector.

Targets: (1) The top 15-20% of Canadian households earning $100,000+ in annual income, (2) Employed Canadians with steady income, (3) University students (youth) who are about to enter the work force, and (4) retirees/seniors.

Message: There are many possible approaches to motivate people to be more giving. Consumer research will be commissioned to determine the best messages for each target.

Action Plan Initiatives: Design one on-going coordinated campaign, under one brand and leadership team, to get the desired synergies/integration. This facilitates the collaboration of many different organizations while ensuring a single-minded focus on messaging Canadian citizens. This is not just one program in one year: no one initiative will be sufficient to cause a change in giving behaviour. A combination of touchpoints and initiatives are required, on-going, to build the overall effect. (Our model is similar to ParticipACTION).

The key to realizing fruition on this multi-faceted and on-going campaign will be the building of partnerships (a coalition of the caring) and inclusion of many independent teams/organizations.

Initiatives to be Considered: • Financial and Legal Professionals Initiative; • PSAs and Public Media Campaign; • Social Media Networking; • New Citizens/ Citizenship Handbook; • Behavioural Economic initiatives via Tax Audits; • University and College Program; • Seniors engagement; • Youth Engagement; • Possible Order of Canada initiative; • Employers program; • Community Recognition Rewards/Recognition; • Philanthropy Boot Camp for Journalists • Religious Institutions; And so on.

Accountability/Evaluation: Use consumer tracking research to assess improvements over time: The build in Brand awareness, improved appreciation for giving, increased giving behaviour (especially among those aware of the new Movement). We will also track reported Stats Can/ CRA “Tax Returns” behaviour for donation tax credit claims.

Budget Implications: $10M per year
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INTRODUCTION

Canada has always been a caring, civil nation. Caring people help others.

However, there are some troublesome trends in our charitable behaviour, and this is a significant issue owing to the size of the Non-Profit Sector to our GDP, the millions of people the sector employs, and the positive impact the N-P Sector plays in the civility and quality of our lives in our communities.

Many concerned parties are recommending possible solutions to boost our charitable behaviour, many with suggestions to lower the “cost of giving” by using tax incentives to encourage greater charitable behaviour.

However, such charitable tax incentives do not explain differences in giving behaviour. Quebec offers the highest tax incentives, but has the lowest giving behaviour per capita. Nunavut offers the lowest credit incentives but has the highest giving behaviour. The decline in giving behaviour is NOT explained by tax incentives, but is due to weakening giving values, fewer mentors, knowing the social norm for giving, and a lower priority to give.

This document proposes that the best and most affordable solution to this challenge is the creation of a ‘social initiative’ similar to ParticipACTION, but for the support of greater individual charitable giving. This would comprise many facets, in partnership with government, corporations, charities, foundations, and individuals. This is an affordable solution with a focus on what matters, and with an incredible return on investment. A rising tide floats all ships. As a ‘public good’, it is natural that governments should care about the decline in giving behaviour across Canada.

Some may argue that private donations are not so important, and that governments are more efficient in raising money (via taxes) to help fund the services to treat those in need, and benefit from current charitable giving. The research shows that private giving adds more benefits than it costs the public purse, drives innovative solutions which politicians fail to take, and that donors like to give. Furthermore, there are other serious implications for governments raising taxes to help replace private giving.

The end of this document shares a proposed action plan to help bring such a movement to life, and to stimulate some considerations in reality.
The Issue:
There are worrying trends facing the Non-Profit Sector: Canadians are showing declining charitable behaviour.
THE NON-PROFIT SECTOR PLAYS A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE IN CANADA

One of Canada’s greatest accomplishments is the development of a caring, open, and civil society. Our many Non-Profit organizations have contributed a significant role to this civility, funded in part by charitable donations and volunteers. Today, Canada has one of the largest non-profit sectors in the world as defined by the percentage of GDP.

The sector reflects our values and our communities. It is part of our social fabric. Non-Profit Institutions (NPIs) serve millions of Canadians across a diversity of needs and benefits.

This sector also represents an economic importance. Although the Non-Profit Sector is not a specific industry, its contribution to GDP can be compared with various industries to illustrate the size and importance of this sector. At about $100 Billion (2007), the Non-Profit Sector represents about 7% of our annual GDP. This is so large that it eclipses the Mining, Oil, & Gas industry (~$88 B), the Retail Sector (~$74 B), the Accommodation & Food Service Sector (~$28 B), the Agriculture Sector (~$15 B), and the Automotive Sector (~$5 B).

THE “CORE” NON-PROFIT SECTOR IS ALSO SIGNIFICANT

The Non-Profit Sector comprises many different types of organizations, including government funded institutions like hospitals, universities and colleges. Often we see reference to the “Core” Non-Profit Sector which comprises all of the non-profits excluding the hospitals, universities and colleges. Just the Core N-P Sector is worth over $35 B (2.5% of GDP) ahead of the Accommodation & Food Services Sector, the Agriculture Sector, and the Automotive Sector.

The total Non-Profit Sector employs over two million Canadians, and has a significant impact on our economy: Labour compensation accounted for 87% of the GDP value of the N-P Sector, a significant 6.2% of GDP.

Source: Stats Can, Catalogue no. 13-015-X “Satellite Account of Non-Profit Institutions and Volunteering, 2007”.
PRIVATE DONATIONS REPRESENT OVER $8 BILLION IN FUNDING

Canadians are a caring population: Over 80% of Canadians typically make a charitable donation (of any size, in any manner, per year). [Source: The GIV3 Foundation survey of Canadians by Ipsos, and Statistics Canada]

Furthermore, about half of Canadian adults have volunteered in the Non-Profit Sector, totaling about 2 million hours per year, representing about 1.1 million full-time equivalent jobs.

However, the level of giving is slowly declining as measured by the level giving represents as a percent of income.

The concern is our recent charitable behaviour has been weakening and not keeping pace with inflation. Other, concerning trends are reviewed in the following pages...

Source: Stats Can
THE NON-PROFIT SECTOR IS LOSING ITS INDIVIDUAL DONORS

Despite the generous behaviour of individual Canadians and the private sector, overall, there are some troubling trends ....

- The total level of private donations has been stagnant over the past nine years and is not keeping pace with inflation.
- There is a declining incidence of Tax Filers claiming a charitable tax credit (T1 Annual Tax Filings); from 30% twenty-five years ago, to less than 22% today.
- Donation behaviour in all income groups has been declining.
- A greater proportion of donations has been coming from a smaller segment of older Canadians. The majority (of younger) adults are contributing a shrinking proportion.

Among all tax filers, this average donation per Canadian has been dropping, and certainly not keeping pace with inflation.
Although we hear in the media that Millennials and younger Canadians are more concerned about the environment and civil issues, we do not observe it in their charitable behaviour. Only the oldest group of Canadians have increased their donation behaviour. Younger Canadian adults continue to show declines over time....And this is spreading into the middle age groups as well. – These younger Canadian adults represent another concern for the future health of the Non-Profit sector.
Should We Care?
DO WE CARE IF OUR CHARITABLE BEHAVIOUR IS DECLINING?

- These troubling trends represent a real concern owing to the size of the Non-Profit Sector to our economy.
- The number of Canadians employed in the sector is significant, and more so than many other industries. It represents a lot of voters.
- This sector directly influences the civility of Canada and determines the quality of life in our communities.
- Our governments are running fiscal deficits, have significant debt loads, and cannot easily boost their support of the N-P Sector to off-set a decline from the private sector.
- And the volume of need remains. Our current levels of support are not nearly enough to cure cancer, Alzheimer's, poverty, homelessness, hunger, illiteracy bullying, and all the other problems charities address.
  - According to Statistics Canada (2012; CANSIM Table 202-080), **9% of Canadians are at or below the poverty/low income line.**
  - Poverty costs Canada over **$70 Billion** annually (source: BC Cost of Poverty report)
  - Each month, over **800,000 Canadians** are assisted by food banks -- 23% higher than the level in 2008 before the recession.
    - And about 50% of food banks have had to cut back on the amount of food provided to each household).
  - The annual cost of homelessness to the economy is **$7 Billion** (source: The State of Homelessness in Canada, 2013)
  - **Over 40% of Canadian** adults have low literacy skills -- Less than 20% of people with lowest literacy skills are employed.
    - A 1% increase in literacy rate would generate **$18 Billion** in economic growth every year (Source: Canadian Literacy and Learning Network, 2005).
  - According to police reports, in 2010 there were over **95,000 victims of family violence**.
  - Animal shelters took in over **170,000 pets in 2012** (source: Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, 2012)
  - It is estimated that a $1 invested in the early years of Canadians **saves between $3 and $9 in future** spending on the health and criminal justice systems, as well as on social assistance (source: Public Health Agency of Canada)

In short, we face a growing “Charity Gap” in Canada. A gap between the on-going needs served by the Non-Profit Sector, and a decline in the source of funds to support the Sector. The impact of this growing issue has potentially devastating implications for the charity sector, for our economy, and our social fabric. This sector is an integral part of our communities, making Canada such a caring and civil society.
If we do not challenge ourselves, today, to resolve this issue, we run the risk of looking back to this time period and wondering why we allowed the core of Canadian values to wane and to diminish the quality of life in our communities.

There will be profound implications to allow the Non-Profit Sector to decay.
If the Non-Profit Sector matters, is philanthropy important?
DOES PHILANTHROPY MATTER?

To answer this question, we can look at both sides of the possible answer:

- **No, philanthropy does not matter because...**
  - We do not need donations from the private sector because we can rely on the government to look after those in need.
  - One could argue that governments are best set up to most efficiently collect the necessary money. Governments can simply increase the amount of collected taxes without incurring “fund-raising costs”. That is, it is more cost-effective and equitable to have governments collect the funds instead of relying on charities to spend a noteworthy amount of their resources to solicit and collect the same funds from donors.
  - There is also worry in some circumstances that extremely wealthy philanthropists can use charitable organizations to push their personal agenda about what needs support in our communities. That is, allowing individuals to act in their own interest, with funds which have received charitable tax credits (and are therefore part of the public purse) is undemocratic.

- **Yes, donations from individuals are important because:**
  - It is fiscally irresponsible for governments to increase their funding when they are already in such debt.
  - Increasing taxes has other serious negative implications to our economy.
  - It is best to have governments focus on what we need governments to do (and no one else can do). Otherwise, many argue, it is more efficient to leave the rest to the private sector and free-markets to resolve.
    - Many social innovations (such as the emergency 9-1-1 number) originated from the private sector, and private donations/foundations. Citizens are more willing to take such risks which politicians are often unwilling to take.
  - Many Canadians are motivated and interested in being charitable as they wish to make a difference in their communities.
    - It is more cost effective to the governments to allow for private donations, and to even encourage such support.
    - Giving in our communities brings individuals together, allows us to build stronger communities, and provides a warmer feeling of involvement which paying taxes does not provide!

As we will see, the best answer seems to be one of balance, with an eye on how governments and community leaders can encourage individual engagement and support.
THE “GIVER’S HIGH” BRINGS MORE TO THE N-P SECTOR THAN GOVERNMENT FUNDING ALONE.

The relationship between government funding, private donations, and Non-Profit Institutions is interesting and a little confusing. Fortunately, owing to the great contribution of research from Abigail Payne (Director, Public Economics Data Analysis Laboratory at McMaster University, Canada), and others, we have some reliable, evidence-based insights into what happens to funding when governments financially support NPIs.

The Benefit of the “Giver’s High”. *(Insights from research from J. Andreoni & A. Payne).*

- If there is a charitable cause that a potential donor cares about, they can either consider donating, or they can withhold their support to allow the government to support the need. For every dollar given by government to solve the problem, one less dollar is required from the possible donor. That is, the donor will see that the problem is being addressed and they do not need to donate. (This is the concept of “crowding out” -- public funding leads to decreased giving from the private sector).

- However, this ignores the important emotional feeling of giving (the “giver’s high” of altruism). That is, individuals like to give, and benefit (emotionally) from their involvement.

- Payne finds that for every dollar governments donate to a specific non-profit, there is a decline in private giving, but the trade-off rate is not 1 to 1. Instead, for every $1 from governments, private donations decline by about eighty cents. That is, in a sense, the “giver’s high” is worth about 20%. Individuals like to give, and do so above and beyond the $1 per $1 ratio.
  - Presumably, donors may also find and donate to other charities not being supported by government funding. That is, the observed concept of “crowding out” for any one charity does not necessarily imply donors will stop giving to all other charities in the sector.

- In turn, making room for, and encouraging altruism yields a net gain to the N-P Sector. Furthermore, it allows us to enhance our sense of community.
Charities Appear to Reduce their Fund-Raising Efforts when Governments Fund Them.  
(Insights from research from James Andreoni and Abigail Payne).

- When charities invest in fund-raising efforts and work to solicit donations, the return per $1 spent is about $5 returned in donations. That is, charitable fund-raising works for the N-P Sector.
- However, the researchers found that when governments funded NPIs, these charitable organizations tended to reduce their own fund-raising efforts. This results in less charitable donations collected from the Private Sector.
- Thus, despite the benefits of the “Giver’s High”, the N-P Sector undermines its own fund-raising capacity by reducing its efforts. We just need to encourage and incent otherwise...

The Role of Foundation Support also Needs Attention.  
(Insights from research from Iryna Kryvoruchko, McMaster University, 2012)

- This issue of Government “crowding-out” also impacts the nature of giving among Foundations. The research indicates that Foundations tend to offer less support to NPIs if they know that the government is helping to support the respective NPI.
- There is also some evidence in the UK that NPIs find it harder to raise funds for ‘core on-going activities’ versus raising funds for new initiatives or projects. That is, Foundations seem to prefer investing in new work, leaving the NPIs to struggle to find funding for their core activities.

“Empirical studies of the determinants of charitable donations, including the few recent studies that have studied this question using sophisticated data and econometric techniques, support the general conclusion that tax incentives have a positive impact on charitable giving.” - Source: Department of Finance Canada: “Tax Expenditures and Evaluations 2014”
THE BEST WAY TO PROCEED APPEARS TO (1) ENCOURAGE PRIVATE GIVING, AND (2) FOR GOVERNMENTS TO CAREFULLY PLAN HOW THEY SUPPORT THE SECTOR

Private giving is helpful, and relieves the need for us to pay more in taxes. The giver’s high is important, and I am not aware of many people who feel so excited about paying more taxes.

Although governments are well positioned to effectively collect taxes to support charities, the research finds that government funding “crowds out” the private sector.

*How governments support* charities should be carefully considered so as to reduce the “crowding-out” effect.

- For example, governments may wish to offer greater use of ‘matching gifts’ to charities as long as the NPIs find matching donations from the Private Sector (and, in particular, from Foundations).
- And the medium and smaller NPIs should get extra consideration so as to prevent a widening gap in favour of the larger NPIs.
- And government funding should be sensitive/supportive of ‘core’ services since Foundations may have a preference to fund only ‘new’ services.

A Need for Special Attention for Smaller Non-Profit Charities

As an aside, over the past 20 years, according to Stats Can data, funding has benefitted the larger NPIs more so than the medium and small sized NPIs. It may be that the larger NPIs (revenue over $1 Million annually) are better equipped and staffed to fund-raise, whereas smaller NPIs have less economies-of-scale, and lower awareness among the public. **This implies a need to pay special attention to how the medium and smaller NPIs get funded.**
What do we need to address?
  • What are the causes of our declining charitable behaviour?
To consider a solution, it is worth appreciating some of the principal causes behind these declining trends and exploring the reality. Admittedly, it is hard to prove causal relationships, and there may also likely be several contributing reasons. The reader can judge for themselves. The following pages review some of the commonly mentioned causes found in published research, in discussions with people, in media, and so on...

The Economy: This is a popular ‘excuse’. In short, many feel they cannot afford to be more charitable. However, the reality is that for the past 25 years, in real constant (equal) dollars, males have had a constant level of earnings, while females have gained. Overall, the amount of accumulated wealth in Canada has grown considerably over the past 30 years. In turn, it is hard to explain much of our charity problem on rational economic factors.

Source: ESDC calculations based on Statistics Canada. Table 202-0703 - Market, total and after-tax income, by economic family type and after-tax income quintiles, 2011 constant dollars, annual, CANSIM (database).
As we look at the different levels of income, we see quite a difference between the top 20% of income earners, versus the remainder. If we first focus on the bottom 80%, we observe that ‘after tax income’ is quite constant, if not slightly stronger over the past 25 years.

The obvious observation is the significant increase in the top 20% and the growing inequality. Perhaps it is a sense of inequality which is leading the majority of people to feel poorer?

- And with such a boom in wealth among the top 20% it does raise the question why this segment is not leading an increase in charitable giving, overall, in Canada? Perhaps part of the solution to supporting greater philanthropy is to target this top 20% as a priority.

Source: ESDC calculations based on Statistics Canada. Table 202-0703 - Market, total and after-tax income, by economic family type and after-tax income quintiles, 2011 constant dollars, annual, CANSIM (database).
DUE TO AN INCREASE IN PERSONAL DEBT, CANADIANS ACTUALLY HAVE MORE CASH TO SPEND.

**Personal Debt Levels:** Canadian personal debt levels have increased considerably over the past several decades, while saving levels have declined. This is a life-style change because Canada’s net national wealth has been growing. It is not that the nation has been facing hard times. Quite the opposite. Much of the economic growth is due to the increased levels of consumerism and personal debt. – Unfortunately, those in debt are less charitable. As interest rates increase, those in debt will be under greater pressure, further threatening giving behaviour.

[Source: “Industry Canada”]

A key question is why are Canadians increasing their debt, and what are they spending all of their (new) money on? And why are they not giving a few percentage points towards charity in their communities? In short, it is not for a lack of money, overall. They simply appear to be choosing to spend it in other ways (as evidenced by greater consumerism in our expanded economy over the past 20+ years). This is the paradox: Canadians have more money at their disposal, but feel poor due to their debt.

**Chart 1:** Ratio of household debt to personal disposable income


Last observations: Canada, United Kingdom and United States: 2011Q3; Euro Area: 2011Q2
When we review charitable donations south of the border (where data is more readily available), we see that during points of crisis (floods, hurricanes, etc.) overall donations increase significantly without cannibalizing on giving across the rest of the year. That is, individuals have the capacity in their expenditures and budgets to give.

In the chart below, we see donations by day, with a year-on-year comparison, 2012 versus 2011. Note that when super-storm Sandy hit the East Coast, donations increased without a subsequent fall in donations thereafter. Furthermore, another increase in giving was observed with the initial launch of the GivingTuesday movement in the USA, without cannibalization thereafter.

This phenomenon appears similarly true for Canada. With the Haiti Earthquake in 2010, in a survey conducted among CanadaHelps donors, less than 10% said their donation to the earthquake victims would result in a decrease in charitable support to other causes in the year. And with the successful launch of GivingTuesday in Canada on Dec 3, 2013, donations increased significantly on that Tuesday without cannibalization across the rest of December. - It seems that giving is a really an issue of motivation and not of economics or capacity to give. In turn, this implies that the solution to address our declining charitable trends rests with greater encouragement and motivational solutions instead of reducing the ‘cost of giving’ in economic terms via tax incentives. The ‘cost of giving’ is not the problem, and therefore reducing the cost of giving is not the solution...
Declines in Religiosity: There has been a decline in religiosity on a per capita basis over the past 50 years. Since religious people give and volunteer more (Source: Ipsos survey for GIV3), it is logical to expect that a decrease in religiosity will likely lead to a decline in charitable behaviour. Every major religion supports charitable aid of their communities. However, with less Canadians regularly attending churches, synagogues, and temples, they are not getting the message, encouragement, reminders, and mechanisms to be so charitable.
CHANGING SOCIAL AND PERSONAL VALUES...

Declining Sociological Interactions: Over the past 50 years, North Americans have experienced some very unattractive sociological trends: We work longer hours, spend more time commuting to work, share less meals together with our families, spend less time per meal, spend more time “on screen” (PC, TV, mobiles), entertain friends at home less often, have fewer good friends, are exercising less, have higher divorce rates, more of us are obese, heart diseases is growing, and the list goes on. - In short, Canadians are becoming a less civil society, and engagement in our communities is declining. This is a concern because those who are more engaged and active are also more giving.

DECLINING SENSE OF COMMUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

Not My Responsibility: Approximately one in five Canadians feels it is the governments’ responsibility to care for those in need. They feel they have paid enough taxes. The point, here, is one of attitude and opinion. This is not about economic inability to give to charity. Fortunately, this is a minority segment of Canadian adults.

[Source: Ipsos Canada survey for The GIV3 Foundation]

Increased ethnic/population diversity: Canada has the highest level of foreign-born citizens among the G8 and Australia (one in five Canadians). In 2011, 13 different ethnic origins had surpassed the 1-million person mark. Four economists/academics found after comparing data on charitable donations with census data covering a 10-year time span that as ethnic diversity increases in Canada, it drives down donations: “We find that diversity has a detrimental effect on charitable donations. A 10 percentage point increase in ethnic diversity reduces donations by 14%.” -- This is likely related to the two above points about our communities, our attitudes, and our declining sense of responsibility to support others.

[Source: Statistics Canada 2011 Census Data, & survey for The GIV3 Foundation]
[Source: Diversity and Donations: The Effect of Religious and Ethnic Diversity on Charitable Giving - By James Andreoni, Abigail Payne, Justin D. Smith, David Karp]
Weak Perceptions of Charities: In general, Canadians are very supportive of the charitable sector. Over 80% of Canadians agree that Non-Profits provide good beneficial services, are trustworthy, require more resources, and should be supported by citizens. Indeed, over 80% of Canadians made a charitable donation in the past 12 months. .... On the other hand, there is a segment of Canadians who feel that charities, collectively, are inefficient (high salaried staff, high overheads, do not use the money wisely, and they bombard households with too many ‘requests’). These people appear to be in the minority, but this segment is vocal in the blogs and social networked world. And the media seems to over-emphasize the few bad stories of charities gone wrong. In turn, we hear people state that charities are corrupt. But clearly, this is an excuse (not to give) more than a true generalization for the whole sector. - The non-profit sector could likely benefit from a strategic PR plan to directly address these perception challenges.

[Source: Ipsos Canada survey for The GIV3 Foundation]

Not Easy to Give: On one hand, Canadians seem swamped with direct mail requests for donations (which may be having a negative consequence of its own), but on the other hand, many Canadians feel they do not know how or where to give wisely. Many also say that they would like to volunteer more of their time, but cannot (easily) find the manner in which to do it, and enjoy their experiences. A Volunteer Canada research report indicates that many charities are not providing the kinds of opportunities that volunteers are seeking.
Charities are not all good at fundraising: This is not a factual, scientific observation, but from my experiences, and in discussions with others, there is a feeling that perhaps the charitable sector is not so strong in developing, nurturing (stewardship), and asking for the greatest amount possible from donors. Many professionals in the N-P Sector do not like asking for money, and many NPIs only seem interested in asking for cash when needed, but do not do a good enough job stewarding donors in-between their annual giving campaigns. - This is a sense that perhaps some charitable opportunity is being left uncollected.

There are most probably other contributing factors.

Furthermore, some of these above causes may also have ripple effects on to future generations. These trends are affecting how the younger generations are being brought up. Over time, the causes and the consequences may become the social norm. The lack of charitable behaviour may simply become ingrained into the next generation (which is what we are starting to observe). We need to work together to reverse and close the growing Charity Gap, and define (re-establish) a better social norm. - We cannot let this charity problem and apathy linger and become ingrained in the next generation.
IN SUMMARY, THE FACTS POINT MOSTLY TO NON-ECONOMIC ISSUES.

Among the many contributing causes of our declining charitable behaviour, we can likely simplify and classify the problems into two types: (1) economic issues, and (2) social/civil/religious issues.

• But it appears that most of the economic reasons are unfounded. The facts point to solid growth in real wealth, and greater spending power over the past decade, especially among the top 20% of Canadian income earners. Most citizens clearly have the capacity to give more when motivated to do so.

• A long historical view, of the USA, implies a social shift. There has been a continuous decline in charitable behaviour despite a significant growth in wealth over the past fifty years. Thus, we need to appreciate that the problem is not economic. The solution lies in our values.

In short, it is likely that Canadians do not wish to be so charitable. Canadians are losing their motivation, their desire, and their sense of responsibility to give. They are losing mentors, losing their ‘sense of community’, and are becoming less socially active outside of their homes/offices.

This implies that the solution to encourage greater charitable behaviour is to address these attitudinal issues. This is what defined Canada as a caring civil nation. This is what is waning. And this is what we must emphasize.

The following pages focus on a suggested set of solutions....
WHY NOT JUST BOOST THE TAX INCENTIVE TO GIVE?

We are happy to see an increase in tax incentives for greater giving, however, we do not feel this, alone, is sufficient to address the challenge at hand. Furthermore, it is an expensive solution and fails to deal with the real problems. - *There is no correlation between charitable tax credit incentives in Canada and giving behaviour.*

As an example,

- Quebec has the most generous tax incentive of all provinces, but the weakest charitable behaviour.
- On the other hand, Nunavut offers the lowest charity tax incentives, but has the highest giving behaviour per capita.

---

Furthermore:

- More religious communities donate at higher levels versus less religious Canadians despite all of us living with the same tax rates.
- With more favourable tax treatment for donation of stock shares, we have not witnessed an increase in giving (but there has been a hit to CRA Revenue).

*In turn, we believe the solution to supporting greater charitable behaviour is more than just tax incentives*
How should we best address the solutions?
THE SOLUTION IS TO FOCUS ON CANADIAN ATTITUDES, VALUES, AND SENSITIVITIES

Since our giving behaviour is not so much a function of tax incentives, but rather charity is mostly a function of community values, up-bringing, social pressures, culture, awareness, and education/mentoring. Offering greater tax incentives is not addressing the problem. We need to focus on the desire to give, and making charitable giving more salient. We need to sell the great feeling of helping others.

For those familiar with ParticipACTION, which promotes greater health as a public benefit in Canada, we need a similar initiative in Canada for the promotion of greater giving. We need to teach, mentor, recognize, and encourage a kinder, more giving culture in Canada. And we have a license-to-believe this would work...
LICENSE TO BELIEVE; A “CONVENIENT TRUTH”: AWARENESS = CHARITY

More than three-quarters of Canadians do not have a good sense of how much they should be giving and volunteering. As a result, they give less.

As a social species, we compare and contrast our behaviours against ‘social norms’. Those communities that have defined social charitable norms do indeed have higher charitable support (i.e. graduates of Ivy League universities, certain religious communities, and those who were taught/raised to be charitable).

- Research shows that those who are taught by a parent, mentor, school or religious organization are more charitable, giving us reason to believe that an awareness, encouragement, mentoring, and educational campaign would have a direct impact.

Q. For someone in your financial situation, do you feel you know what is the average level of charitable giving, or not really?

![Percentage of Canadians who donated $100+ in 2007](image)

Q. “Growing up as a child you had adults who showed you the importance of charity & volunteering.”

% Canadians Who Donated $100+ in 2007: Split into three groups based on mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ipsos Canada survey among 1,062 Canadian adults conducted for GIV3, May 2008
A Plan for the Billion Dollar Opportunity
A movement to encourage, motivate, and facilitate greater charitable behaviour....
If the problem is defined as a challenge, we can approach it as the marketing industry would; namely, to inform, persuade, encourage, and motivate. 

*Since 80+% of Canadians have donated in the past 12 months, the challenge is not to get more Canadians to give, but rather, it is to give more.*

- This is also a question about targeting and understanding the differences by segments of donors.
- And to facilitate giving to make it as easy (and trustworthy) as possible.

Among marketing and sales professionals, when confronted with a negative objection from a consumer, the proven approach is to (1) sell the benefits of the behaviour, while also (2) recognizing and working to mitigate the negative feelings, and/or (3) change the weighting of the negative in the overall consumer decision (e.g. “Buckley’s Cough Syrup tastes bad, but it really works”).

To close the charity gap, we need to consider this dual approach. We need to emphasize the positive and reduce the negative.

---

**The Billion Dollar Opportunity**

...If we could raise the national average of giving from 0.75% to 1.0% of Income, it would generate over **$2 billion more** for the non-profit sector, **annually**.

...If we could match the giving level in the USA (admittedly, over a longer time), we would see **$8 billion** more for the charitable sector, each year.
THE PROPOSED SOLUTION: A NEW UNIFIED SOCIAL MOVEMENT

Since there are several reasons for the decline in our charitable behaviour, Canada needs a multi-pronged approach to the solution. We need a strong emphasis on awareness, attitudes, and encouragement rather than reducing the “cost of giving” by dipping into government finances. This is what we at “GIV3” are working towards. We are calling for a greater movement specifically focused on reaching and touching Canadians citizens (as a compliment to the government policy work of Imagine Canada, and their work in the area of corporate giving).

We envision....

1) A Focus on the Canadian public, via institutions, corporations, media channels, education, and social programs.

- To encourage/motivate/persuade Canadians to be more charitable.
- To define the social norm, and constantly teach and remind the benefits of charity. This is about leveraging social psychology and insights (to the appropriate targets).
- To incent Canadians by educating them about current tax benefits, and/or through other self-serving benefits.
- To address any concerns about negative perceptions of charities and the charitable sector. This is about mitigating any negative concerns, and reducing the barriers to giving.
- To facilitate the ease of giving and volunteering. Enable the transaction to happen with minimal disruption.
- To recognize and thank (stronger) charitable behaviour.

2) Creation of one overall ‘brand’ and steering committee (similar to the ParticipACTION model) comprised of the leaders of each of the above approaches, to support, integrate, and coordinate a synergistic approach, along with...

- Media partners to publicize the initiative
- Perhaps some professional advertising agency support/consultation.
- And a research partner to help measure achievements for greater accountability, and to provide insights for refinement/adjustments over time.
- Perhaps something like “DonACTION”!

3) Assessing responsibilities for the different solutions (above) to different organizations to share the work.
STRUCTURING THE SOLUTION: *WHAT FORM OF COLLABORATION?*

It is logical to think that collaboration is required among leading organizations in the sector to solve the multi-faceted nature of the challenge. However, collaboration has its challenges, which may not be so beneficial to the current existing leading organizations.

- Collaboration takes time and effort and may distract each organization from its main mission.
- Collaboration may ‘average out’ the unique strengths of each distinctive organization. A consensus is often the blurring of many unique perspectives.
- One collaborative voice may be less impactful versus several strong separate voices.
- Collaboration raises many legal issues: ownership of intellectual property, fair resourcing, dispute resolution, dissolution rules, and so on.

In turn, to ensure maximum efficiency, with minimal complexity, it is likely best to adopt one uniquely focused organization to concentrate on a single mission to encourage more Canadians to be more charitable. This is proposed as a superior approach versus a partnership of many separate organizations. This single-purpose entity will be a coordinator

- This allows each of the current distinct organizations to exercise their own unique strengths to express their own voices
- This allows a multi-faceted approach, but with one coordinating body
- This simplifies and avoids legal issues associated with collaboration of separate bodies

Naturally, the support, participation, and guidance of the leading sector organizations will be important and required. They will be key contributors, but as separate unique organizations.

To be clear, as we evolve our thinking, we suggest that one single mission-focused entity lead the coordination to encourage more Canadians to be more charitable. It will be this unique entity working with many others to coordinate the multi-pronged approach to close the growing Charity Gap.

An independent, uniquely focused entity should work to compliment (not duplicate) the other leading organizations. There are several organizations leading the focus on corporate giving, on corporate participation, on government (tax) policy, on foundation coordination, on corporate social responsibility, on charity governance, on charity fundraising, and so on. It will be important to be very focused on encouraging Canadian citizens to be more charitable, in coordination with the other organizations as they deliver their missions.
A MULTI-PRONGED APPROACH UNDER ONE BRAND

It is early in the process to be too definitive in how to execute this proposed solution, and clearly it needs input from many sources. In the interim, this shares a few initial thoughts, if for no other reason than to spark some discussion and feedback...

GIV3 envisions a multi-faceted approach to the $ Billion Solution, aligned under one single ‘brand’ to allow for a strong synergistic effect to maximize awareness and help popularize the movement. That is, we envision many different programs, but each branded (or co-branded with independent partners) under one unifying brand.

Here is a starting list of initiatives which can be considered in this ‘one brand/multi-faceted’ solution...

- **Youth leadership and educational programming**: in order to maximize the involvement and chances of success with Canadian youth, engage youth leaders and various education associations, both at the high school, college and university levels. The program would help create and support educational programs, targeted for youth engagement, to help sensitize young adults to the social responsibilities and benefits of a caring and civil society. This is about encouraging giving behaviour at an early life stage.
  - To ensure volunteering and philanthropy are on the agenda and that our future leaders are aware of the challenges.
  - To communicate to university students their social responsibility as they are about to graduate and start earning an income (e.g. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada).
  - To support high schools, colleges and universities with teaching aids/kits, and to offer an incentive/reward programs, (e.g. Toskan Casale Foundation, YPI initiative).

- **Professional Advisors/ Financial Planners/Notaries**: To help define the appropriate behaviour for their High Net Worth clientele; perhaps a kit, client brochure and/or website can be created to help define and encourage the clients touched by FPs and Notaries. (e.g. CFA Institute, Advocis, FPSC.)
A MULTI-PRONGED APPROACH UNDER ONE BRAND (CONTINUED)

- **Employer/Corporate Associations:**
  - To reach employees to encourage greater giving via payroll deductions.
  - To persuade companies to consider the benefits of visible ‘social responsibility programs’ (e.g. CSBR association, Young Presidents Organization, Young Entrepreneurs Organization, etc).
  - Leverage greater corporate giving programs to act as challenging matches for individual giving and volunteering. We need to ask corporations to show greater leadership.

- **Canadian Banks and Credit Cards:**
  - Explore ways to facilitate giving behaviour by automatic collection of donation dollars into separate consumer accounts. For example,
    - Allow Canadians to request that the equivalent of 1% of their monthly credit card bill be added, paid and held in their “charity account”, in their own name, so they can donate it at the end of the year as they please.
    - Allow financial donations to be made at ATM machines.

- **Charities:** The goal is to ensure Canadians hold a positive view of charities and about giving (e.g. CanadaHelps.org, Imagine Canada, Volunteer Canada, AFP, etc)
  - To help educate and ensure best practices in stewardship, transparent governance.
  - Implement a public relations program designed to improve the perceptions of the non-profit sector.
  - Perhaps the Charity Directorate of the CRA can take a more visible public service initiative to boost the image of the charitable sector, and of charity governance.
A MULTI-PRONGED APPROACH UNDER ONE BRAND (CONTINUED)

- **Government partners to help support the policies, incent greater giving, to leverage “nudging”. (and behavioural science)**
  - Revenue/Finance departments (Charity Directorate)
    - Ask the CRA to include a “Thank You” message in each audit/review for each tax-filer who claimed a charity receipt. And for those tax returns without a charity tax receipt, ask the CRA to include a reminder about the tax savings of greater charity. That is, show Canadians that someone is paying attention and cares, and is appreciative.
    - Although not so relevant to individual citizens, the CRA might consider increasing the requirement of foundations to donate more than just 3.5% of capital. - There are many moral reasons for doing so, and we should be confident that there will be more rich philanthropists in the future (just as most foundations today originated from wealth created within this current generation)
  - Create a “Thank You Gift Fund” which charities can give to their donors (for example, travel or tourism vouchers).
  - Non-political support such as the Governor General’s office
    - To celebrate giving.

- **Non-Profit Sector Partners to help coordinate and support this sector initiative.**
  Have a unified communication program that enhances the perceptions of the critical role the N-P sector plays in Canada, in the daily lives of each citizen. (e.g. Imagine Canada, Community Foundations of Canada, Philanthropic Foundations of Canada, Social Innovation Generation, CanadaHelps, United Way, etc).
  - Ask each N-P to discuss and promote this new movement in their newsletters and on their websites.
  - Create “Direct Mail” tests to explore ways to help non-profits increase annual giving within their individual efforts/campaigns.

- **Engage community centers, community cultural groups, and community associations/clubs to create and show charitable leadership (at the grassroots level).**
  - Encourage/fund community-level awards for new fresh giving initiatives
A MULTI-PRONGED APPROACH UNDER ONE BRAND (CONTINUED)

- **Public awareness marketing.** In a sense, this is designed to fill the religious void, on a weekly basis:
  - Use social networks and on-line communities to tell stories, popularize charitable behaviour, and support charitable causes
  - Develop a public awareness campaign using broadcast media (with media partners and ad agencies), to illustrate that this is a total Canadian-wide effort in which we are all engaged
    - Promotes universality of the giving concept and fairness for all
    - Defines a higher social norm, in a public manner
    - Reminds us all of our moral responsibilities
    - Encourage any and all lottery winners to donate 10%

- Perhaps the Governor General’s office would consider an active role in soliciting engagement and support for this message. This movement is neutral and all-encompassing for all charitable organizations in Canada. Perhaps recipients of the Order of Canada could also be engaged in this movement.

- Develop a dedicated Quebec strategy, recognizing the unique history, culture and charitable landscape in Quebec. The strategy would be developed in association with key sector leaders in the province with the objective of maximizing the chances of a successful Quebec program, which both aligns with and complements the National program.
 WHY GOVERNMENT SUPPORT?

✓ **Greater charitable behaviour is a public good** that will benefit all charities (“a rising tide floats all ships”) and all Canadians. With a significant gesture of support from Government, the private sector will more readily commit to do their share to support the initiative and build it forward.

✓ When government takes the first step, corporations, foundations and communities will be mobilized and empowered to continue the movement. Similar to the “Big Society” program initiated in the UK, this is about government helping and empowering people to come together to improve our society (big society, small government).
Development of an action plan
WHO ARE THE IDEAL COLLABORATORS?

In addition to the leading charitable organizations and NPIs, there are other organizations which can contribute to the effectiveness...

- Banks and financial professionals/notaries to reach wealthier Canadians
- Employers to reach employed Canadians
- Universities and Colleges, YMCA, Apathy Is Boring to reach students and youth
- Media partners for PSAs
- CRA to help target and thank donors (and non-donors?)
- “Leave A Legacy” for targeting retirees and estate planning
- AFP Chapters to create more recognition awards
- Religious Institutions to reach religious people
- Seniors’ organizations

IS SOCIETY SUPPORTIVE AND READY TO HELP? IS NOW A GOOD TIME?

Yes! Owing to many sociological trends, advances in digital mobile technologies, and economic anxieties, there is a desire for greater emotional connection with others, towards authenticity, to experience real, human feelings.

Charitable support is always appropriate, in general. People appreciate that there are many others ‘less well off’ who need help.

WHO ARE THE IDEAL TARGETS? WITH WHAT MOTIVATIONS?

Although consumer research is needed to confirm the best targets, and related messages to each target, we have gathered some of the learning at hand. The following page shares a summary of our insights as the basis of discussion and research assessment....
## AUDIENCE ANALYSIS & SEGMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics, psychographics</th>
<th>Those who are more charitable</th>
<th>Those who are less charitable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brought up to be charitable. Had a mentor.</td>
<td>Feel life is a struggle. It is about me (against ‘them’). A competition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel a civic duty to help community! More religious.</td>
<td>More likely to believe it is the government's job to help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Less religious.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older, retired</td>
<td>More liberal minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Canada</td>
<td>Lack charitable role models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More self-centered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefit to being charitable?

| | Feel good, self-esteem; Doing what is right. |
| | Release of guilt and obligation |
| | Fitting in/ feeling part of community. Pulling own weight. |
| | Personal connection (family/friend) to a specific charitable cause. |
| | Many feel to appreciate the positive self-image and ‘feeling good’. |
| | Many deflect their social responsibility on to the government (because they pay enough in taxes). |
| | Feel more self-centered: me against them. |

### What incentives might be required to motivate greater giving?

- Recognition and to be thanked → The emotional pay-off
- Knowing what others in peer group are giving.
- Tax credits
- Intrinsic motivations

### Why are some people giving less? What is the barrier to giving more?

- Among wealthy donors, they lack a defined expected norm. They stop giving when they feel they are giving more, in absolute, than others.
- They do not think in terms of percent of income
- Leaders do not want to be giving more than others. They do not want to feel they are being taken advantage of, or have bad judgment in being too generous.
- The vast majority do not know how much they should be giving.
- They are not aware of what others are doing/giving. They lack a social norm.
- They lack mentors.
- Feel they give enough in taxes and it is the government’s responsibility to look after those in need
- Resent being (directly) told what to do

### Who has an influence on them?

- Religious institutions
- Peer pressure
- Self (own self-esteem, ego).
- Charities asking for help
- Peer pressure, social norms + conformity
- Not likely governments!
- Many reject ‘being told’.
- Not on charities’ radar/lists.

### What do people perceive the norm (expectations) to be?

- Among the religious, some understand the norm of giving is 10% (tithing).
- 75+% Canadians “do not know what they should be giving”.
- More likely to think in absolute dollars and not as percent of income.
- Canadians feel that giving is important, and 85+% do give, but it is often small amounts (because they do not know what is a “right” amount).
- Many have heard about tithing, but reject this as old religious influences and prior to current tax rates
WHERE ARE THE TARGETS?

The wealthy can be reached through financial planners, and employers.

The CRA can thank donors and perhaps help define average donation levels (in tax assessment mailings). Will the CRA consider messages to non-donors (simple framing messages)?

Religious leaders can define social norms and expectations (in terms of % of income)

Appropriate media channels can reach the respective targets.

Colleges and Universities can be used to reach soon-to-be-graduates

INSIGHTS ABOUT MOTIVATION:

Research is going to be important in determining the ideal messages. Some of our learning and thinking to date:

• Telling people what they should be doing is often met with barriers/defenses. A better approach is likely to leverage the opposite message to get people to reduce their defenses: e.g. “Keep 97% for yourself, ... Just be 3 % giving.”

• Framing is also an important way to change the perspective about how much to be giving (i.e. 2-3% versus 97-98%)

• Conforming: Feeling a part of the community and pulling one’s own weight is also important to many donors (“what are others giving?”)

• Guilt, although unpopular in theory, many fundraisers feel this is a real motivator for giving.

• Feeling good about ones’ self may also be a good motivator for on-going giving (but perhaps not enough to achieve the desired giving level).

• People also want to feel their life was purposeful and that they “made a difference”.

→ Consumer research should be conducted in year 1 to determine the most impactful approaches + messages, to the different targets.
WHO ARE WE COMPETING AGAINST?

Since we are supporting all charitable giving, we are not competing with other NP orgs. Instead, we are competing against other uses of peoples’ funds for other types of experiences.

- We are in an emotional battle for “self-esteem/doing what is right” versus “self-indulgence”.
  - Question?: How else do people support/fulfill their self-esteem, do what is right, and “make a difference” in their life?
- Some feel that donating competes against paying enough taxes to governments.
- Note: This “Billion Dollar Opportunity” is not a movement to collect money from everyday Canadians. We encourage people to give to registered charities of their own choice.

WHEN IS THE DESIRED BEHAVIOUR MOST LIKELY TO HAPPEN? HOW CAN THIS BE MADE EASIER?

There is a disproportionate amount of giving in the last 6 weeks of the year.

- Is this for tax-mitigation reasons, and/or due to the holiday spirit?

Nov 15 is National Philanthropy Day (although this is not well known)

Nov 11 is Remembrance Day (where people are displaying their red poppy pins). Perhaps this public display is important to ‘confirming’/’pulling one’s weight’ (?)

End of November/Early December has the “GivingTuesday” initiative.

There is also likely a greater sensitivity when filling out annual tax returns in April.

However, April/May is not an ideal time for donating due to payment of annual tax return filing requirements (?)

January/February is also likely a reduced opportunity due to higher credit card bills from the Christmas shopping season.

Perhaps June/July is good if people are receiving tax refunds (?). This is also when the CRA is providing tax assessments to individuals.
WHAT KEY INFORMATION IS MISSING OR DO WE NEED ANSWERED? HOW CAN WE RESOLVE THIS?

What is the best motivational message to leverage? And which targets will likely be the most lucrative? Why are “Millennials” and younger Canadians showing the most declines in giving behavior?

Consumer research is envisioned in Year 1 to address:

i. Identifying the ideal targets, and testing the most motivating messages among Canadians.
   - This can also include testing the program name, logo, and slogan
   - We can also use this study as the ‘benchmark’ (year 0) for future tracking and program evaluation.

ii. A focused study on younger adults to learn in which ways their interests, needs, and motivations require new approaches and solutions.

iii. A specific focus will be required for Quebec where a real cultural difference appears to be leading this province to be the lowest in per-capita donations (by half as much as the next weakest province) despite having the highest tax credits of all provinces.
SUMMARY OF POSSIBLE INITIATIVES WITHIN THE OVERALL CAMPAIGN

The following is a list of possible initiatives or programs envisioned as parts of the overall campaign. Each will have a special consideration for cultural differences in the Province of Quebec.

**Financial and Legal Professionals** – Prepare kits and materials for the professionals, for their wealthy clients, to get to the top 15-17% wealthiest Canadian citizens.

**PSAs and Public Campaign in Media** – Advertisements to communicate to the Canadian public, targeted to our primary and secondary targets.

**Social Networking Management** – Conduct activities, contests, sharing, and other creative ways to increase Facebook fans and to stimulate their sharing/postings/reach. This is about creating a strong social media initiative.

**Leverage “Nudging” and Behavioural Economic Insights:** Work with the CRA to include a simple “Thank You” note in each annual tax return audit letter shared with donors after their T1 Filings.

**Giving Tuesday** – after Black Friday and Cyber Monday, a day dedicated to giving to others. The movement now engages more than 6,000 charities and businesses and millions of Canadians. Major online platforms have reported significant increases in donations eg. CanadaHelps + 450% since 2012 prior to GivingTuesday.

**The Great Canadian Giving Challenge** – a public contest to benefit any registered Canadian charity, occurring annually in June. Every $1 donated to a registered charity on CanadaHelps.org or GivingChallenge.ca, automatically enters the charity to win a $10,000 donation awarded on Canada Day. In 2018, 90,000 Canadians participated, donating more than $11 million to over 11,000 charities, representing a 150% increase in donations compared to June the year before we started the GCGC.

**New Immigrants/ Citizenship Handbook** – Work with government to include communications and messaging to new citizens about civil responsibility and charity in Canada (e.g. Citizen Handbook).

**Charities: Communication and Direct Mail Campaigns** – Reach out to charities (via industry/sector lists and partners) to increase familiarity of such a sector giving initiative to engage charities, encourage their partnership, and to have charities communicate the ‘give more’ message to their supporters (via their websites and newsletters).

**University & College Program** – Develop philanthropic course curriculum and materials for use in community colleges and universities. Programs to be developed in association with the Association of Universities and Canadian Colleges (AUCC) and the Canadian Association of Community Colleges (CACC).

**Religious Institutions** – Create a communication piece about our mission, and the need for support. Share it with the various leaders of the religious institutions (at senior leadership level).

**Seniors Engagement** – Create a story (such as “Granny’s Birthday Club”) which can be shared among seniors as a way to appreciate the need to educate their children and grandchildren about being charitable.

**Youth Engagement Program(s)** – In addition to College and University programs, develop youth engagement communication and programs in communities to increase levels of volunteering and community involvement. Potential partners Apathy Is Boring and YMCA Canada.

**Order of Canada** – In collaboration with the office of the Governor General, engage OC philanthropic leaders as ambassadors in a broad based community involvement program including a community recognition program.

**Community recognition** – In collaboration with community organizations, cultural groups, and associations/clubs create and show charitable leadership (at the grassroots level). Encourage/fund community-level awards for new fresh giving initiatives.

**Employers** – In collaboration with business leaders, United Way, Volunteer Canada, CBSR, Imagine, YPO and YEO, target an increase in employee payroll deduction programs and employee volunteer days.

**Volunteering** – Partner with Volunteer Canada and the civic volunteer centres across Canada to ensure this aspect of giving back is also communicated and encouraged.
CONCLUSION

Canada needs a sustainable on-going public campaign to popularize and support more charitable giving, for the public good. We need to address the growing Charity Gap. *The Billion Dollar Opportunity compels us to try.*

We need a single-purpose entity focused on one mission: *to encourage more Canadians to be more charitable.* - A free standing, legal entity, with a single minded mission.

The proposed Action Plan is the perspective of a few individuals. Clearly, many heads are better than just ours, and we prefer a consensus. We recognize that there are already many efforts in place to help make a difference. This plan needs to be built around a team effort. Our plan is to work with the many others who are best equipped to address their areas of expertise.

Please consider how you can address this significant social problem. *Helping this movement is helping all charities. A rising tide floats all ships.*

- Offer your comment and guidance: john.hallward@giv3.ca
- Share this with others who can help make a difference.
- Consider how you can help financially support our initiative.