

## **CAP® CONVERSATION WITH LEADERS INTERVIEW SERIES**

### **A LOOK AT GIVING DONE RIGHT**

Featuring **MARK WEBER**, JD, MSFS, CLU®, ChFC®, AEP®, CAP®, Founder, Legacy Spectrum Advisors, LLC, and **PHIL BUCHANAN**, President, Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) and Author of *Giving Done Right: Effective Philanthropy and Making Every Dollar Count*.

Phil Buchanan and Mark Weber discuss the challenge of foundations and individuals securing candid feedback from grantees, and how, contrary to much current thinking, reliance on for-profit business performance metrics can undermine a nonprofit's effectiveness.

**Link to video:** <http://www.kaltura.com/tiny/xdbso>

Length: 35:15

Alignment: GS 839 Planning for Philanthropic Impact in the Context of Family Wealth

#### **Content:**

1. Discussion Questions
2. Biographies
3. Additional Resources
4. Transcript

## Discussion Questions

1. Why is it difficult for foundation leaders to obtain candid feedback from their grantees?
2. Much current thinking argues that the more nonprofits operate as if they were for-profit businesses, the more effective they will be. Phil Buchanan disagrees, on the grounds that the “power dynamics” of the two sectors are so different.
  - a. What are the power dynamics of these two sectors, and how do they differ?
  - b. What does he mean in asserting that “Grantees aren’t a foundation’s ‘customers’”?
  - c. Why does he object to nonprofits’ comparing funding their work to making an investment in a for-profit enterprise?
3. Phil Buchanan argues that the application of business concepts to nonprofits can encourage assumptions about philanthropy that are not necessarily true:
  - a. What assumptions about scale does the “business mindset” encourage?
  - b. For-profit businesses try to avoid duplicating efforts. But why might it actually be more effective to have, for example, a dozen small, local nonprofits distributing food to the underserved, as opposed to a “name brand” megaphilanthropy?
  - c. What does Mr. Buchanan mean when he says we should “scale solutions, not organizations”?
  - d. Quoting founder Bryan Stevenson, Phil Buchanan urges funders to “get proximate” with those in need whom they hope to help. What does Mr. Stevenson mean by this? How might this result in more effective philanthropy?
4. Why is measuring performance for a nonprofit less clear-cut than for a business?
5. One performance metric commonly used to assess nonprofits is overhead expenses. Why does Phil Buchanan consider this metric “useless”?

## Biographies

**Phil Buchanan** is the founding president of the Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP), a nonprofit whose data-driven research helps funders maximize their philanthropic effectiveness. CEP's clients include some of the nation's largest foundations, such as Ford, Rockefeller, and MacArthur. Mr. Buchanan is a columnist for the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, and his op-eds and articles have appeared in the *New York Times*, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, and the *Financial Times*. In 2016, he was named "Influencer of the Year" by the *Nonprofit Times*. His most recent book, *Giving Done Right: Effective Philanthropy and Making Every Dollar Count* (Public Affairs, 2019) was named the "Best Philanthropy Book of the Year" by *Inside Philanthropy*. He lives in Massachusetts with his wife and their two daughters.

**Mark A. Weber**, JD, MSFS, CLU®, ChFC®, AEP®, CAP®. In 2020, after over 32 years heading up the Wealth Transfer practice of SilverStone Group, Mark sold his interest in the firm, exited the financial service profession, and started Legacy Spectrum Advisors, LLC. He now devotes his time to teaching, writing, speaking and consulting in the field of philanthropy. Additionally, Mark founded and continues to lead the Omaha Chartered Advisor In Philanthropy® Study Group, which has thus far guided over 100 Omaha-area professionals (attorneys, accountants, financial planners, wealth managers and planned giving officers) through the graduate-level coursework necessary to attain the [CAP® designation](#). He is the author of *The Legacy Spectrum: Passing Your Wealth with Thought and Meaning* (2017), available on The Legacy Spectrum [website](#), and, with Phil Cubeta, of *The Legacy Spectrum Workbook*, available from [Porchlight Books.com](#).

## Additional Resources

Center for Effective Philanthropy: <https://cep.org>

Phil Buchanan, *Giving Done Right: Effective Philanthropy and Making Every Dollar Count*. Public Affairs, 2019.

For further information about "proximate" leadership, see [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/effective\\_change\\_requires\\_proximate\\_leaders](https://ssir.org/articles/entry/effective_change_requires_proximate_leaders)

GiveWell  
<https://www.givewell.org/>

Jeffrey Bradach, "Going to Scale: The Challenges of Replicating Social Programs", *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 2003.  
[https://ssir.org/images/articles/2003SP\\_feature\\_bradach.pdf](https://ssir.org/images/articles/2003SP_feature_bradach.pdf)

## Transcript: A LOOK AT GIVING DONE RIGHT

Featuring **MARK WEBER**, JD, MSFS, CLU®, ChFC®, AEP®, CAP®, Founder, Legacy Spectrum Advisors, LLC, and **PHIL BUCHANAN**, President, Center for Effective Philanthropy (CEP) and Author of *Giving Done Right: Effective Philanthropy and Making Every Dollar Count*.

- 00:05      Mark: Well, Phil Buchanan, welcome and thank you for agreeing to visit stay about your new book. [Phil Buchanan on screen]
- 00:13      Before we start, because this is for our CAP students and CAP graduates, would you tell us a little bit about Phil Buchanan's background and about the Center for Effective Philanthropy, just to put a little bit of context before we get into your book, giving or giving done right.
- 00:29      Phil: Sure. Mark, and thanks for having me. I was born in Toronto, Canada, grew up in Portland, Oregon. Worked in higher education administration for six years ended up getting an MBA worked in strategy consulting for a bit and then was hired as the first executive director of the Center for Effective Philanthropy 19 years ago there was a founding board but not really a staff at that time. And so, so that's my background in a nutshell and CEP is located in Cambridge, Massachusetts, we have an office in San Francisco and really focused on on helping foundations to be to be more effective. I can tell you more about myself, but not sure how much detail you want me to get into.
- 01:15      Mark: But talk a little bit about Center for Effective Philanthropy, a lot more. I mean, I look website looks like yeah like 20 employees or so, I mean, do you work on a fee basis for different individuals or organizations or what exactly do?
- 01:31      Phil: Yeah, great. We actually have about 45 staff in Cambridge and San Francisco. We've got one person in Amsterdam now. We work to help institutional foundations, as well as individual donors to be more effective. So a big component of what we do is grant funded research on questions like um, how do you think about strategy and philanthropy? How do you assess performance in philanthropy, because it's not it's not so simple, or obvious.
- 02:01      But then we also have a big fee for service or earned revenue component of what we do. And that's mostly for foundations involving various feedback tools. One of the challenges for big institutional donors, is they don't get any candid feedback because they're surrounded by people who are predisposed to telling them what they think they want to hear. So we

have something called the grantee perception report, which provides nonprofit perspectives back to a funder on how they can be helpful. Other assessments advisory services, and then we have programming that we do. That was, used to be a conference in person pre COVID. Now it's a lot of virtual programming webinars, educational opportunities that are aimed at both individual and institutional donors.

- 02:48 Mark: Would you like you to fall, just a little bit because you made a good point. I think many of our CAP students don't, probably don't, I didn't, when I when you said, oh, that's true. You said donors oftentimes don't get honest feedback of what they're doing to, elaborate on that just a little bit.
- 03:07 Phil: Yeah, I mean, there's a there's an inherent you know power imbalance or power dynamic between the funder, and the the the grant seeker or gift seeker. And so that can that can inhibit candor and there's a lot of sort of trite jokes about this in philanthropy that you know, once somebody becomes a foundation president, you know, they're they've never looked better. People ask them if they've lost weight. You know, and all that kind of stuff and I've heard that joke 100 times and if the foundation president that tells it to me, I still laugh like it's the first time I heard it.
- 03:43 So, you know, so there is this dynamic, it can be hard to be to be candid. People don't want to jeopardize understandably their, their funding and and so that can lead to a real challenge for for funders, because they they sometimes don't know what they don't know.
- 04:01 Mark: And it was...reminded me. I had lunch probably two years ago with a law school classmate of mine for many years ago and she heads up or she retired now, but she had up a major foundation. And she said, it's different now I go to the grocery store and people say hi to me. They, now, I realized, who really was my friend and who just wanted something from it. Never occurred to me before that everyone's looking for an angle to get to her today able to get money out of the foundation.
- 04:27 Phil: That's right. And you know, it's funny, because when we work with foundations sometimes and I and I talked about this in in Giving Done Right in the book. I people will say, oh, hey, Phil, we want to do that that customer feedback tool that you have. And I say, you mean the grantee procession report this survey of nonprofits that you find and they say, yeah, like get customer feedback.
- 04:51 And I'm like, that's really a terrible analogy, actually, because because grantees aren't your customers. The money is flowing in the opposite direction. Right. And the reason that matters is that if I have a bad meal at a restaurant. I don't really feel worried about trashing that restaurant online. I don't ever have to go back there again. But if I have a bad

interaction with a program Officer or an individual donor, who I think is sort of uniquely positioned to support my organization, I'm not going to trash them online. I'm not going to give them any feedback and I will go back because I feel that I have to in order to get funding, you know, to support the mission of our organization. So the dynamics, the power dynamics are really different between a donor or a funder, and a nonprofit than they are between a business and a customer.

05:50 Mark: All right. I think that's a really good point to make, at times, because donors, we get all this positive feedback.

05:57 Phil: Right.

05:58 Mark: But we don't really ever asked, are we are we giving most effective way we could?

06:01 Phil: Exactly

06:03 Mark: A positive feedback. Well, let me ask you, when you when you wrote Giving Done Right, what is it that you are hoping to add to the growing body of literature on philanthropy?

06:17 Phil: Yeah. I mean, I think there were two things motivating me. One was a sense of inspiration about what it is that effective philanthropy can, at its best to accomplish and what the nonprofit sector has done to strengthen this country is what I know best, but I think it's true, true, more broadly. So there's all kinds of things that have come to be because of effective philanthropy supporting great nonprofits that we take for granted in our lives from um, you know that our kids won't die of yellow fever, because the Rockefeller Foundation supported the development of a vaccine. Ah, to the arts and culture that we take advantage of in our communities to perhaps the nonprofit hospital that that cared for a loved one.

07:09 Um, and I think it's under appreciated the role of nonprofits and the role of philanthropy. Ah, so I wanted to try to communicate that in a in a positive way. But also I think I was motivated by frustration. Ah, in seeing donors, whose hearts were in the right place, who wanted to do something, to make a difference, make the same predictable mistakes that so many donors who have come before them had. And so you know I, I don't want to be, I don't want to presume that a single book really changes that much. But it was my effort to try to help at least a few donors to avoid some of those predictable mistakes by laying out what others have learned so that they don't have to learn it the hard way.

8:02 Mark: And by the way, you did a really nice job of your footnotes and the reading list. It's a comprehensive list there which is well done. In our

materials, I think it's the first CAP class that deals with families and philanthropy. The major book that we read was by Tom Tierney and Joel Fleischman on Give Smart. I'm sure you're quite familiar with that. But that's nearly almost 10 years ago that came up. So what have you added since that? I mean I'm kinda [Phil Buchanan on screen] put you on the spot, and I'm pulling you away for that book, but what, what would you say that you've taken the next step, or what's changed since that so that's that was published.

08:46      Phil: Yeah, I think, Give Smart is a good book. And I have a lot of respect for Tom Tierney and Joel Fleischman. And Joel Fleischmann actually was a mentor to me and helped bring the Center for Effective Philanthropy into existence through a grant that he made when he was in Atlantic Philanthropies.

09:05      I believe that the, in the 10 years since give smart between gift smart and Giving Done Right there was even more embrace of a sort of markets and business as analogies for everything mindset in philanthropy that I argue against in Giving Done Right. I argue that phrases like “operate more like a business” as if that's a synonym for effectiveness are not helpful. And I think that's a difference between, you know, this book and other books about philanthropy is that I'm really trying to say, look, philanthropy is, is not helped by the analogy to investing in business that folks so often just, just rely on.

10:00      And another thing that I think that I really try to emphasize that maybe a little bit different. Is that we get to infatuated with the notion of size and scale in in in our society and in that um, you know there is almost an equation of larger organizations with more effective organizations and a diminishment or disparagement of small organizations as somehow ineffective or duplicative or inefficient. And one of the things that I try to do and Giving Done Right, is to show that sometimes it makes a lot of sense for an organization to grow significantly. Other times, the very smallness, and community rootedness of an organization is what allows them to be effective in serving people who trust them because of their community roots.

11:03      I think that's really crucial. Especially now in this moment where we're seeing just how significantly different the impacts for example of COVID are on different communities. And then we need to be supporting organizations that are best positioned to serve particular communities and it isn't always the largest organization or the one with the greatest brand awareness. Or brand name recognition that that we should be reflexively giving to. So those are a few things that I think are emphases that are a little bit different in my book, then maybe some of the other good books about philanthropy.

- 11:42 Mark: Yeah. I like the comment. Thank you. I'd comment on a couple of things. I used to be on a community foundation Board. And one of the things when I see all these small organizations doing the same thing. And what sticks in my head in our community was delivering of food for people. [Phil Buchanan on screen]
- 12:02 And I think this would be so far more efficient to have one big warehouse and one all trucks that do all this and instead of having eight different organizations. And it occurred to me after we got to know their organizations, that's not true that the little organizations knew their community. They were trusted. They were accepted there and they knew where the real pain was instead of some big organization saying just go give food to this part of the town. I mean, it was far more effective having these small organizations. And so I came to believe that, yeah, it wasn't the most perfectly efficient.
- But I'm saying was the most effective sometimes having smaller organizations multiple ones so long that its not completely duplicitous to the other one. If there's and there's certain things they can do together. They could share maybe a pantry or freezers or something to store food, whatever. But, but I think your point is very well taken. It's not always the largest to get the most efficiencies to make a nonprofits the most effective.
- 13:09 Phil: Just, just two points on that. One is often what we should be focused on is and I think I think Jeff Bradach use this phrase from Bridgespan, scaling solutions not necessarily scaling organizations, right. And then solutions might be different community by community. And then the second point is that there is this real issue of trust in when you're dealing with historically disadvantage, discriminated against, or marginalized communities, in particular. Where are they going to show up looking for help.
- 13:49 So, I, I've been writing some blog post recently about just the challenge at nonprofits are facing in the economic and health crisis post COVID. And one of the people I wrote about runs an organization in Seattle. It's called World Relief Seattle serving immigrants she herself is an immigrant from India 40 years of history serving that community, refugees, asylum seekers helping folks get jobs, helping with legal services. And then, when COVID hit, mass massive unemployment for the population that this organization has serve because the first jobs tend to be in the hospitality industry.
- 14:37 So, so where do they go, they go back to the organization that first helped them when they got to this country because that's who they trust. And so Chitra Hanstad, the executive director of world relief Seattle, she said to



me, we never did food before, you know, but now we have to because they came to us. And so we developed a partnership with the food pantry. We reconfigured some space we have. And we're delivering 700 meals a week to people. And that's just the reality. You know, particularly some of the folks that she's working with are undocumented people who are scared and they know that they'll be safe if they go to this organization. And so I think that's something that, that, that is also part of the equation.

- 15:26 Mark: And just to pursue that a moment because that is what you said is so true is the, many of us want to sit back and write checks and right and that's the extent of our philanthropy. And we try to pick organizations out about and which ones are most efficient, which we'll talk about that in a moment, but it is oftentimes combining with, joining up with an organization that has boots on the ground that is close to the problem.
- 15:54 Phil: Right
- 15:58 Mark: ...and being involved not just giving money but giving some of your time to being engaged and getting know that organization too. We talked a little bit about that, of getting both of your time and your and your talents in addition to money in your book, which I think was a very good point.
- 16:11 Phil: Absolutely. I mean, I think, you know, Bryan Stevenson of Equal Justice Initiative uses the phrase the phrase, get proximate. And I think that's just so, so important.
- 16:33 And one of the people who is very kindly let me tell a little bit of his story in the in the book is a guy named Mario Marino. Who was one of the sort of you know fathers of the venture philanthropy movement and the idea that there were analogies between venture capital and philanthropy that were very helpful. And and I you know, I asked him, do you still think it's a good analogy? And and he said, I actually don't. I think we've done good work, but I don't think it's a good analogy because the degree of social complexity is much greater in this work.
- 17:02 And I asked him, Well, what advice do you give to donors. Now that you've spent, you know, three decades learning that this was harder than you thought it would be. And he said, Well, I tell them, he said, I tell him I was arrogant and that you have to bear witness that you have to get close to the people and the problems that you're seeking to address and that it takes time and not to assume that you know best what others need. And I just thought, that was so powerful coming from him. Because he's so self reflective, and able to talk about his own, his own missteps along the way.
- 17:38 Mark: That takes quite a degree of humility to admit that.

17:41 Phil: Yeah, absolutely. Yeah.

17:45 Mark: Yeah, and oftentimes with money comes power and humility isn't something you think naturally with those power, money also. But giving effectively and that's much what your book talks about and and it gets into the humility part also I'm getting down to where the actual problem is and working with the people that that are most affected by it.

18:07 I do want to challenge a little bit though. Because you you do kind of go out of your way to dispel parallels with business and

18:16 Phil: Yes

18:17 Mark: ..coming from the business world. There's a lot of good things that business does. I mean we strive for efficiencies we we look and try that pay, attract and retain top talent. You know, we're always looking for innovations. I mean, capitalism and the business have done some wonderful things. I mean, I don't venture it's made our country with is today. And so I don't, I will, I like to have you distinguish a little bit about that. So I think some of the things that business does can be effective in the philanthropic world.

18:54 Phil: So I totally agree that that business is vitally important, and that and and that has played a huge role in in making you know, many of the good things about our country come, come to fruition. I think it's also, of course, done some damage right and then a lot in between.

19:19 I think my point is that that the role of business is distinct and different from the role of government, which is distinct and different from the role of the nonprofit sector funded by philanthropy. And that the boundaries between those sectors are important and understanding their unique role is important so if markets could solve all our problems, we wouldn't have any problems but but there are certain issues that define market solutions.

19:49 Where philanthropy and the nonprofit sector plays a vital role so that that that would be that would be one point I would make. So it's not a knock on business to say philanthropy and nonprofits do something different and distinct that business often can't do particularly well.

20:06 The second thing is not to think of business like as a synonym or business as a synonym for effectiveness. Because I agree with Jim Collins, the business guru who I think, you know, is one of the few business gurus who really gets the distinct role that the nonprofit sector plays and he says, why would we want to emulate the practices of business when business, most businesses, like most of everything are mediocre. Right.

So there are great businesses and, and just think about your last customer experiences in the last week. I bet some of them were maddening. Right.

- 20:47 And there, their businesses that are that are not great, and that we shouldn't emulate. So let's not use business as a synonym for effectiveness and let's recognize that actually, there are some really distinct challenges about about leading a nonprofit and I think leading nonprofit takes everything it takes to run an equivalent size business but then a bunch more because of the complexity involved.
- 21:10 One example on that performance measurement is quite simple. in the non in the in the business world. And in investing and we can ultimately compare nonprofits or investments along universal metrics like profit or or ROI, but for nonprofits, there isn't a universal measure measurement as much trickier, the measures are not in your financial statements. And so it's it's just understanding those differences that I think is really important.
- 21:42 You're right there. I'm not saying no, you know, the sectors cannot learn from each other, although I think the learning can go both ways, but I am saying that they play distinct roles they do different things. And I don't think business sort of has the lock on all that is good.
- 21:58 Mark: I agree with that, thank you for your clarification. [Phil Buchanan on screen]
- 22:06 Okay, I do want you to pursue a little deeper. Again, in your book you talk about overhead expenses. I mean that's gotten to be now there's all these services out there that measure overhead and when people like our audience, you I think are typically dealing with my senses, directors of major foundations. And people this is their world that they trying to figure how to distribute how to disperse money effectively.
- 22:36 And most of our clients, most of us are attorneys, accountants, financial services people and we have nonprofit development directors, of course. But when they're, we're, trying to motivate them to give money and they want to do it effectively and I know from our materials that generationally there's certainly a difference when you get to be the oldest generation, they tend to trust institutions more and they're willing to just write the check to United Way or Salvation Army and call it good.
- 23:06 And that certainly changed as I get younger they want more feedback they want more hands on. They want to see what you're doing but overhead is an easy thing to measure whether it's 10% or what the number is. And I get that totally simplistic, but what what can we as advisors.

- 23:25 What can we give the donors that don't have big foundations are trying to make decisions by themselves on the most effective way to give and that their dollars being used, or most effectively?
- 23:37 Phil: Yeah. Um, it's a great question. I mean, I think that there are really good resources to help you find the most effective organizations in particular communities community foundations can be a great resource. So if you care about educational opportunity for people in a particular community, go to the community foundation and ask them to help you find the best organizations to support.
- 24:09 There are other resources for giving globally. If you care about trying to prevent death from diseases that don't have to kill people, you know, you can go to Givewell and you can look at their careful vetting of the impact of different organizations working to prevent deaths by malaria, for example. But overhead, I think, is not a good measure and and first of all it's not defined consistently.
- 24:41 And second of all, it incentivizes, I don't like that word. Can that really be a word?.. But creates incentives for nonprofits to you know, make judgment calls about what they even call overhead and and and and and I I think most importantly, like if you, it's not, it's just doesn't tell you anything. So if you think about, you know, sometimes I'll hear people say like you know, I want to support the food pantry, but I don't want my money going to salaries. Well, what, why not? The, or to rent, why not? You want it only going to the potatoes, which can only be served by volunteers who are coordinated by staff. Who are serving the food in a space for which rent is charged. Why should we differentiate? Why is one better than the other? And if it's a well led organization. Why not give an unrestricted way so that those leaders have the flexibility, then to allocate resources as they see fit to pursue the mission.
- 25:52 So I think the most important thing to ask of a nonprofit you're thinking about supporting is essentially what are they trying to do. What are their goals. How are they trying to do it. What are their strategies and then what information do they have that suggests that they're making a difference that they're on the right path. Performance indicators, and you should be able to find the answers to the questions relatively easily on an organization's website. Again, you can get guidance from a community foundation or a or an advisor. Or any number of different websites, depending on the area that you're that you're looking at. But I don't think overhead is a good measure.
- 26:31 And last thing I'll say about this the one study that I know of overhead rates which utilized Givewell which does vary, which I referenced before, which is very extensive impact assessments, was done by a consultant in

the UK named Caroline Fines and she found it an inverse relationship there. In other words, it was the organizations that had higher overhead that tended to be producing more impact and results. And that's in part because some of the things that can get considered overhead are actually essential investments in people in technology that are required to do the work well.

27:13 Mark: You know, I think what you're saying is what I'm hearing you say is people just need to put more evidence, it's not so simple as going to a computer screen and pulling out there looking for some numbers. In our in our cap classes, the one of the beauties of having a cross section of people in there, including the nonprofit's I know I certainly have a far greater appreciation of our nonprofit world after getting to know development directors and

27:48 I guess the what I what I've seen over my career is when decisions are made were to give to nonprofits, the nonprofit persons. Oftentimes, not even in the room. It's oftentimes attacks decision. Right, our financial planner will say you have this amount of money you can afford to give this much away. But there's not as much thought, giving to the effectiveness of it. And. And I think with that argues for at least in my perspective, from my perspective, I'm, I would want to bring the nonprofit in and doesn't have to be. There's the fear of that. Well, I don't want them to see everything I'm doing they're just going to ask for all my money. I think we have to give them for the doubt sometimes to trust them and to say I'm going to give you this amount of money helped me figure out how to deploy most effectively.

28:34 Phil: Before COVID we knew that there is a legacy of racial injustice in this country that that goes back to slavery and in the data. I mean, for anyone who's skeptical. All you gotta do is look at the data and the data will tell you that their rates of arrest and incarceration for people who you know, do the same things are different based on race that you know the outcomes in terms of housing, banking, controlling for income, you know, different based on like everywhere we look, we can see it.

29:12 And then COVID hit and I, I, I had a couple of talks I was supposed to do on a you know book talks that got rescheduled to Zoom's. And I thought, I can't give the same talk, you know, I mean, a lot of the same principles apply but but but by early April, it was clear that if you wanted to do something about COVID philanthropically, that racial equity had to be Part of your equation because we had death rates of African Americans twice that of whites because of the economic impacts disproportionately on immigrant populations, disproportionate on women actually, African American, Latinx people we had virulent racism directed at Asian and Asian American people. So there's no way to be effective and not take all

of that reality in into into account and then the murder of George Floyd, you know, which of course it's just one in a long, long series of killings of black people by police obviously elevated this issue even more.

30:27 And I'm hopeful that that people will think about that as they make their philanthropic decisions and there's very practical implications of this right like so we often we often think about getting in our, in our little community where we live.

30:44 Well, let's stop and look you know at what what's going on in our community. What's going on in other communities. So in in the town. I live in the rates of COVID infection are very low, and the philanthropic capacity is quite high. So if I care about the suffering, let's say, just in Massachusetts. That's where I live, related to this crisis. It makes no sense for me to give in the little town that I live in it makes sense for me to, to give in Lawrence and Brockton, and the other geographies, where the health implications, the health impacts are very high and the economic dislocation is very high, but the philanthropic capacity is lower. So we have to apply that lens, I think, and not just reflexively you know, give to what we know we have to get out of our, our own geography, our own circles and give where the impacts our greatest.

31:48: Mark: Well, thank you, that's a that's even more difficult to do. I totally agree with you on the need to do it, but it's hard when we can't see and feel these organization and get to know them. So it just takes more work on our part to get comfort there.

32:02 Have you seen any research like on the impact on donor, how giving actually is good for the donor.

32:16 Phil: Yeah.

32:13 Mark: I mean, I find something very interesting. If you wouldn't mind commenting on that I would appreciate it.

32:19 Phil: Yeah, in that at the very end of my book I quote, from a book called "The Paradox of Generosity", which is based on the Science of Generosity Initiative, which is a big research project at the University of Notre Dame. And I'll just read what they said. They said, those who give their resources away, receive back and turn in offering our time, money and energy in service of others well-being we enhance our own well-being, as well. And letting go of some of what we own for the good of others, we better secure our own lives too. This paradox that generosity is a sociological fact confirmed by evidence from quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews.

- 32:57 So a very rigorous study that showed a correlation between giving and happiness and a sense of purpose and fulfillment in in life.
- 33:13 Mark: I think we know that intuitively that's interesting to hear that there's a studies on this. All right, so last question. How could our cap students and kept graduates best use your book. How would you suggest that they deploy that most effectively?
- 32:30 Phil: Well, by reading it, of course, and I think that, I think that, you know, I tried to write in a way that if you don't want to read every chapter. You don't have to it. If you want to skip to the end of the chapter and get the key insights you can. And that you can go back to it and say, like, okay, I'm trying to set goals right now. That's where I am, read the chapter on goals and the really tough trade us. You have to make as you think about what your philanthropic goals are.
- Or if your goals are established and you know what, you know, know what you want to do. And now you're facing the question of like, well, who do I support, who do I not support. How do I evaluate nonprofits?
- There's a whole you know chapter of the book that's essentially devoted devoted to that. And then you know I hope I don't I you know, people can can can put a review on Amazon and tell me I'm wrong, but I, I hope that also people learn from the stories and the data just about this important part of American history in American life, that is philanthropy in the nonprofit sector. So in addition to it being practically useful as folks advise donors. As folks make their own giving decisions. I hope it's also just helpful in understanding this component of American life a little bit better.
- 34:53 Mark: Well, thank you. It really was well done and I did do that. Some chapters. I went to the end or read the key points. First, and I went back and read it. Which I've been known to do before. But anyway, Phil Buchanan. Thank you very much for Giving Done Right and good luck on the sales of your book. It's really I think you meant a lot to this field. So,thank you.
- 35:11 Phil: Thank you, Mark. Thank you.
- 35:14 Mark: All right.