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## Participating Organizations by Category

| Advocacy |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Basic Rights Oregon <br> Campaign for Southern Equality <br> Equality California <br> Equality Federation <br> Equality Florida <br> Equality North Carolina <br> Family Equality <br> Freedom for All Americans <br> Georgia Equality <br> GLAAD <br> Human Rights Campaign (HRC) | interACT: Advocates for Intersex Youth <br> Keshet <br> LGBTQ Victory Fund \& Victory Institute <br> National Center for Transgender Equality (NCTE) <br> National LGBTQ Task Force <br> National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance (NQAPIA) <br> PFLAG <br> SAGE: Advocacy \& Services for LGBT Elders <br> Southerners on New Ground (SONG) <br> True Colors United |
| Issue |  |
| CenterLink <br> GLSEN <br> Genders \& Sexualities Alliance (GSA) Network Immigration Equality <br> The New York City Anti-Violence Project (NYCAVP) | Out \& Equal <br> Point Foundation <br> Reconciling Ministries Network (RMN) <br> Soulforce <br> The Trevor Project |
| Legal |  |
| ACLU Jon L. Stryker and Slobodan Randjelović LGBTQ \& HIV Project <br> GLBTQ Legal Advocates and Defenders (GLAD) <br> Lambda Legal | National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR) Transgender Law Center (TLC) |
| Research \& Public Education |  |
| Funders for LGBTQ Issues | Movement Advancement Project (MAP) |

Note: One organization wishes to remain anonymous and is excluded from this list.
See the Methodology infographic (page 5) for definitions of organization categories.

## KEY FINDINGS

The National LGBTQI Movement Report (NMR) series provides a comprehensive, annual snapshot of the financial health of many of the largest lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI) social justice organizations in the United States. These organizations generally focus on either broad LGBTQI advocacy, issue-specific advocacy, legal advocacy, or research and public education about LGBTQ people and issues.

This year, in particular, The 2021 National LGBTQ/ Movement Report is critically important. It focuses on fiscal year 2020, which was marked by the COVID-19 pandemic. Since the onset of the pandemic, MAP has conducted surveys of leading LGBTQI organizations regarding the impacts of COVID-19, but this year's NMR is the first to assess the entire fiscal year in this detail. ${ }^{1}$

This year's report shows that participating organizations ended the first fiscal year of the pandemic with strong financial standing-but also that this financial health may shift dramatically as the pandemic continues to unfold. Additionally, while these overall numbers paint a picture of strength, they do not necessarily reflect the many tremendous challenges that organizations and their staff have gone through over the past year, including the ongoing impacts to staff mental and physical health. ${ }^{2}$

This annual report shows key financial trends and benchmarks in these major areas:

- Revenue
- Expenses
- Financial Trends
- Indicators of Financial Health
- Fundraising
- Staff
- Boards
- New this year: Trends in Staff Demographics Over Time

Note that because different organizations participate from year to year, readers should not compare findings in this year's report to those in previous years' reports. Instead, readers can find historical comparisons within this and each report, as participating organizations are asked to provide both current and past years' data whenever possible.

## Revenue: Continued Growth, Even Amid COVID-19

- Across 39 participating organizations, combined 2020 revenue totaled $\$ 398.5$ million, exceeding combined 2020 expenses ( $\$ 303.8$ million) by roughly \$95 million-a dramatically higher differential than in previous years.
- From 2019 to 2020, organizations reported significant increases in all sources of revenue, except for fundraising events. These dramatic shifts-many of which reverse previous years' trends-include a combined $157 \%$ increase in revenue from bequests, 65\% increase in revenue from corporate contributions, $57 \%$ increase in foundation funding, and a 32\% increase in revenue from individual contributions. Fundraising event net income fell by a combined 20\% during the fiscal year marked by COVID-19, social distancing, and in-person event cancellations. While the decline in fundraising event income may not be surprising, the remarkable increases in other sources of revenue suggest both that organizations ended the year in a stronger position than might have otherwise been expected given the economic devastation of the pandemic, but also that organizations' financial positions could just as easily change in the coming fiscal year if these increases are temporary.
- Including in-kind revenue, these organizations reported a combined $35 \%$ revenue increase from 2019 to 2020. Excluding in-kind revenue, organizations' revenue increased $37 \%$.
- Organizations that provided five-year trend data reported an aggregate 70\% revenue increase from 2016 to 2020 (including in-kind).
- Individual donations remain the largest share of organizations' combined revenue, comprising $36 \%$ of total 2020 combined revenue.


## Expenses: Growth Over Past Five Years, Focused on Programs and Services

- Total combined 2020 expenses were $\$ 303.8$ million, and the majority of organizations' combined expenses (78\%) were spent on programs and services.

[^0]- As may have been expected due to COVID-19, expenses related to fundraising fell by a combined $4 \%$ from 2019 to 2020, while expenses for both management and programs and services each increased by a combined 8\%.
- From 2019 to 2020, total expenses (including inkind) increased 6\%. Excluding in-kind, participating organizations' expenses increased $1 \%$.
- Organizations that provided five-year trend data reported an aggregate $34 \%$ expense increase (including in-kind) from 2016 to 2020-demonstrating a clear growth in programs and services.


## Indicators of Financial Health: Clear Growth and Strength

- All organizations that provided five-year trend data report a five-year average liquidity ratio above one, meaning all organizations have consistently maintained enough cash and liquid assets on hand to at least cover their current financial obligations. In fact, nearly two-thirds (64\%) of organizations report a five-year average liquidity ratio over seven, meaning they can cover their liabilities more than seven times over with what they have on hand. This longer-term strength and consistency (i.e., maintaining a strong liquidity ratio over the past five years) may help explain why LGBTQI organizations emerged from the first year of the pandemic in relative financial health.
- Daily cash expenditures did not change from 2019 to 2020, with an average of $\$ 16,500$ in spending per day.
- Participating organizations reported an average of 428 days of working capital in 2020, a $70 \%$ increase from the previous year.

Fundraising: Growth in Large and Medium Donors During the Pandemic, But Continued Declines in Small and Micro Donors that Comprise the Majority of Individual Givers

- In 2020, participating organizations reported a combined total of over 412,000 individual donors, the vast majority of whom (95\%) gave under $\$ 1,000$ in 2020. More than two in five (42\%) of all individual donors in 2020 gave under $\$ 35$.
- Among organizations that provided five-year trend data (2016 to 2020), the total number of donors by donation size was significantly impacted by COVID-19. Generally speaking, the number of larger donors increased, while the number of smaller donors decreased-likely reflecting the disproportionate economic impacts of COVID-19 on those who were already economically vulnerable to begin with. ${ }^{3}$
- From fiscal years 2016 to 2019, the number of large donors ( $\$ 25,000+$ per year) increased by $22 \%$. From 2019 to 2020, the number of large donors increased again, but only by $3 \%$.
- From 2016 to 2019, the number of medium donors ( $\$ 1,000-\$ 24,999$ per year) decreased by $9 \%$, but from 2019 to 2020, the number of medium donors instead grew by $20 \%$ noticeably reversing the longer-term trend.
- From 2016 to 2019, the number of small donors ( $\$ 35-\$ 999$ per year) decreased by 3\%. From 2019 to 2020, the number of small donors decreased even further, by another $9 \%$.
- Five-year trend data are not yet available for micro donors (<\$35 per year), but participating organizations reported a 9\% decrease in these donors from 2019 to 2020.
- Five-year trend data show that the number of individuals who attend fundraising events grew $10 \%$ from 2016 to 2019, but then decreased $41 \%$ from 2019 to 2020 amidst the pandemic.
- Based on the number of donors to participating organizations (assuming that all donors are LGBT people and that there are no duplicates) and the total number of LGBT adults in the United States, data reported by participating organizations suggest that only $3.6 \%$ of LGBT people-only about 1 in every 28 LGBT people-donated to these leading LGBTQI advocacy organizations in 2020. Of course, many non-LGBTQI people donate to these organizations, and some LGBTQI people likely donate to multiple organizations, so the true number of LGBTQI people who donate to these important organizations is likely even smaller.

[^1]
## Staff: Demographically Diverse in Race, Gender, Orientation, and Age

- Participating organizations employed a total of 1,344 paid staff in fiscal year 2020, 93\% of whom are fulltime workers. The average staff size at participating organizations is 34 staff, and the median staff size is 20. Staff size ranges from a low of one to a high of 269.
- Not all organizations reported staff demographics. Among those that did, organizations reported racially diverse staff, with $52 \%$ of all staff and $46 \%$ of all senior staff being people of color. Among all staff, 19\% are Black or African American, 14\% are Hispanic or Latino, $8 \%$ are Asian or Pacific Islander (API), 6\% are multi-racial, $0.7 \%$ are Native American, and 4\% identify as another race or ethnicity. Compared to the national population, this means that LGBTQI organizations employ more Black and API people, but employ fewer Hispanic or Latino people. ${ }^{4}$
- Among reporting organizations, $45 \%$ of all staff identify as women, $38 \%$ as men, $9 \%$ as nonbinary, and $8 \%$ as genderqueer or another gender identity. Looking just at senior staff, the share of men rises to $43 \%$, and the share of nonbinary and genderqueer declines to $8 \%$ total.
- Among reporting organizations, 16\% of staff and 13\% of senior staff identify as transgender. Nationally, an estimated $0.6 \%$ of the adult population identifies as transgender. ${ }^{5}$
- Of organizations providing data on the sexual orientation of their staff, $85 \%$ of all staff and $86 \%$ of senior staff are LGBTQ. Among all staff, $44 \%$ are gay or lesbian, $9 \%$ are bisexual, $24 \%$ are queer, $0.3 \%$ are asexual, 8\% are another (non-heterosexual) orientation, and $15 \%$ are heterosexual.
- The majority (64\%) of all staff are ages 30 to 54, followed by $25 \%$ of staff under the age of 30 , and $11 \%$ of staff who are 55 and older.


## Boards: Demographically Diverse, Though Less So Than Staff

- Participating organizations reported a total of 728 board members, with an average board size of 19 members and a median of 16 . The smallest board is comprised of 5 members, and the largest of 63.
- Boards are less racially diverse than staff, as only $42 \%$ of both boards and executive boards are people of color. ${ }^{6}$ In particular, board members are much less likely than staff to be Hispanic or Latino, Native American, or multiracial. Only 9\% of board members and executive board members are Hispanic or Latinx (compared to $14 \%$ of staff), and only $0.3 \%$ of board members are Native American (compared to 0.7\% of staff). There were zero Native American members identified among executive boards at organizations that reported these data.
- Among board members, 49\% identify as men, 45\% as women, $3 \%$ as nonbinary, and $3 \%$ as genderqueer or another gender identity.
- Overall, $9 \%$ of board members and 9\% of executive board members identify as transgender.
- Of organizations providing data on the sexual orientation of their board members, 68\% of board members are gay or lesbian, $3 \%$ are bisexual, 11\% are queer, $0.3 \%$ are asexual, $4 \%$ are another (nonheterosexual) orientation, and 14\% are heterosexual.


## The Numbers of Staff of Color and Transgender Staff Have Grown Over Past Ten Years

- In a new analysis this year, MAP examined trends in staff demographics among organizations that reported these data in fiscal years 2010, 2015, and 2020. The results show noticeable changes in the composition of movement staff, including:
- Among organizations that reported staff racial data ( $n=22$ organizations), over the last ten years, the number of movement staff of color increased significantly, from 34\% people of color in 2010 to 52\% people of color in 2020.
- Among reporting organizations ( $n=22$ ), the share of staff who are transgender nearly tripled, from 6\% in 2010 to 16\% in 2020.
- Among organizations that reported staff gender identity ( $n=22$ ), the share of staff who are women has remained largely unchanged (48\%

[^2]in $2010,46 \%$ in 2020), and the share of staff who are nonbinary, genderqueer, or another gender has risen considerably. The number of staff who identify as genderqueer or another gender more than doubled, from 3\% in 2010 to 7\% in 2020, with an additional 8\% of staff in 2020 identifying as nonbinary. ${ }^{7}$

- The National Movement Report did not request data about staff sexual orientation until fiscal year 2015, so an analysis of 2010 to 2020 is not possible. However, among organizations that reported sexual orientation data for 2015 and 2020 ( $n=17$ ), there are clear changes in how movement staff identify.
- The share of staff who are bisexual rose from $7 \%$ in 2015 to $12 \%$ in 2020 -though this remains a far lower number compared to the fact that the majority (55\%) of LGBT people nationwide identify as bisexual. ${ }^{8}$
- The share of staff who are gay or lesbian fell from $61 \%$ in 2015 to $41 \%$ in 2020, but this shift may more reflect additional options (e.g., queer) for staff to identify with in the 2020 survey. In 2020, 25\% of staff at reporting organizations identified as queer. ${ }^{9}$
- While these initial analyses are encouraging, the findings are limited by organizations' willingness to collect and/or report demographic data about their staff and board. This is especially concerning if the organizations most willing to collect and report demographic data are already those organizations with more diverse workplaces in the first place-in other words, the true demographics of movement staff (or how those demographics have changed over time) may be different than what is shown here, if organizations with less diversity simply choose to not report any demographic data at all. With fuller and more consistent data collection and transparency efforts, deeper and more meaningful analysis is possible, which can in turn better serve the movement as it works to better support people of color, transgender and nonbinary people, and all members of the LGBTQI movement workforce.

[^3]
# 2021 NATIONAL LGBTOI MOVEMENT REPORT 

## METHODOLOGY

The Movement Advancement Project (MAP) selected the 39 participating organizations based on their size, importance to the overall LGBTQI movement, and collective coverage of LGBTOI issues and constituencies. Most participating organizations (35) have budgets over $\$ 1$ million; four organizations have smaller budgets but are national leaders working in areas of critical concern to the LGBTOI movement.

MAP collected standardized financial and operations information from participating organizations and summarized key information across participants. This report provides aggregated data across participating organizations, with most figures and charts showing data for all organizations combined. Where figures or charts reflect data based on a subset of participating organizations, this is noted.

## 39 PARTICIPANTS, TOTAL 2020 REVENUE = \$398.5M, TOTAL 2020 EXPENSES = \$303.8M

## PARTICIPATING LGBTOI ORGANIZATIONS ARE COMPRISED OF ADVOCACY, ISSUE, LEGAL, AND RESEARCH \& PUBLIC EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS

(n=39)
Advocacy organizations advocate for the entire LGBTOI community or a particular subset of the LGBTQI community on a broad range of issues.

Issue organizations advocate for the entire LGBTOI community or a particular subset of the LGBTOI community on a particular issue or related set of issues.

Legal organizations provide legal services to LGBTQI people and advocate and/or litigate within the legal system for LGBTOI people.

Research and public education organizations provide the LGBTQI community and the broader public with information about the issues facing the LGBTOI community. They may provide research or policy analysis, or educate the public through media work.


THE MAJORITY OF PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS FOCUS ON NATIONAL LGBTOI ISSUES
Note: Many organizations noted more than one focus, as shown below.
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## REVENUE AND EXPENSES

This section provides an overview of the revenue and expenses of leading organizations in the LGBTOI movement. For participating organizations, revenue and expenses increased from fiscal years 2019 to 2020, though both revenue and expenses from fundraising fell during the COVID-defined fiscal year 2020. Note: on this page, some analyses required data from previous years. Only organizations that provided data for all years in the relevant analysis are included. Note also that, where applicable, percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

39 PARTICIPANTS, TOTAL 2020 REVENUE = \$398.5M, TOTAL 2020 EXPENSES = \$303.8M

## INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS REMAIN TOP SOURCE OF REVENUE AMONG LGBTOI ORGANIZATIONS

2020 Revenue by Source (n=39)


MAJORITY OF MOVEMENT REVENUE ATTRIBUTED TO 501(C)(3) ORGANIZATIONS
2020 Revenue By Legal Type (n=39)


2019-2020 EXPENSES FOR PARTICIPATING ORGS \$ Millions ( $\mathrm{n}=39$ )

| EXPENSES | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | \% CHANGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Programs \& Services | $\$ 221.4$ | $\$ 238.1$ | $+8 \%$ |
| Fundraising Expenses | $\$ 34.8$ | $\$ 33.4$ | $-4 \%$ |
| Management \& General Expenses | $\$ 30.0$ | $\$ 32.3$ | $+8 \%$ |
| Total Expenses | $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 6 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 0 3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{+ 6 \%}$ |

* Note: Columns may not sum due to rounding.

MAJORITY OF MOVEMENT EXPENSES (78\%) SPENT ON PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Combined 2020 Expenses (n=39)

2020 REVENUE EXCEEDED EXPENSES BY \$93.8 MILLION
Yearly Difference in Revenue and Expenses, 2016-2020, in Millions ( $n=38$ ) $11 \%$ Management \& General $\$ 93.8$

11\% Fundraising
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## FINANCIAL TRENDS

This graphic examines the financial capacity of LGBTOI movement organizations from 2016 through 2020. At the end of the 2020 fiscal year, the participating organizations as a whole remain well-resourced and supported by a diverse range of revenue sources, even amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Note: on this page, some analyses required data from previous years. Only organizations that provided data for all years in the relevant analysis are included. Note also that, where applicable, percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

## 38 PARTICIPANTS, TOTAL 2020 REVENUE = \$396.2M, TOTAL 2020 EXPENSES = \$302.3M

COMBINED REVENUE INCREASED 70\% FROM 2016 TO 2020
2016-2020 Revenue by Source, in Millions ( $n=38$ )


COMBINED EXPENSES INCREASED 34\% FROM 2016 TO 2020
2016-2020 Expenses by Source, in Millions (n=38)

39 PARTICIPANTS, TOTAL 2020 REVENUE = \$398.5M, TOTAL 2020 EXPENSES = \$303.8M


COMBINED REVENUE INCREASED
35\% FROM 2019 TO 2020
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## INDICATORS OF FINANCIAL HEALTH

This section examines several key indicators of financial health for leading organizations in the LGBTQI movement. Indicators of financial health measure the average financial stability of participating organizations, including liquidity ratio, days of working capital, and daily cash expense. Liquidity ratio measures cash and investments on hand to cover current financial obligations such as accounts payable and lines of credit. Average days of working capital is the measure of an organization's cash reserves, shown as the average number of days an organization could meet all its expenses using only its current reserves. Note: on this page, some analyses required data from previous years. Only organizations that provided data for all years in the relevant analysis are included. Note also that, where applicable, percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.


DAYS OF WORKING CAPITAL INCREASED 70\% FROM 2019 TO 2020 2016-2020 Average Days of Working Capital ( $n=36$ )

DAILY CASH EXPENDITURES DID NOT CHANGE FROM 2019 TO 2020
2016-2020 Cumulative Average Daily Cash Expense, in Thousands ( $n=36$ )


2019-2020 STATEMENT FINANCIALS TREND DATA \$ MILLIONS (N=38)

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | \% INCREASE/DECREASE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assets |  |  |  |
| Cash and Cash Equivalents | 63.4 | 122.1 | $+93 \%$ |
| Investments | 70.9 | 98.2 | $+38 \%$ |
| Other Current Assets | 39.3 | 62.3 | $+58 \%$ |
| Net Fixed Assets | 33.8 | 35.3 | $+4 \%$ |
| Other Long-Term Assets | 22.2 | 20.6 | $-7 \%$ |
| Total Assets | $\mathbf{2 2 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ |
| Liabilities |  |  |  |
| Current Liabilities | 19.2 | 27.0 | $+41 \%$ |
| Long-Term Debt | 8.2 | 7.8 | $-5 \%$ |
| Other Long-Term Liabilities | $\mathbf{3 1 . 8}$ | 8.9 | $+101 \%$ |
| Total Liabilities |  | 43.6 | $+37 \%$ |
| Net Assets | 118.7 |  |  |
| Without Donor Restrictions | 51.2 | 505.2 | $+73 \%$ |
| With Donor Restrictions | 28.0 | 33.1 | $+10 \%$ |
| With Permanent Donor Restrictions | $\mathbf{1 9 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 4 . 7}$ | $+18 \%$ |
| Total Net Assets | $\mathbf{2 2 9 . 6}$ | 338.4 | $49 \%$ |
| Total Liabilities and Net Assets |  | $47 \%$ |  |
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## FUNDRAISING AND FUNDRAISING EFFICIENCY

Like most other nonprofits, participating organizations rely on fundraising to generate a significant portion of their revenue. This section includes analysis of top contributor trends, fundraising costs, fundraising from individual donors, and more. Overall, the data show mixed trends, as organizations saw increases in the number of medium and large donors, but decreases in the number of small and micro donors. Note: on this page, some analyses require data from previous years. Therefore, only organizations that provided data for all relevant years are included.

39 PARTICIPANTS, TOTAL 2020 REVENUE = \$398.5M, TOTAL 2020 EXPENSES = \$303.8M
3.6\% OF LGBT POPULATION CONTRIBUTES TO PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

Combined Donors Giving Any Amount vs. Total Adult LGBT Population (n=34)


Note: Assumes all donors are LGBT. Likely percent of LGBT non-donors even higher.

SMALL DONATIONS COMPRISE THE MAJORITY OF DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

2020 Donor Pyramid ( $n=34$ )


412,424 Total Donors Annual donation amount:
Micro (<\$35) $\square$ Small (\$35-\$999) Medium ( $\$ 1,000-\$ 24,999) \quad$ Large $(\$ 25,000+$ )

CONTACTABLE NAMES VARY GREATLY




MORE THAN TWO IN FIVE DONORS ARE NEW DONORS
2019-2020 Percent of Donors That Are First-Time Donors ( $n=30$ )


Note: This metric was first asked in 2019, so earlier years' data are not available.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOP 10 DONORS REMAIN STABLE OVER TIME
2016-2020 Percent of Revenue from Top Ten Contributors ( $n=36$ )


ORGANIZATIONS' AVERAGE COST TO FUNDRAISE FELL DURING 2020
2016-2020 Average Cost to Raise \$1 (n=38)
\$0.13 \$0.13 \$0.13

2016
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## STAFF AND BOARDS

This section examines the staff and boards of participating organizations. Organizations were asked about staff size, tenure, and compensation, as well as board size and contribution policies.

## ALL PARTICIPANTS (N=39): 1344 TOTAL STAFF ( 1249 FULL TIME; 95 PART TIME) \& 746 BOARD MEMBERS



FOR EVERY 6 BOARD MEMBERS, THERE ARE


STAFF MEMBERS


WIDE AVERAGE SALARY RANGE FOR SENIOR STAFF
Average Senior Staff Compensation (n=35)


Organizations reported the average compensation across all senior staff. This graphic shows the lowest average, the average of averages, and the highest average senior staff compensation.

## TENURE OF SENIOR STAFF VARIES GREATLY

Shortest, Average, and Longest Tenure of Senior Staff, in Years (n=37)
Shortest

- Avg
Longest
0.0 2.1
8.0
0.8
6.1
16.2
.
0.8
11.7

Shortest Tenure of
Senior Staff

Senior Staff

Organizations reported the length of their shortest and longest tenured senior staff member, as well as the average tenure across all senior staff. This graphic shows the ranges of shortest tenure, the ranges of average tenure, and the ranges of longest tenure among senior staff.

MOST BOARD MEMBERS ARE REOUIRED TO DONATE OR SOLICIT CONTRIBUTIONS, BUT POLICIES VARY
Board Give/Get Policies (n=38)
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## STAFF AND BOARDS

This section examines the staff and boards of participating organizations. Organizations were asked questions about their staff and board demographics, including age, gender identity, identification as transgender, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity. Only some organizations provided this information. Figures show data for combined staff or board across all organizations that provided data. Note that numbers may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

ALL PARTICIPANTS (N=39): 1344 TOTAL STAFF ( 1249 FULL TIME; 95 PART TIME) \& 746 BOARD MEMBERS



RACE/ETHNICITY OF STAFF AND BOARD


MAJORITY OF STAFF ARE AGES 30-54 ( $n=36$ )


ONE IN 14 STAFF ARE
PART-TIME WORKERS
( $n=39$ )
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## STAFF DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

This section examines demographic trends over time for staff of participating organizations. Organizations are only included if they reported a given type of demographic data for each year included in below analyses. Figures show data for combined staff across all organizations that provided data. Note that numbers may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

PERCENT OF MOVEMENT STAFF BY GENDER IDENTITY, FY2010-2020
( $n=22$ )


Note: Nonbinary was added as a unique response option in 2018 (for FY2017).

PERCENT OF MOVEMENT STAFF THAT ARE PEOPLE OF COLOR, FY2010-2020
( $n=22$ )


PERCENT OF MOVEMENT STAFF THAT ARE TRANSGENDER, FY2010-2020
(n=22)


PERCENT OF MOVEMENT STAFF BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION, FY2015-2020

$$
(n=17)
$$



## ABOUT THIS REPORT

The National LGBTQI Movement Report, published annually by MAP, examines revenue and expenses, fundraising and fundraising efficiency, and other indicators of financial health for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI) advocacy, issue, legal, and research and public education organizations.

movement advancement project 1905 15th Street \#1097 • Boulder, CO 80306-1097
www.lgbtmap.org


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For additional research on the impact of COVID-19 on LGBTQI movement organizations, see MAP's ongoing research at www.lgbtmap.org/covid-19.
    ${ }^{2}$ For more about impacts of COVID-19 on the staff of LGBTQI movement organizations, see MAP's 2021 Pulse Survey series, tracking organizations' experience in each quarter of 2021, at www. Igbtmap.org/covid-19.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ For more on the disproportionate impacts of COVID-19 on LGBTQ people, including lowerincome LGBTQ households and LGBTQ households of color, see MAP's December 2020 and December 2021 reports based on an NPR, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health nationally representative polling series.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ According to the 2020 Census, in 2020, people of color comprised 42.2\% of the U.S. population. This includes $12.1 \%$ who were Black or African American alone, $18.7 \%$ were Hispanic or Latino, $6.1 \%$ were Asian or Pacific Islander alone, and $0.7 \%$ were Native American alone.
    ${ }^{5}$ Andrew Flores, Jody Herman, Gary Gates, and Taylor Brown. 2016. How Many Adults Identify as Transgender in the United States? Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.
    ${ }^{6}$ While boards are less racially diverse than staff, the fact that 42\% of board members are people of color mirrors the national population, which is also roughly $42 \%$ people of color.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Nonbinary was added as a unique response option for fiscal year 2017.
    ${ }^{8}$ Jeffrey Jones. 2021."LGBT Identification Rises to $5.6 \%$ in Latest U.S. Estimate." Gallup.
    ${ }^{9}$ Queer was added as a unique response option for fiscal year 2016. In that year, 15\% of movement staff identified as queer-though note this $15 \%$ is not directly comparable, as it reflects a different set of organizations (the 25 organizations who reported sexual orientation data for FY2016) than those studied here (the 17 organizations who reported sexual orientation data for both FY2015 and FY2020).

