

Chapter 14

Philanthropy for Military and Veteran Families: Challenges Past, Recommendations for Tomorrow

Linda Hughes-Kirchubel and Elizabeth Cline Johnson

The term philanthropy—“an act or gift done or made for humanitarian purposes” (Merriam-Webster, 2016)—evolved from the Greek *philanthropia*, which refers to benevolence and love of humankind. Over the centuries, philanthropists have been dedicated to local, national, and global issues. They have founded universities, supported medical institutions, and religious endeavors and worked to abolish slavery and establish civil rights. They have at times engaged with military and veteran communities. During the Civil War, for example, “the centerpiece of philanthropic efforts was the U.S. Sanitary Commission, a privately funded national federation that assumed responsibility for public health and relief measures on the battlefield and in military encampments” (Hall, 2006). During the Great Depression and World War II, philanthropists gave with a mission of promoting “science, scientific standards and professional values, as well as opportunity and personal responsibility” (Hammock, 2003). In 2014, individuals gave \$358.4 billion—a year-over-year increase of more than 7%. Meanwhile, corporate giving increased to \$17.77 billion, and foundation giving increased to \$53.7 billion, increases of 13.7% and 8.2%, respectively (The National Philanthropic Trust, 2016). While some of the money was earmarked specifically for the military affiliated, giving specifically to veterans and military-affiliated families is a relatively novel endeavor (Meyer, 2013).

The purpose of this chapter is to describe philanthropic efforts that emerged after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, in support of service members, veterans, and their families. Concentrating broadly on corporations and foundations, it begins

L. Hughes-Kirchubel, M.A. (✉)

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Military Family Research Institute,
College of Health and Human Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA
e-mail: lhughesk@purdue.edu

E.C. Johnson, M.A.

University of Houston, Sugar Land, TX, USA
e-mail: bethjohnson@uh.edu

with a background on the philanthropic sector before moving on to offer historical context on philanthropy's engagement with military families, as well as key events that helped to shape the post-9/11 response. Drawing on the expertise of leaders in the field, the chapter then details military and veteran families' needs and analyzes the philanthropic response, giving examples of efforts that succeeded as well as those that were less effective. After discussing gaps that remain, the chapter concludes with recommendations for future philanthropic leaders to consider when faced with responding to military and veteran family needs during an era of deployment, conflict, and combat.

14.1 Background

More than any other generation in history, the current one aims to support military members, veterans, and their families, according to a Department of Defense (DoD) white paper (Copeland & Sutherland, 2010). In the aftermath of 9/11, philanthropic organizations worked to address emerging needs of veterans, military members, and their families. Some worked on the national stage. Others were regional. Still others focused on local communities. Early on, some leaders emerged:

- Bob Woodruff Foundation (which focused on the needs of wounded warriors);
- Blue Shield of California Foundation (domestic violence prevention);
- The Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation (mental health issues);
- The Dallas Foundation (military families and “shadow warriors”);
- Fisher House Foundation (housing and scholarships);
- JP Morgan Chase Foundation (employment, financial capacity, and small businesses);
- The Lincoln Community Foundation (veteran reintegration);
- The Patterson Foundation (honoring and memorializing military members, veterans, and their families);
- The Robin Hood Foundation (economic, housing, and legal issues);
- Robert R. McCormick Foundation (education, employment, and behavioral health); and
- The Walmart Foundation (employment, education, and job training).

In the philanthropic ecosystem, these and other philanthropic organizations do not work in isolation. Foundations issue grants, but are buttressed by infrastructure that provides multiple kinds of support (Powers, 2015a, 2015b). For example, the Council on Foundations offers “opportunity, leadership, and tools” to more than 1750 member organizations and provides information, education, and occasions to network, exchange ideas, and share best practices (Council on Foundations, 2016a, 2016b). The Council established and maintains the Veterans Philanthropy Exchange, a clearinghouse in which organizations can connect and share ideas, challenges, and best practices. On the regional level, the Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers collaboratively links 33 regional associations of grant-making

organizations, which together reach 5550 organizations, many of whom work in the military-affiliated space (Forum of Regional Associations and Grantmakers, 2016).

14.2 Historical Context and Key Events

Prior to Sept. 11, 2001, philanthropic foundations, like the American public, were largely disengaged with the military (Powers, 2015a, 2015b). However, in the aftermath of the attacks on the World Trade Center, United Airlines Flight 93, and the Pentagon, more than 1270 foundations, corporations, and other institutional donors gave an astonishing \$1.1 billion for 9/11-related assistance (Renz & Marino, 2003). More than 70% of that went to relief efforts, survivors, and victim aid.

The attacks propelled the nation into conflicts in two countries, and between fiscal years 2002 and 2008, the number of troops located in Iraq and Afghanistan soared from about 5200 to more than 188,000 (Belasco, 2009). During this time of mobilization and deployment, communities and foundations began to take steps to support military members. But the lion's share of foundations did not have military or veteran family support as part of their mission. Early philanthropic efforts, largely uncoordinated, were tied to the communities that the funders served. Communities with high numbers of military or veteran families got more attention to military-specific issues; communities with fewer military or veteran families got less (Powers, 2015a, 2015b).

During this time, the public (and some funders with no experience in the space) assumed that military family needs would be handled first by the DoD and then by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). But it soon became clear that government agencies could not do it alone (Cooke, 2016; Nonprofit Quarterly, 2014; Powers, 2016a). Foundations were called upon by government leaders to help address these military family needs, not only during deployments and separations, but also after the conflicts ended (Wills, 2008). By 2008, service members were coming home to challenging economic scenarios. Many brought with them the visible and invisible wounds of war, including traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and life-changing physical limitations. Between December 2007 and June 2009, the Dow Jones Industrial Average fell 50%, with some of the hardest hit industries being the financial sector, construction, manufacturing, and real estate (Dividend.com, 2016). A seminal period in the philanthropy field had begun. It was a time of opportunity and change.

Philanthropic leaders determined that the only way to address military families' challenges would be through collaboration among funders, charities, and the government (Wills, 2008). However, recognizing the need for collaboration and implementing it were two very different things. Funders and foundations were not quite sure how they could help address the needs of this particular population, and how to weed through the ever-increasing numbers of charitable causes eager to serve. Then, in 2009, the California Community Foundation (CCF) released a report based on lessons learned through its Iraq Afghanistan Deployment Impact Fund, which

awarded more than \$243 million in grants to 53 nonprofits to meet the needs of men, women, and families affected by deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan. The report identified and explained challenges that military families faced upon reunion and offered advice to grant-makers who wanted to help. Suggestions included tackling issues regionally by collaborations between local government and private organizations to provide a community network of support, especially in places away from bases. Jack Amberg, senior director of the McCormick Foundation's veteran programs and a retired Army officer, explained at the time, "Working together can help foundations perform the critical role of identifying and plugging holes in the charity and government safety nets for veterans," (Blum, 2010).

14.3 Needs of Military-Affiliated Families

As leaders in the philanthropy domain worked to identify some of the most critical needs for military and veteran families, community foundations provided important guidance. They coordinated needs assessments to determine needs in local communities, and from there, larger foundations assessed funding gaps, determined if and when government agencies and others could respond, and prioritized opportunities for engagement. For example, the military's own transition programs were neither robust enough nor flexible enough to meet service member needs, causing unintended difficulties for the very individuals that they hoped to help. Funders began to look for solutions that could be adapted and used in multiple locations, believing that it did little to fund a localized community program that could not be successfully transferred elsewhere. "Our goal was to actually try to influence larger institutions ... [by] really designing programs from that perspective" (Long, 2016).

However, foundations lacked a way to assess a global view of the needs of military and veteran families. Each foundation has its own sets of missions and funding priorities, so had to research, document, and understand military and veteran issues in order to best serve these families. Without an overarching understanding about the needs of military-affiliated families—it became difficult to find a strategic path forward. This revealed "the importance of advancing strategic philanthropy—not doing philanthropy that just feels good or charitable philanthropy, but philanthropy where there is either a systems goals or a broader outcome, beyond just an awareness raising campaign or something that's a kind of immediately meeting some needs" (Cooke, 2016). In many instances, foundations that were doing excellent work tackling social problems didn't even know that many of their clients were military connected.

Philanthropic foundations looked for smart intersections between their own missions and the needs of those who were military members, veterans, and their families. For example, foundations associated with the pharmaceutical industry began to focus on health care, while foundations associated with the financial industry focused on employment issues. Those foundations that were associated with behavioral healthcare issues soon recognized that these would be the signature wound of

the war, a term first used by RAND Corporation. Like many physical wounds, mental health issues had their own associations with stigma. Researchers have found that there exist “negative stereotypes toward individuals with psychological problems” and that external stigmatization can be coupled with the experience of “self-stigma, leading to reduced self-esteem and motivation to seek help” (Green-Shortridge, Britt, & Castro, 2007). Such stigma can heighten military members’ fears that help-seeking behaviors might imperil their job. Foundations thus recognized that they must walk a fine line of advocating for better mental health and creating a climate in which employers shied away from hiring veterans.

Meanwhile, foundations seeking to help with employment and career support began to see that while not all military members experienced transition-related problems, many did have difficulty finding a job and assimilating into the community—in part because many civilian hiring managers had limited understanding of how military skills could translate to the civilian world. “It’s a very complex, difficult world to come back where almost nobody really knows what you have done if you’ve been a soldier or a sailor, because such a small percentage of the population has been in war or in the military,” said Donald Cooke, vice president of philanthropy for the Robert R. McCormick Foundation (Cooke, 2016).

It also became clear that some philanthropic organizations needed to be educated about why they should get involved with military-affiliated issues, especially during the early part of this era. An apparent lack of motivation existed among some foundations about why military and veteran families deserved a portion of their philanthropic dollars. These organizations believed it was the government’s job to take care of these families and failed to understand the extent to which governmental agencies could offer support. In addition, they did not see the breadth of military connections that existed in the populations they already served. For example, funders of faith-based organizations, healthcare providers, and K-12 education served military-connected families. And the term is very inclusive—families mean mothers, fathers, sisters, cousins, significant others, and grandparents in addition to the traditionally recognized spouse and children. But with so many others needing philanthropic support, these organizations needed convincing that military and veteran families were a good investment (Powers 2015a, 2015b).

14.4 Responses and Strategies: Successes and Challenges

One of the earliest philanthropies to focus efforts on addressing the needs of military families was the Chicago-based Robert R. McCormick Foundation. In 2008, the foundation created a new program aimed at making grants to charities that assisted veterans. It also gathered other grant-makers together to address the regional response in Chicago (Blum, 2010), supporting transitioning veterans in the areas of employment, behavioral health, and coordination of services (Robert R. McCormick Foundation, 2016). By 2015, 57 of its grants (ranging from \$3,750 to \$600,000) supported a host of community projects, not just in Chicago but in surrounding states as well.

Certain comprehensive community solutions succeeded in effectively addressing problems that military and veteran families faced. One example, Points of Light's Community Blueprint initiative was a "call to action for communities to unite together, collaborate, and share tools and resources to build stronger communities by serving and engaging service members, veterans, and their families" (Points of Light, 2016). The initiative worked to bridge the civilian-military divide, and aimed to be sustainable over time—an important characteristic of successful philanthropic endeavors. Other community-oriented approaches throughout the country—in places like San Diego, San Antonio, and South Florida—became strong examples of success at the micro-level (Long, 2016). In addition, some funders who worked deeply on single issues such as mental health, drove progress forward over time by developing relationships with a variety of partners. A combination of "a good idea, long-term support and some really strong relationships...has worked very well," said Peter Long, president and CEO of Blue Shield of California Foundation.

Working on a multiplicity of issues, funders helped to change inadequate narratives surrounding military-affiliated families. Got Your 6, the Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation and other organizations made a concerted effort to replace the "broken veteran" narrative with one that prioritized strength and resilience. "Just because our foundation is focusing on mental health, and we feel there's a need to do so, it does not mean that we're saying that all the veterans are broken," said Catharine Grimes, director of corporate philanthropy at the Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation. "We're saying that there's very clear data showing that approximately one-third of these veterans are coming back with some pretty significant challenges from a mental health perspective and there is a need and role philanthropy can play for that subset of the veterans who need it" (Grimes, 2016). Organizations began to frame help-seeking behaviors as examples of military and veteran family resiliency and strength. They also worked to retrain the public to think about veterans as a more diverse—and younger—demographic, and to think about the unique needs faced by women veterans in conversations about issues such as education, health care, and financial security. Many programs that used peers to work with targeted groups, such as younger veterans, were also successful.

Working together became the hallmark of initiatives associated with Joining Forces, created in 2011 by First Lady Michelle Obama and Dr. Jill Biden, wife of the Vice President, to mobilize the nation in support of military and veteran families. Joining Forces focused on employment, education, and wellness issues as it aimed to raise the nation's awareness about military-affiliated families, as well as to generate volunteerism, activism, and support. In March 2013, the National Guard launched its own version of the program, Joining Community Forces, which leveraged the strengths of the National Guard—including its location in every single state—to create more supportive communities for military families. The convening power of leadership was important. These related initiatives provided a catalyst for seeing philanthropic opportunities differently. Joining Forces also provided a mechanism for government agencies to engage with funders in a responsible way.

In 2014, four foundations¹ helped to initiate the Philanthropy-Joining Forces Impact Pledge. A grassroots effort, the pledge began with the help of a group of funders that were already working in the veteran/military space. It prioritized collaboration and aimed to mobilize and sustain philanthropic support. At the same time, it encouraged funders to join in order to “strengthen services and support for millions of veterans and military families throughout America” (Council on Foundations, 2014). In the context of the pledge, the Council on Foundations offered input to policy makers as well as the VA, DoD, and White House. In addition, the Council acted as a communicative liaison between NGOs and VSOs that sought philanthropic partners while connecting Council members to new collaborative efforts. There were certainly successes; since its creation, the pledge “has cumulatively resulted in investments of nearly \$282 million” in private funds through grants and other forms of support (Council on Foundations 2016a, 2016b). The pledge represents a unique opportunity for philanthropy to focus joint efforts on helping military and veteran families. However, its potential remains unreached, and it remains difficult to convince some to sign on to the pledge if they do not see themselves as military or veteran funders.

Within the philanthropic space, collaboration was a challenge. Nationally, large organizations struggled to work together, identify lessons learned, and then leverage projects for greater impact. It was difficult to clarify and embrace lessons learned, and then replicate the best programs, scaling them up or down as needed. Organizations were doing good work, but largely worked in silos. Though Joining Forces helped to address these challenges, competition for resources was and still is high. For example, in 2016 the Bob Woodward Foundation received more than 500 proposals for \$22 million in funding (Carstensen, Director, National Collaboration Initiative, Bob Woodruff Foundation, 2016). On the other end of the spectrum, many small programs “from horse whispering to fly tying” were unsustainable (Cooke, 2016). Faith communities, often expert at attending to the moral wounds of war, struggled to find traction and become part of existing coalitions. Specialized military and veteran communities, such as female veterans, were underserved.

From a philanthropic perspective, other issues became problematic. For example, funding large national organizations that lacked tight community ties and “boots on the ground” relationships created less impact than desired. At best, effectiveness suffered due to organizational distance from its communities; at worst, organizations failed to deliver on commitments. In one instance, the leadership of a large, national organization received critical media attention and two top-level employees were fired after accusations of financial misconduct. For some organizations that lacked capacity to properly absorb the dollars, “overfunding” became problematic (Carstensen, 2016). It was also hard for some community foundations to justify setting aside any significant amount of money for veterans and families when they existed in such small numbers within the wider community. Understanding a potential grant recipient’s business model and examining board members’ relationships

¹Blue Shield of California Foundation; the Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation; the Lincoln Community Foundation; the Robert R. McCormick Foundation.

and expertise also provides a window into oversight capacity; so does training grant officers as “subject matter experts” about the population and needs the award is attempting to address (Carstensen, 2016).

Lastly, true partnerships between private foundations and the VA remained a source of untapped potential. Some funders believe this is because VA had to find a way to work through or around its own barriers to such partnerships, which existed within VA’s bureaucratic structure as well as within its congressionally mandated policies. Philanthropic leaders believe, however, that it is “only a matter of time” until true public/private philanthropic efforts with the VA emerges. “Hopefully, we will be seeing that in the future,” Grimes said. Smaller public/private partnerships are already being forged through community efforts with local VA centers; these are community-based models of success, where the veteran comes home, and “where the community wraps around the veteran” (Cooke, 2016). Finally, building relationship between philanthropy and the VA is key. This will enable both to set outcomes and impact so that both can use funds to leverage change (Carstensen, 2016).

14.5 Evaluation and Lessons Learned

Since Sept. 11, 2001, the philanthropic sector has accomplished much on behalf of military and veteran families; but gaps remain. First, there still exists a gap of national leadership within philanthropy. While many organizations individually have taken leadership roles in the space, and the Council on Foundations has also contributed to the national conversation, it would be erroneous to suggest that nationally, a voice on veteran and military philanthropy exists to help guide the way with respect to new directions, new initiative, and new challenges. This needs to be addressed sooner, rather than later, and especially in advance of future conflicts, crises, or wars.

It is not unusual for foundations to struggle with identifying the demographics of the military and veteran families in the communities the foundations service, often due to the government’s privacy constraints. For one thing, veterans don’t always self-identify. For another, states that experienced military deployments almost exclusively by National Guard and Reserve units may have military families with unique needs because these families do not live on installations with built-in support structures. Also, privacy issues may make it difficult to identify the kinds of issues these families are facing. Those who deployed to combat zones and whose jobs put them on the front lines may have different challenges when compared to those who deployed to areas that were far removed from the chance of blast injury, IED exposure, or patrols that placed them in direct contact with enemy combatants. Even if service members did not deploy in the traditional sense of the word, they might deal with deployment-related issues (i.e., stateside-based pilots of drones were not exempt from symptoms of PTSD) (Carstensen, 2016). Figuring out how best to serve returning veterans is also complicated by the fact that it is difficult to get

details about the kinds of needs unit members may have based on their demographics and family characteristics (Bartle, 2016).

Gaps remain with regard to philanthropic intersections with the very severely wounded, those with mental health issues and, in particular, military-connected suicides. One RAND study states that “at least” 20% of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are suffering from PTSD and/or depression. “But then there’s that really small percentage that are severely wounded.... They really need around-the-clock care,” said Grimes. “They really can’t live independently.” This, and the issue of veteran and military suicide, remains an elusive issue for the philanthropic sector. A related issue is a focus on helping caregivers of the severely injured, whether they are young spouses or aging parents. These individuals—from Baby Boomers to millennials—may be caregivers for decades, with this role affecting their identity, their family structure, and the dreams they had for their future. This “is not fully developed” and philanthropic attention should be paid to these individuals.

Gaps also remained between private foundations and public organizations, especially with regard to creating collaborations that reduced barriers to care. These kinds of partnerships break traditional boundaries, and double each organization’s impact. Yet there were knowledge barriers that affected philanthropy’s efforts to respond. The difficulties in identifying where veterans lived created barriers to developing strategic investments. Engagement by DoD and VA, coupled with changes to the laws that govern these agencies, can better serve the needs of military and veteran families (Bartle, 2016; Carstensen, 2016; Cooke, 2016; Grimes, 2016; Long, 2016; Powers, 2016).

During his tenure as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mike Mullen repeatedly issued a call for communities of all kinds, including philanthropic organizations, to better collaborate and care for those who serve:

There is a huge list of needs, growing needs. It cannot be met by the Pentagon. It cannot be met by the VA. It can only be met, I believe, by the community groups throughout the country joined together with the Pentagon and the VA to get it right for those who’ve sacrificed so much (Van Dahlen, 2011).

The Office of the Joint Chiefs also called on the creation of a strategic plan for philanthropic organizations that helped shape the sector with respect to service of military-affiliated families, an effort that did not come to fruition during the past 15 years, though hope remains high that it still will.

14.6 Recommendations

The purpose of this chapter is to provide guidance to the next generation of philanthropic leaders in the event our nation’s military engages in lengthy deployments and faces the stressors associated with combat and family separations. Since 9/11, the philanthropic sector has taken steps to respond to the needs of military and veteran families and continues to do so today. Looking to the future, a number of

lessons can be learned from recent experiences. The following recommendations are designed for the next generation of philanthropic leaders, with the understanding that they must be adapted to fit the context and needs of future situations, be they deployments in peacetime or in times of war.

1. *Philanthropic organizations must understand that the populations they serve are infused with military and veteran families already.* Every foundation should be able to pinpoint those clients who have a military affiliation; they do not exist in silos. There is a constant need for vigilance, reflection, and revision, and funders must always be listening to what is being said on the national stage as well as what military and veteran families are saying (Cox, 2017). In a mature philanthropy ecosystem, philanthropic organizations should be vigilant in understanding where they are connected to the military and veteran families. Their thinking, giving, and strategies must be ready to evolve as circumstances change. In this way, funders can respond to families' unique and changing needs within the context of the funder's mission and goals (Cooke, 2016; Cox, 2017; Long, 2016).
2. *Overlay military cultural competence on existing philanthropic services, programs and initiatives.* Even as each philanthropic organization should identify the military and veteran families it serves, so should it examine the usefulness of filtering its services, programs, and initiatives through the military and veteran lens. Issues of poverty, behavioral health care, child welfare, education—these are just a few examples of the many philanthropy focuses that can be filtered through the military and veteran lens, integrating work on their behalf with existing efforts for civilians.
3. *Work to develop true public/private partnerships with the DoD, the VA, and other organizations that serve military and veteran families exclusively at national and local levels.* Philanthropic leaders believe that now is the time to pursue the development of true public/private relationships among and between the DoD, the VA, and philanthropic funders. Leaders in the public sphere appear ready and willing to partner; so do philanthropy leaders. VA has a unique opportunity to lead this charge by transparently partnering at the local level and integrating into local systems when there are opportunities. It remains to be seen whether barriers that have been built into laws, regulations, and bureaucratic processes can be broken down or modified to accomplish this goal. It is crucial to our military families, who represent a mere 1% of the nation's population. The devil is in the details, and it will take time and commitment to hammer out the means to create smooth and effective collaborations.
4. *Scrupulously avoid duplication of projects. Instead, look for ways to augment and complement.* Often, projects were created without examining whether similar ones already existed within the community. Funders should urge their partners to replicate and scale the best, most successful programs using the lessons learned to improve and modify them as necessary. In addition, the philanthropic community should be educated about how best to avoid the overabundance of organizations in a specific area of the space, so that they are not competing for the same resources.

5. *Build and maintain relationships at all levels and develop a national strategy for philanthropic efforts.* Midway through the conflicts, high-level leaders in multiple domains, including philanthropy, met to critically evaluate current work in the military/veteran space, and to set ambitious goals for future work. Known as the White Oak meetings, these gatherings helped to spur collaborations and build relationships, which in turn impacted work on behalf of military families. Future leaders in the philanthropic domain should heed this example as one to be replicated. In addition, create opportunities to convene with policy makers and service providers to increase funders' understanding of challenges. These kinds of meetings are important avenues for creating strategies that are embraced by leadership across multiple domains. They create and sustain a generative space for reflection, goal-setting, and creative collaboration among the highest leaders. Likewise, relationships within philanthropy should be built across national, regional, and local organizations as well as across organizations with divergent foci. Within these contexts, philanthropists should work to set a national strategy behind which all funders could rally.
6. *Prioritize the use of data, evidence-informed practices, and needs assessments to drive deeper understandings of the military and veteran space.* As funders are confronted with multiple demands on their resources, they need to pursue data-driven information to assess priorities and evaluate outcomes. To do so, joining together is key. Working with experts on rigorous evaluation methods is one way to do this; requiring evaluation, needs assessments and use of evidence-informed practices from funding partners is another way. Evidence can help build comprehensive understandings of military and veteran families, their situations and the solutions that are working best; add context and depth; and ensure that funders' dollars are spent on the most effective programs, initiatives, and outcomes. It is crucial to create systems of evaluation and measurement. What, for example, do healthy transitions look like? Bringing researchers together with funders can help identify these and other issues, and while some funders are investing in research to help drive the conversation forward, more should be done to achieve deeper understandings of evolving military and veteran family needs.

14.7 Conclusion

Philanthropy cannot exist in a vacuum, and there is no such thing as a philanthropic effort on its own. Peter Long, president and CEO of Blue Shield of California Foundation put it succinctly: "We have to fund somebody. We have to work with somebody. We have to get ideas from somebody." In creating a battle plan to serve military families, philanthropic leaders must determine how to work effectively within this ecosystem and identify ways to serve military-connected families before new crises emerge.

Cooke, of the Robert R. McCormick Foundation, says there is "room for everybody in philanthropy" to serve military and veteran families (Cooke, 2016). Many of the funders are doing so without knowing that the military affiliated are receiving

their services. It starts with military cultural competency, which has been absent in decades past, but now is on the rise. That, Cooke said, may be one of the biggest contributions that current philanthropic leaders have made to the wider philanthropic domain in the past 15 years.

“I think that maybe a great, lasting piece—that the cultural awareness and competency has increased for the decades ahead,” Cooke said. “And that would be a great thing.”

Acknowledgements Linda Hughes-Kirchubel is director of external relations at the Military Family Research Institute at Purdue University. The Institute is located in the College of Health and Human Science’s Department of Human Development and Family Studies. Elizabeth Cline Johnson executive director of public relations and community partnerships at the University of Houston. This research was supported in part by a grant from Lilly Endowment Inc.

We are very grateful to all of the philanthropic leaders who contributed to the preparation of this chapter.

References

- Bartle, B. (2016, January 27). President, Lincoln Community Foundation. (L. Hughes-Kirchubel, & E. Johnson, Interviewers).
- Belasco, A. (2009). *Troop levels in Afghanistan and Iraq FY2001-FY2012: Cost and other potential issues*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Blue Shield of California Foundation. (2016, March 24). *Preventing violence in the homes of military families*. Retrieved from Blue Shield of California Foundation: chrome-extension://oemmndebldboiebfnladdacbfmadadm/http://www.blueshieldcafoundation.org/sites/default/files/u9/Preventing_Violence_Military_Families_June_2013.pdf
- Blum, D. (2010). Grant makers collaborate to help veterans. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 23(3), 18.
- Bob Woodruff Foundation. (2015). *2015 Woodruff Foundation annual report*. New York, NY: Author.
- Bob Woodruff Foundation. (2016, March 17). *The Woodruffs’ story*. Retrieved from Bob Woodruff Foundation: <http://bobwoodrufffoundation.org/woodruff/>
- Carstensen, M. (2016, October 26). Director, National Collaboration Initiative, Bob Woodruff Foundation. (L. Hughes-Kirchubel, Interviewer).
- Cooke, D. (2016, January 27). Senior vice president-philanthropy, the Robert R. McCormick Foundation. (L. H. Hughes-Kirchubel, & E. C. Johnson, Interviewers).
- Copeland, J. W., & Sutherland, D. W. (2010). *Sea of goodwill: Matching the donor to the need*. Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff.
- Council on Foundations. (2014, May 2). *Announcing the Philanthropy-Joining Forces Impact Pledge*. Retrieved from cof.org: <http://www.cof.org/content/announcing-philanthropy-joining-forces-impact-pledge>
- Council on Foundations. (2016a). *About the council*. Retrieved from Council on Foundations: <http://www.cof.org/about>
- Council on Foundations. (2016b, April 6). *Supporting veterans and military families*. Retrieved from Council on Foundations: <http://www.cof.org/content/supporting-veterans-military-families>
- Cox, K. (2017). Senior manager, Walmart Giving. (S.M. MacDermid Wadsworth, Interviewer).
- Dictionary.com. (2016, March 16). *Philanthropy*. Retrieved from Dictionary.com: <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/philanthropy?s=t>

- Dividend.com. (2016). *The Dow 30: A look into the last five recessions*. Retrieved from [Dividend.com: http://www.dividend.com/dividend-education/the-dow-30-a-look-into-the-last-five-recessions/](http://www.dividend.com/dividend-education/the-dow-30-a-look-into-the-last-five-recessions/)
- Forum of Regional Associations and Grantmakers. (2016, March 12). *About us*. Retrieved from The Forum of Regional Associations and Grantmakers: <https://www.givingforum.org/about>
- Green-Shortridge, T. M., Britt, T. W., & Castro, C. A. (2007). The stigma of mental health problems in the military. *Military Medicine*, 172, 157–161. <https://doi.org/10.7205/MILMED.172.2.157>.
- Grimes, C. (2016, January 27). Director, corporate philanthropy, Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation. (L. H. Hughes-Kirchubel, & E. C. Johnson, Interviewers).
- Hall, P. (2006). A historical overview of philanthropy, voluntary associations, and nonprofit organizations in the United States, 1600-200. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook - Second Edition* (pp. 32–65). Yale University Press.
- Hammock, D. C. (2003). Failure and resilience: Pushing the limits in Depression and war. In L. J. Friedman & M. D. McGarvie (Eds.), *Charity, philanthropy and civility in American history* (pp. 263–280). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, P. (2016, January 27). President and CEO, Blue Shield of California. (L. Hughes-Kirchubel, & E. Johnson, Interviewers).
- Merriam-Webster. (2016, March 16). *Philanthropy*. Retrieved from [Merriam-Webster.com: http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/philanthropy](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/philanthropy)
- Meyer, T. (2013). In K. Zinsmeister (Ed.), *Serving those who served: A wise giver's guide to assisting veterans and military families*. Washington, DC: The Philanthropy Roundtable.
- Nonprofit Quarterly. (2014, May 5). *Major foundation initiative for returning veterans unveiled by White House*. Retrieved from Nonprofit Quarterly: <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2014/05/05/major-foundation-initiative-for-returning-veterans-announced-at-white-house/>
- Points of Light. (2016, April 2). *Community blueprint*. Retrieved from Points of Light: <http://survey.clicktools.com/app/survey/response.jsp>
- Powers, S. (2015a, December 8). Senior director for policy and partnerships, Council on Foundations. (L. Hughes-Kirchubel, & E. C. Johnson, Interviewers).
- Powers, S. (2015b, December 15). A battle plan for supporting military families: Efforts in the philanthropy domain. (Hughes-Kirchubel, L.H., & E. Johnson, Interviewers).
- Renz, L., & Marino, L. (2003). *Giving in the aftermath of 9/11*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Robert R. McCormick Foundation. (2016, March 17). *Veterans program*. Retrieved from McCormick Foundation: <http://www.mccormickfoundation.org/veterans>
- Robin Hood Foundation. (2016, March 23). *Robin Hood Veterans*. Retrieved from Robin Hood Foundation: <https://www.robinhood.org/veterans>
- The National Philanthropic Trust. (2016, March 16). *Philanthropy timeline: The roots of giving*. Retrieved from The National Philanthropic Trust: <http://www.nptrust.org/history-of-giving/timeline/roots/>
- Van Dahlen, B. (2011, May 25). *Keeping faith with our military community*. Retrieved from Veterans Advantage: <https://www.veteransadvantage.com/va/coverstory/keeping-faith-our-military-community>
- Wills, D. K. (2008). Charities scramble to provide housing and health care to veterans. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 20(11), 3.